

(MY ONLY COPY)

TUITION TAX CREDITS

A Responsible Appraisal

JAN AND CHARLOTTE ISERBYT
1062 WASHINGTON ST.
BATH, MAINE 04530

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Barbara M. Morris is a nationally recognized authority on the philosophy of contemporary education. She publishes THE BARBARA M. MORRIS REPORT.

In addition to *TUITION TAX CREDITS*, her books include *WHY ARE YOU LOSING YOUR CHILDREN?*, *CHANGE AGENTS IN THE SCHOOLS* and *BETRAYING AMERICA IN THE SCHOOLS*.

A graduate of Rutgers University and a registered pharmacist, Mrs. Morris and her husband, a biochemist and retired college professor, live in California.

TUITION TAX CREDITS

A Responsible Appraisal

THE BARBARA M. MORRIS REPORT

Upland, California 91786

Copyright © 1983 by Barbara M. Morris. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form whatsoever without written permission from the publisher.

Published by The Barbara M. Morris Report, P.O. Box 756, Upland, CA 91786. Write for current price and quantity discounts.

Contents

Acknowledgements	ix
Why A Responsible Appraisal of Tuition Tax Credits?	xi
What is a Tuition Tax Credit?	xiii
1. Why Do Public Schools Exist	1
2. Partnerships: The Made in Heaven Solution	5
3. TTCs: The Corporate Connection	21
4. TTCs: Facets of Control	25
5. TTCs: New Opportunities	33
6. TTCs and Computers	40
7. TTCs: Design for Collectivism	45
8. TTCs: Beyond Today	52
9. TTCs: Specious Arguments Pro and Con	60
10. The Responsible Alternative	73
Appendix	78

**TUITION
TAX
CREDITS**

A Responsible Appraisal

Barbara M. Morris

Acknowledgements

Recognition and appreciation must be expressed for the tremendous amount of help that was given by so many people, in so many ways.

In particular, gratitude is expressed for the assistance given by Pierre Smith. A superb researcher, he contributed a tremendous amount of information and untold hours of skillful editorial assistance. His dedication, borne of sincere concern for the future of our country and for generations yet to come, has been extraordinary.

In spite of much enthusiasm for tuition tax credits and or vouchers, Elizabeth Tishler recognized, from the first indications of support from some conservatives and church schools, that the pitfalls outweigh the promises. Without her keen insight, research for this book probably would not have been undertaken.

Victoria Bradford not only has been a steadfast, knowledgeable colleague, but also provided exceptional documentation that greatly supports our position on tax credits.

To these and all the others who could not be recognized here, "thank you."

Why A Responsible Appraisal of Tuition Tax Credits?

A responsible appraisal of “tuition tax credits” looks beyond the obvious.

It transcends the emotion-laden rhetoric of “parents rights” and “freedom of choice” promised by implementation of a tuition tax credits system.

It mandates examination and exposure of as many critical tangential issues as possible - - issues generally unknown, denied or deliberately glossed over - - issues which have far greater potential significance than the matter of tuition tax credits alone.

It is only through a responsible appraisal that it is possible to arrive at a *properly informed* position on the subject.

What is a Tuition Tax Credit?

Basically, a tuition tax credit (TTC) is a “gift” from the federal government. This “gift” is created by amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to allow a federal income tax credit for tuition.

It is a “gift” that can only be accepted through filing an income tax return. Thus, this “gift” is allowed by the Internal Revenue Service and therefore, is subject to the same IRS scrutiny as any other item on the return.

It means a tuition tax credit is a lot more than a simple “gift” to assist in the education of children. The law that makes the “gift” possible also includes a few “strings,” which may be good or bad, depending on the intent.

Tuition tax credit legislation introduced in 1982 (which did not pass and will be introduced again in the next session of Congress) has a few strings. One is that schools practicing racial discrimination could not receive tuition tax credit money. At the very minimum that means that parents and/or schools would have to produce and allow inspection of records to prove compliance.

It could be a string to bar other types of discrimination prohibited by the federal government: sex (including gender and preference), religious and handicapped (the handicapped include drug addicts and alcoholics being rehabilitated).

It could be a string introduced at some later date to require private and/or church schools to hire all classes of handicapped persons as teachers, teacher aides, maintenance workers, etc.

It could be a string to require small private schools to accept a quota of severely handicapped youngsters in need of constant daily medical attention even though such schools could not afford the financial burden.

It could be a string to require church schools to hire lesbians, homosexuals, Humanists, Eastern cultists, or whatever, regardless of whether the schools' religious beliefs might be compromised.

Even though the current legislation is carefully worded, the principal concern remains that once it becomes law, it can be amended in future years to serve a purpose far removed from the original intent. What is a "gift" today could become an uncontrollable monster tomorrow.

For the cruel truth is that what the federal government gives (allows), it can take away, and in the process, much more can be taken with it than was ever thought possible.

1.

Why Do Public Schools Exist?

Any discussion of tuition tax credits (TTCs) must be prefaced by an understanding of the purpose of public “education.”

Why do public schools exist?

Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, (AFT) explains it this way:

“Public schools do not exist to please Johnny’s parents. . . They do not even exist to ensure that Johnny will one day earn a good living at a job he likes. . . ”

“In short, public schools exist to create citizens.”¹

What kind of citizens he would have the schools create is open to question. But as important as it is to know what he really means, it is even more important to look beyond his rhetoric. That is where we find the true answer to the question, “Why do public schools exist?”

It is incorrect to refer to what is taking place in those buildings called “public schools” as “education.” In the traditional meaning of the word, “education” is just about the last item on the public school agenda. This has been demonstrated in many ways but it is verified most dramatically with every publication of declining SAT scores. And after taking into consideration that academic

2 / Tuition Tax Credits: A Responsible Appraisal

achievement tests have been (and continue to be) renormed over the years to reflect the decline in academic instruction, we know for sure where academic education fits into the ladder of priorities.

The fact is that "education" as provided in government schools* is designed and exists to bring about total *revolutionary change*. Change that would transform our Constitutional Republic and a Judeo-Christian ethic rooted in the Ten Commandments to a Humanist/Socialist participatory democracy. This means children must be subjected to a variety of behavior modification programs and processes that result in the following objectives:

- * Destruction of traditional morals and mores;
- * Acceptance of formerly unacceptable social attitudes, values and behaviors;
- * Change in religious beliefs and practices;
- * Changes in our form of government;
- * Change in our economic system.

THE TTC CONNECTION

What does all this have to do with TTCs? After stripping away the specious arguments and emotionalism, the basic purpose of tuition tax credits is as follows:

1. To eliminate or sufficiently emasculate private education through regulation, coercion, co-optation, and/or financial dependence.
2. To spread and perpetuate the above objectives of government schooling.

The above would be accomplished through the following mechanisms:

1. Regulation. Once private/church schools accept government assistance (however that assistance is to be distributed - - through parents as the conduit or directly to schools), regulation of participating schools would follow by increments.
2. Partnerships. TTCs would enable and en-

courage the formation of partnerships between corporations, public schools and private schools. Such partnerships are now being promoted by the government and the education establishment. While corporations and other private entities would help shoulder the expense of schooling, such "partnerships" would be in name only. The government education combines, (NEA, AFT, and their satellite organizations); federally funded tax-exempt foundations as well as federal agencies and departments of the U.S. government - - would ultimately determine the curriculum and goals of schools accepting TTCs.

Tuition tax credit-inspired partnerships would also make possible control of technical/vocational education provided by private corporations whose TTC-supported "learning centers" would be controlled at first by their own goals and objectives, and later by the government's goals and objectives as educators become corporate consultants to make certain that corporate offerings meet the specifications of the education establishment.

In simplest terms, TTCs would guarantee spread of the philosophy and goals of government education (as described above) into private schools to the point where private education becomes "private" in name only. This is a necessary precursor for the ultimate goal: Uniformity and internationalization of all education.

THE GLOBALIZING LINK

Most "socialist democracies" in the Western world (Australia, Canada, Netherlands, and France, for example) finance and control to one degree or another, private as well as state schools. In the overall scheme of things, it is the U.S. that is the laggard, standing in the way of a system of universalized, standardized global education. However, with computers and satellites now a reality, the U.S. could pull all the diverse educational elements into line.

Internationally, the trend toward nationalization and uniformity has begun. Following the recent election of Socialist Francois Mitterand in France, the government

has now announced it will “integrate” all church schools receiving government assistance into the state system.

As Americans become more dependent on the government for their needs, the legislative proclivities of those elected to public office will exhibit increasingly socialistic tendencies. Therefore it is not unrealistic to expect that the situation in France could easily be duplicated here. For if the truth is to be acknowledged, the U.S. is already very much a “socialist democracy”.

If the goal is a totalitarian “one world” situation (and it is, without question) then every nation of the world must educate and work toward that goal. Every nation must be able to exert absolute control over its educational system to insure there is no serious deviation that would sidetrack attainment of the goal.

With the assistance of the federal government, public schools in the U.S. have been teaching toward a one world government goal for many years as have many private and church schools under the banner of “peace and justice” or “global perspectives” education. But there are not enough private/church schools doing it to guarantee uniformity. There are still far too many independent educational entities (which are increasing daily, particularly in the form of fundamentalist and home schools) that are determining their own goals and objectives. If those holdouts could be enticed with TTC assistance (and in these times of economic difficulty, how many would not be tempted?) the problem would be effectively mitigated. The regulations that could be imposed regarding curriculum would set up the needed uniformity and control sooner or later.

“It wouldn’t happen here” with tuition tax credits? Yes, it could. It is unwise to ignore logic, common sense and an understanding of past and present history.

*The terms “government schools” and “public schools” are used interchangeably throughout.

2.

Partnerships: The Made in Heaven Solution

Even as many in the decision-making ranks of the education establishment thunder against TTCs with the allegation that they would destroy public schools, it is important to recognize the noise as mere diversionary rhetoric. While TTCs may eventually destroy public schools as we now know them, TTCs will neither destroy the education establishment nor its control of what passes for education. The decision-makers know full well that with TTCs and with the help of the federal government and the IRS, they can control ALL education, public and private, through PPBS in the guise of "accountability". (A detailed explanation of PPBS is included in the appendix).

Let's look at the way things really are. Thanks in part to an effective "overpopulation" campaign in the schools (sex-ed and pro-abortion, contraceptive programs and counseling) which has been transmitted to a generation of children (who in turn as young adults have obediently responded to the "overpopulation" hoax by accepting the utility of abortion and "necessity" of limiting family size to two children), U.S. schools are suffering from a lack of children to fill classroom seats. It is no small dilemma. Most areas are so child-poor that schools have been forced to close their doors.

The result is an equation that requires no mathematical skill to understand: Too few children plus closed schools equals teachers and other school personnel out of work. But "teachers out of work" is just the tip of the iceberg. The potential domino effect within the establishment's empire would be awesome.

The problem is compounded by a seriously ailing economy. The educators are very keenly aware that they have extracted from taxpayers just about as much as they can. Increasingly militant money demands for "education" are clearly seen by the taxpayers as not for the benefit of children, but rather, for fattening paychecks of those who are already overpaid in relation to what they produce.

Think for one moment. Since teaching jobs depend on having enough children to fill classroom seats, what would be the logical means to lay claim to as many children as possible, taking into consideration that the supply is severely limited? At a meeting of the Oregon State Department of Education, educators were told "Every profitable piece of education has been taken over by the private sector."² They know what must be done to share the bounty. Clearly, TTCs represent a "made in heaven" solution for public education.

Of the many reasons TTCs are a made in heaven solution for government education, one of the most important would be the opportunity for forming TTC-supported partnerships with a variety of entities: parents, schools, and corporations. That would guarantee the basic necessities for survival and gain for the government system: children and money.

The suggestion that partnerships would be the salvation of public education is not based on uninformed conjecture. Promotion of partnerships as a desirable condition appear with regularity in educators' journals.

In an article in the November 1982 *Educational Leadership* the question is asked (and which assumes a positive answer):

"Has the time come when the enlightened self-interests of the various sectors will prevail and collaborative activities will result in

an expanded, multi-institutional educational process?"³

The obvious question is, how can this collaborative, expanded "multi-institutional educational process" develop without adequate funds? The public schools are already in a financial bind because the education establishment has gone to the public well once too often. Voters continue to show by their balloting on school issues that they are tired of paying for what they aren't getting.

And private schools? Where would *their* share of the money come from for their part of the collaboration? With few exceptions they operate with slim budgets. What better solution than tuition tax credits? This mechanism would all but guarantee formation of a "multi-institutional educational process" while allowing a temporary facade of independence for private schools, and at the same time, insuring financial survival of the education establishment. (Not necessarily survival of public schools as we now know them, but the financial survival of the education establishment. There is a difference..)

In the March 1982 issue of *Learning*, Michael W. Kirst, Professor of Education, Stanford University, suggests solving the "funding squeeze" with coalitions and alliances:

"Improving the school finance picture will depend, above all, on the willingness and ability of educators to coalesce, and to seek out alliances within and without their ranks."⁴

Reinforcement of Kirst's thinking is found in an article by Patricia M. Lines in the October 1982 *Phi Delta Kappan*. The author argues for partnerships, and as to the question 'where is the money going to come from,' her conclusion is revealing:

". . . states might explore constitutional ways of providing partial state aid to local districts that make their school libraries, physical education facilities, art facilities, testing and

guidance services, and other resources available to pupils in alternative educational programs. *Such cooperation requires new laws and regulations. It also demands new relationships between state and local education officials and between public and private educational systems.*"⁵ (emphasis added)

Of what might that "partial state aid" consist? The "new relationships between state and local education officials" certainly suggests federal block grants. But more important, the relationships between "public and private educational systems" certainly point to TTCs or vouchers!

Partnerships may also be forged through a system of TTC-supported "dual enrollments." This is suggested as a frontier of cooperation in an article in the March 1982 NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals) Bulletin. The authors explain that through dual enrollments,

"The states can play a constructive role and can help maximize choices for students and *collaboration between public and private educators.*" (emphasis added)

They continue,

"On occasion, a private school student will study at a public vocational school for half a day. This is called "dual enrollment," and is approved by several midwestern states . . . This type of cooperation is economical and builds a broader base of support for the public school."⁶

Note well the bonus that comes with this "partnership": ". . . a broader base of support for the public school."[!]

If, according to Michael Kirst, "improving the school finance picture" depends "above all" on coalitions, collaborations and alliances, what is he actually suggesting?

How will coalitions and alliances be possible without a source of equitable funding? And what is the most likely source of "equitable" funding?

Kirst also pleads for mending the widening rift between parents and public schools:

"The political split between parents and teachers needs to be bridged. The involvement of business and labor in public schooling needs to be sought and cultivated."⁷

Coalitions with business and labor figure prominently in the TTC picture and will be discussed later. But for the moment, let's focus on Kirst's desire for mended bridges between parents and educators.

THE RITE OF RECONCILIATION

Improving relations with parents is seen in a curiously conciliatory article in the November 1982 *Educational Leadership*:

"Shifting to a partnership policy in education will not be easy. Most schools . . . still operate on the premise of the irrelevance or weakness of the family . . . The family's role is seen as little more than that of producing children and feeding, housing, and clothing them so they can go to school . . . Educational research has begun to focus on the importance of the family as educator. It is now being recognized that much of what a child needs to know, both before and during the school years, is learned in the family."⁸

Quite an admission of guilt. But in spite of such repentant breast-beating, it is certain that any partnership with parents is to be subject to unilateral control. The author explains:

"Teachers in partnerships with parents are accountable to them for guiding the learn-

ing of their children. *They gain authority from this relationship, and they need not be bashful about using it*, as long as it genuinely reflects parents' values rather than professional values and interests clothed in the name of 'the best interest of the child'.⁹ (emphasis added)

Since when have parents' values been respected? If educators were serious about wanting to "genuinely reflect" parents' values, they would not be undermining parental values with values clarification and other alienating techniques.

The same condescending tone seen above is echoed by Patricia M. Lines in the October 1982 *Phi Delta Kappan*. (Research for her article was conducted with support from the Education Commission of the States and grants from the Carnegie Corporation and Spencer and Ford Foundations.)

In the article, Ms. Lines displays thinly veiled and unexpected enthusiasm for "nontraditional educational options" for which she offers little supportive evidence. Admitting that nontraditional schools often resist attempts by researchers to locate and evaluate them*, nevertheless,

"The scant amount of available evidence from standardized tests suggests that these unaccredited alternatives are educationally adequate. Test scores introduced in evidence in a few lawsuits suggest that children's performances improve after they are enrolled in unauthorized educational programs."¹⁰

As a bonus, the "scant available evidence" also shows that supporters of fundamental schools are motivated by strong religious beliefs, not by segregationist attitudes.

Why such profuse public praise? Surely, the "scant available evidence" also could be skewed to show that the opposite is true. Again, why? Because in order to pull in ALL the stray cats and dogs they must be recognized and given legitimacy. It could be said that surely, money would not be given to just *any* nontraditional entity that didn't measure up academically. But the rebels

don't need to measure up academically. After all, the concern of the education establishment is not academic excellence but money and control. Besides, even the public schools are not required to demonstrate any particular level of academic standards!

PARTNERSHIPS WITH PARENTS

At this point it would make sense to look at enrollment figures as they affect the financial picture of government schools.

The National Center for Education Statistics estimates that during 1976-78, there was a 3.3 percent decrease in the number of school-age children in the nation. Relative to that decrease, private school enrollments have held their own, declining not less than 2 percent. NCES projects private school enrollments will increase 16 percent during this decade. Other estimates suggest that enrollments in the 15,000 non-Catholic private schools are increasing by 100,000 per year. "It seems likely that the fastest growth in attendance has occurred among small, unaccredited schools."¹¹

An exodus of children to private schools could pose an intolerable financial dilemma. In San Francisco, public school officials claim the U.S. Army is injuring their district's financial position because 215 of 474 children in grades K-5 who live at a military base are provided with military transportation to private schools. Their absence from public schools results in a loss to the district of \$412,000 in state aid and approximately \$300,000 in federal impact aid payments. Calculation of the amount of state aid alone - - almost \$2,000 per child - - provides a compelling reason for formation of TTC-supported partnerships with private schools.

But in addition to children in "legitimate" non-public schools, it has been estimated that more than 10,000 families now educate their children at home in defiance of compulsory attendance laws. If each family has two children, and each child is worth \$2,000 in state/federal funds, that amounts to \$40 million. That's a figure worth fighting for. It's worth extending an invitation to enter a partnership and "share" the "benefits" of tuition tax credits.

So it does not come as a surprise that the January 1983 issue of *Phi Delta Kappan* published several articles and an editorial favorable to home schooling. While stating that numbers of children likely to be taught at home do not “. . . represent a significant drain on the financial resources made available to the schools,” editor Robert W. Cole Jr. nevertheless suggests that “. . . school-people have the opportunity to turn home schoolers into allies.”

Still holding out the olive branch, he continues,

“Why not work with parents to develop a sound and exciting curriculum for those children whose schoolroom is the family kitchen? And why not include those same children in average daily attendance figures, so that the schools lose no money in the bargain?”^{1 2}

Yes, school people *do* want parents as partners. They want to train those parents to use an “exciting” curriculum, overlooking the fact that if parents wanted an “exciting” public school curriculum they would have put their children in the government school in the first place.

But mostly, schoolpeople want parents as partners “so that the schools lose no money in the bargain.”

That's the bottom line.

TRAINING THE PARTNERS

But there is still more to this “partnership with parents” game than meets the eye. At a meeting of the Minnesota Education Association held in October 1982, Ruth Anne Schai told an attentive audience that research shows that babies can learn before birth and that education from conception would be a future focus of educators. She also explained that children can learn a great deal of cognitive information between the ages of one and three and that this would open up opportunities for teachers to train parents because homes are not considered educationally adequate environments.

It would be well to point out that Ms. Schai's view about early training is not new. In *Crisis in Child Mental*

Health: Challenge for the 1970s, the Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, special programs for children under three were recommended. A "homebound educational program" would include:

" . . . vigorous and systematic efforts to bring the knowledge of the physician, nurse, psychologist, social worker, trained paraprofessional, and early childhood educator into the home. Mothers would be taught the preferred ways of handling infants. . . ."¹³

The desire of people-shapers to mold and bend malleable infants to *their* dimensions continues without abatement. More recently, Mortimer Adler's *Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto***echoed the Orwellian sentiment of the Joint Commission Report:

"For the school to succeed in giving the same quality of basic education to all children, all must be prepared for it in roughly equal measure. Hence, at least one year - - or better, two or three years - - of preschool tutelage must be provided for those who do not get such preparation from favorable environments.

" . . . a democratic society is limited in its ability to effect such equality. It can do so only through the public agencies it is able to finance and over which it can exercise some control. Preschool tutelage should, therefore, be provided at public expense for those who need but cannot afford it . . . The inequality of homes produces inequality of nurture . . ."¹⁴

Clearly, the preschool market is not insignificant in the overall scheme. As more mothers out of financial necessity are forced to return to work soon after childbirth, the education establishment stands to benefit handsomely.

Many corporations now make "in house" child care and educational programs available to their workers. In an article in the October 1982 *Phi Delta Kappan* it is

suggested that,

“Industries must also extend to these pre-school programs the positive benefits of quality and product control, performance-based staff and student evaluations, and management by measurable objectives . . . The diagnostic procedures of early childhood education must be incorporated into these programs, along with remediation for those children with social, emotional, intellectual or physical problems.”

The authors conclude,

“The child-care scramble may yield one unexpected gain for educators. For the first time, we may see a formal link between two systems that have traditionally failed to communicate with one another -- the public schools and the early childhood programs. Children are likely to benefit, if this link is forged.”¹⁵

Needless to say, the “innovators” and “experts” in the money-hungry education establishment will be more than happy to provide “diagnostic procedures,” “product control,” and social and emotional “remediation” of children who are “likely” to benefit from the linkage.

GETTING A FAIR SHARE

The movement toward partnerships is not recent, nor one that is happening by virtue of some unknown or undefinable cause. It began in earnest in 1965 with passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Joseph M. Cronin and Regan Kenyon explain that,

“Since 1965, additional federal laws and amendments have expanded the entitlement of private school students . . . defined new working relationships between public and private school officials. The 1965-1980 years can be characterized as an era of partial co-

operation between states and private schools, except in the realm of regulation.”¹⁶

Here it should be pointed out that many proponents of TTCs argue that TTCs are needed to insure that private school students receive a “fair share” of public money. Chester E. Finn Jr. notes that,

“ . . . private school students have received nowhere their ‘share’ of assistance for most of the Education Department programs, despite the stated intention of Congress that they should. The main reason is that the federal funds that would provide services to private school students are turned over to the local public schools; the private schools never receive a single dollar of actual federal money . . . It is not surprising that the public school students generally end up with more than their share.”

*“This particular problem could be solved without any new or different forms of public aid to nonpublic education.”*¹⁷ (emphasis added)

While public schools may have been tight fisted with money meant for private schools, federally funded “inservice training” for private school teachers apparently has not been limited. Cronin and Kenyon explain that,

“ . . . One legacy of ESEA Title IV-C and Title I . . . was the practice of inviting private school teachers to attend instructional conferences, seminars, and workshops. . . These workshops may help overcome traditional hostility or suspicion.”¹⁸

Apparently as an effort to rectify this pennypinching injustice perpetrated by public school officials,

“In 1981, the Congress practically without

debate, passed education appropriation language requiring 'equal expenditure' of federal dollars on private as well as public school students. This may signal a new parity between the sectors."¹⁹

In the meantime, the states have not been remiss in fostering a "new parity" of their own:

* In 1977 Washington State Superintendent Frank Brouillet spoke in favor of public-private collaboration for the "general good."

* In 1981 Dr. Peter D. Relic, Superintendent of West Hartford, Connecticut schools (and formerly with HEW) called for formation of an association of public and private administrators; inviting private school trustees to meet with public school boards "to discuss future needs and priorities"; and developing other non-academic activities between private and public schools to enhance cooperation.

* In 1974 the Illinois State Constitution was changed to replace the term 'Superintendent of Public Instruction' with the more neutral 'State Board of Education and State Superintendent of Education,' with responsibility for assisting and preparing guidelines for private schools as well.

* In 1978 and 1979 the Council of Chief State School Officers changed its national policy statements to delete references to public schools only.²⁰

The education establishment knows it cannot get rid of the unaccredited nuisances without a war. They have allowed the rebels to go too far, and now there are too many of them. Despite often serious consequences, violations of compulsory attendance laws continue, and ". . . appear to be rising dramatically, presenting policy makers with one of the most serious issues facing them today."²¹ Thus, the strategy of choice seems to be to treat them if not as equals then with a dignity that would

not preclude recognizing them as "partners" for financial purposes:

"... a few state officials have recognized the financial implications for public schools of the trend toward nontraditional schooling which is siphoning off students and thus enrollment-based aid.

"This issue is unlikely to go away. . . ."22

No, the issue isn't likely to go away, and if they play their cards right, perhaps with enough flattery and offers of benign financial assistance via TTCs, the stray cats and dogs can be lured into the snare.

COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

Government education must have another connection for financial survival: Community educational foundations. There are an estimated one hundred already existing, most of them in California. The Ford Foundation has been spearheading the drive, contacting other national foundations and corporations in an effort to create a national pool of funds that would be used to set up additional community foundations to assist local public schools. One of the most visible community foundations is operating in San Francisco as the San Francisco Education Fund (SFEF). Although the SFEF is said to be completely separate from the school district, nevertheless, to watch over the interests of the educators, one SFEF board member is on the San Francisco school board and two other members are former members of the board. SFEF funds go directly to individual teachers for projects they would like to have implemented. The SFEF is discussed in an article in the October 1982 *Phi Delta Kappan* and concludes,

"In the present economic climate, new approaches to improve education in the public schools must be found. SFEF is one such approach. It has a track record of success, and it holds promise for other communities."²³

Another foundation, the California Educational Initiatives Fund has been established by the Bank of America and Chevron U.S.A. to support innovative educational programs developed by California elementary and secondary schools. Projects will be selected by a statewide committee of superintendents and "individuals concerned with the quality of education."²⁴ Over the past three years, California schools have received \$3 million in grants through this "partnership."

What kind of programs would be funded? An example is described in an article in the Ontario, CA *Daily Report* titled "Grant to keep Chino students from fighting." It tells about a \$11,400 grant from the above mentioned California Initiatives Fund which will be used "to train staff members in teaching students proper social behavior." Having found that the usual counseling approaches don't work because they don't tell students what to do or not to do, but leave them to decide for themselves, the grant money will be used to train teachers to show "students alternatives to using their fists."²⁵

Better the \$11,400 would be spent on phonics materials and training teachers how to use them. That would be a real "innovative educational program" that would encourage and enable children to read instead of acting out their frustrations caused by the non-education they are getting.

Even while a concerted effort is being made to set up community foundations as quickly as possible, too many replications are not seen as desirable. Former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, has warned that these foundations cannot possibly replace tax dollars. There is concern that if they become widespread, the quality of education in affluent districts would outpace that of less affluent communities, posing a serious problem since a major goal of public education is not academic excellence, but "equity."

While Keppel insists community foundations cannot possibly replace tax dollars, what they are doing is leading the way for corporations and taxpayers to enjoy tax benefits for contributing to the support of public schools through a system of TTCs or vouchers. For example, the "D.C. Greater Educational Opportunities

Through Tax Incentives Initiative of 1981" (which was defeated at the polls) would have allowed a credit up to 50 percent of income tax payable for taxpayers and corporations for contributions made on behalf of particular students. For some, then, education becomes a tax shelter write off.

Community foundations on a limited scale give the public and business community time to get used to the idea that property taxes and federal money are not the only sources of funding for public education. They will also provide the opportunity to convince the public that corporate involvement will mean a reduced tax burden. But will the public also be told that when corporations assume a financial responsibility for public education, that consumers will be paying for such corporate largesse in the form of a tax built into the products and services corporations sell to the public?

* * *

* The government education establishment need not worry too much about nontraditional schools that resist attempts by researchers to locate and evaluate them. A research proposal has been submitted to the National Institute of Education by the Hewett Research Foundation, Raymond S. Moore, President, entitled "A Study Which Compares the Academic and Behavioral Measures of the Home-Taught Child With National Norms."

On page three of the proposal we read, "The problem this study then seeks to address is the lack of objective information relating to the nature of home schools. . . ."

On page four we read "The purpose of this study is to gather information . . . To gather demographic information about families . . . To develop . . . information about the curriculum offered in the home schools . . . To gather information concerning the emotional and social development of children educated in home schools . . ."

On page 6 we learn there will be developed a "master computerized list of the families educating their children in home schools which have been obtained from any of

the sources listed in step 1.”

As providers of “non-traditional education,” home schoolers for the most part do not wish to be identified, and as a matter of fact, often go to great lengths to keep their activities not only from the authorities but from friends and neighbors. Such cautious parents would be devastated and feel betrayed if as a result of subscribing to a newsletter of interest to home schoolers, or as a result of having purchased home schooling materials, they discovered their names revealed to federally supported researchers.

** A critique of the *Paideia Proposal* has been prepared by Child Care Commentary, Box 278, Eudora, KS 60025. Send them a SASE for information.

3.

TTCs:

The Corporate Connection

In the May 1982 NEA Journal, *Today's Education*, Sharon P. Robinson writes:

"In a time when political leaders are marshaling tuition tax credits and vouchers in an effort to shift responsibility for education from the public sector, a *commercially based education utility could rapidly replace public education.*"²⁶ (emphasis added)

Just what she has in mind is open to speculation, but it would be a good bet she may be referring to corporate-provided, TTC-supported education. At the meeting of the Minnesota Education Association held in October 1982, Ruth Anne Schai told an audience that businesses would play an important role in the future of education. She saw vouchers as providing a great opportunity for businesses to set up their own schools and sell programs to the public. This possibility she saw as "healthy competition" for public schools. Why the sudden acceptance of "healthy competition"? Because not only would opportunities open up for teachers to become consultants to (or otherwise be employed by) corporations under the pretense of making certain that the profit motive does not take precedence over high quality programs - - but the way would be paved for teachers to set up their own corporations. Ms. Schai

envisioned teachers becoming professionals like doctors or lawyers, setting up their own educational firms or practices and contracting out their services, in competition with businesses. She again stressed this would be possible if vouchers were available. (It matters not whether the bounty is in the form of tuition tax credits or vouchers. Government subsidy by any other name is still . . . government subsidy. Either way, educationists stand to gain).

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORTS TAX CREDITS

The idea that corporations, with the help of tuition tax credits or vouchers would set up their own schools is not new. A U.S. Chamber of Commerce Task Force Report in 1966 ²⁷ supported tuition vouchers. This Report recommended:

“ . . . that the government consider continuing to finance education for all children - - but that it offer them, as an alternative to public education, financial support for private education up to the amount of the average expenditure per pupil in local public schools . . . the present institutional structure in education may not be the best way to organize it.”

The Report also suggested that this proposal would result in a lack of private schools to fill the need created by parents opting for non-government education. (“ . . . our present public school system is government owned and operated,” says the report) but this could be easily remedied:

“ . . . there are not now in existence enough private schools to meet the likely demand under such a scheme. But there is little reason to doubt that they would spring up in response to the opportunity. . . Universities, like-minded groups of teachers or private corporations. . . all might be interested in operating primary and secondary schools given the existence of a

market as broad as their proposal would create. Public schools concerned about their continued attractiveness under this plan might even contract to have all or part of their facilities run by one of these groups.”

This is precisely what is being suggested seventeen years later!

Those private schools accepting tuition vouchers could not continue to operate without government interference. The Report continues:

“Minimum standards would be set up for private schools . . . to demonstrate their competence . . . Any school meeting these standards would be ‘approved’ . . . ”

This nagging fact of life pertaining to TTCs or any other “third party” payment plan has never been resolved to anyone’s satisfaction, yet many supporters of TTCs continue to believe participating schools would not be regulated.

Just as drafters of the Chamber Task Force Report left no doubt that participating private schools would be controlled, they also left no doubt that it was perfectly acceptable, and perhaps even desirable if public schools did not survive:

“Jenks puts the case for change well:

‘Either tuition grants or management contracts to private corporations would, of course, ‘destroy the public school system as we know it’. When one thinks of the remarkable past achievements of public education in America, this may seem a foolish step. But we must not allow the memory of past achievements to blind us to present failures. . . .’”

Remember this Report was made public in 1966! And it is interesting that the “educational grant plan received the full and unqualified support of the Task Force, headed by Erwin C. Canham, editor of the *Christian*

Science Monitor and composed of 100 top business leaders throughout the country.” The Report was said to be “hammered out” by the chief executive officers of entities such as Sears Roebuck, Coca Cola, General Electric, major banks, insurance companies and transportation lines as evidence of “. . . their concentrated and personal involvement in the issue of quality education for ALL” (emphasis in original)

PLANK NUMBER TEN

One last thing must be mentioned about corporate partnerships with public schools. It is Karl Marx’s tenth plank in his *Communist Manifesto* which reads as follows and which needs no additional comment:

“Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children’s factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production. . . ”

In summary, as a means of financial survival, the public education establishment definitely wants partnerships not only with all private schools of every description, but with corporations as well. As far as partnerships with schools are concerned, the problem is that under prevailing financial circumstances, the education establishment could not achieve this objective - - not without a reorganized and/or supplemental system of funding and attendant regulatory powers. Tuition tax credits could certainly go a long way toward solving the problem, simultaneously creating expansive financial opportunities with no loss of any kind to the education establishment. And once corporations become eligible for their share of the TTC pie, the education establishment would set up its own corporations to offer some “healthy competition.”

But this is the bottom line: While partnerships are an absolute financial necessity for the education establishment, an equally absolute necessity is *control* of any partnerships entered into.

4.

TTCs:

Facets of Control

Regardless of assurances that proposed TTC legislation would be drafted with appropriate language to insure complete autonomy of participating private schools, common sense and abundant evidence tell us such assurances are not trustworthy. The following are just some of the reliable warnings about the dangers inherent in TTCs which cannot be ignored or disputed:

* "Some to be sure, like to think they can have it both ways; i.e. can obtain aid without saddling themselves with unacceptable forms of regulation. But most acknowledge the general applicability of the old adage that he who pays the piper calls the tune, and are more or less resigned to amalgamating or choosing between assistance and autonomy."²⁸

* In the Stanford University *Campus Report* of March 18, 1981, president Donald Kennedy had this to say about TTCs:

"While the tax credit may seem simple to apply, it would require additional federal regulations. The Internal Revenue Service must determine which institutions . . . are eligible."

* In the July 1981 *School Board News*, Thomas A. Shannon, Executive Director of the National School Boards Association stated:

“. . . tuition tax credits for private elementary schools would profoundly change the character of private education. A simple fact of political life is that public regulations follow public money.

“Private schools that operate with public money will be subject to public regulations regardless of whether this is done in the name of ‘accountability’ or effecting social change.”

While Shannon’s argument is clearly self-serving, nevertheless, he’s right. TTCs are the camel’s nose under the private school’s tent flap.

* In Minnesota, transportation, cost of guidance counseling and school health services have been subsidized by the state since 1955. According to the *Washington Post* of Oct. 22, 1981:

“Having gone down the road of aid to non-public schools, the state legislature now may demand some say in how those schools are operated.”

Hearings were set on legislation “. . . to set minimum standards for private schools and to require the licensing of non-public school teachers.

“Supporters of the bill say it was designed *primarily to rein in a rash of tiny ‘home schools’ set up by fundamentalist Christians for their children. . .*” (emphasis added)

Obviously, the intention is not just a ‘little regulation’ of private schools in order to make certain quality education is being provided; the goal is *total control of ALL education.*

IRS & REGULATIONS

Some time ago the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC)

which supported passage of the disastrous Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, distributed a brochure in support of S. 550 the then current Packwood-Moynihan tax credit bill. The brochure asks the question, "What are tax credits?" and provides this answer: "Education tax credits concern the federal income tax . . ."

That admission ought to be enough to cause any potential recipient to shun TTCs. For if TTCs "concern the federal income tax" then TTCs would be of concern to the IRS. And what is of concern to the IRS would be subject to policing and regulations promulgated by that agency. Chester Finn puts the regulation of eligible recipients into focus:

"Short of scattering money in the streets or handing it out to everyone who wants some, the funding agency must define eligible recipients. . . This means, in a word, 'regulation', the inevitable concomitant of public financial support."²⁹

Finn also believes the government is obligated to recognize that the private schools it helps support are different from public schools - - that it is this "differentness" that makes them supportable. The other side of the coin, he says, is the obligation of private schools,

". . . to recognize certain limits to their differentness and certain ways they must conform to the norms and expectations of a society that values and supports them."³⁰

How are "norms and expectations" to be defined? A required "norm" might mandate a safe and healthful environment, to which no one could object, providing the definition allowed for "safe and healthful" is reasonable.

Another norm may refer to the definition of "education". Finn admits this may include ". . . the teaching of certain subjects and passing of certain tests of educational attainment."³¹ Could mandated sex-ed, for

instance, be a price to be paid in exchange for TTCs?

An "expectation" might require disclosure to the state or federal government of certain kinds of personal information about pupils and teachers - - information ordinarily not recognized as being the business of government. Once all schools are "on line" with computers, there is no limit to the amount of information private schools would be "expected" to provide.

Nathan Glazer, professor in the Graduate School of Education at Harvard and a supporter of TTCs, admits that even though private schools are already regulated to one degree or another by the states, he worries about additional controls surely to be engendered by TTCs. He states:

"Thus the question of what kind of regulations are imposed on private schools as a result of their receipt of public funds is a serious worry."^{3 2}

He also wonders if in their attempts to provide a drug-free environment, private schools might be inhibited by government regulation. He cites the dilemma faced by a Chicago school that wrestled with the question of whether it had the right to forbid a pupil to wear a T-shirt which bore the word "Marijuana". He asks:

"Would they be subject to the rules on privacy of school communication . . . The degree to which they could maintain their independence of such externally imposed rules would be crucial . . . It should be possible, without worrying about First Amendment rights, to ban not only drugs but student behavior that suggests drugs are fun and normal. But could private schools continue to do so?"^{3 3}

TTCS & RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

An even more important issue is raised by Glazer. He sees TTCs having a possibly disastrous impact on religious instruction. He asks:

“. . . what happens if prayer or the Ten Commandments are banned from private as from public schools by judicial interpretations, or if a court or the IRS decrees that a religious test for teachers or students deprives a school of the right to receive tax-deductible gifts, or is simply impermissible? These matters must concern advocates of tuition tax credits as well as opponents . . . For opponents of an expanded role for private schools, such an extension of rules and regulations would be desirable. . . ”³⁴

A related problem not addressed by Glazer is that of a possible requirement that all schools must teach “comparative religions” in order to promote acceptance of religious “pluralism”. Courses in “comparative religions” can - - and do - - convey to students the impression that all religions are “equally good,” or “equally bad” - - depending on the attitude of the teacher. A student flirting with agnosticism could exit from a “comparative religions” course with all the “facts” needed to affirm his thinking. A student with a wishy-washy Christian background could be quickly relieved of any lingering beliefs he might have brought to the course.

If prayer in private or church schools were to become an issue, Milton Friedman, a supporter of TTCs, has the answer. When asked what would happen if the Supreme Court decided that Catholic schools couldn’t qualify, he answered:

“Well, if religiously connected schools were excluded, that would really not make much difference, because it would just be a matter of reorganization for the parochial schools to qualify.

“The parochial schools could be set up as independent, non-profit schools, and religious instruction removed from them and given separately by the Church in Sunday school classes and the like.”³⁵

Some denominations might reject such a “solution,” but it is difficult to imagine that many Catholic and Protestant schools would find it too objectionable, since they are so very secular right now. If this were not the case, TTCs would have died a deserving death long ago. Nathan Glazer also warns:

“The most careful estimation of these possibilities is necessary . . . the extension of rule and regulation from public to private schools may depend in part on whether tuition tax credits provide publicly-raised funds to schools, but even more on the *tenor* of judicial and administrative rulings. Even without a penny of public funds, private schools are potentially and actually subject to a host of regulations at the state level.”³⁶

Not only does he prudently recognize the current state restraints, but he also points out that:

“. . . the Internal Revenue Service took it upon itself to determine what racial and ethnic composition of private schools justified the traditional tax exemption of non-profit religious and educational institutions.”³⁷

The ‘social sin’ banned by TTC legislation now before Congress is “racial discrimination.” But racial discrimination is not a valid issue. The majority of parents today are not sending their children to private schools to avoid integration. The ‘racial discrimination’ issue is the crack in the door that will allow the government to ban other types of newly defined or discovered discrimination. For example, schools accepting TTCs would have to submit to an assortment of laws, rules and regulations, not the least of which would be the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which introduces another unforgivable ‘social sin’ -- that of sex discrimination.

What does it matter that current legislation bars IRS regulation? What *does* matter is that even before the measure has been thoroughly debated, New Jersey Senator Bill Bradley intends to amend it to make certain

the IRS *as well as* the Justice Department would have power to enforce anti-discrimination mandates. Which is nothing new. Senator Moynihan, co-author of the Tuition Tax Relief Act of 1981 was quoted in the *Washington Post* of March 5, 1978:

“ . . . It is irresponsible to argue that tax credits would foster racially segregated education. Our bill is carefully drafted to exclude schools that might seek to discriminate on racial lines by requiring the Internal Revenue Service to police their compliance with civil rights statutes as part of allowing them to obtain and keep tax-exempt status. . . ”

Today it's a ban on racial discrimination. What will be policed tomorrow?

What it could be, not tomorrow but at any time is suggested in the August 1982 *Distant Drums*:

“And lest in our haste we forget just what is meant by ‘civil rights’ legislation, in particular the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent amendments, it is well to consider Title IX of this act, which was enacted as an ‘education Amendment’ in 1972 as part of Public Law 92-318. This ‘Education Amendment’ MANDATES that no person on the basis of their sex shall be discriminated against. In fact, Title IX mandates that ‘ . . . No person in the United States shall . . . be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE . . . ’ (emphasis added). It should be obvious to all concerned that ‘Tuition Tax Credits’ means ‘Federal Financial Assistance’. It is also a matter of record that ‘SEX’ can be construed and logically could imply ‘PREFERENCE’ under the language of the law . . . ”³⁸

Nathan Glazer continues to warn that there is “sufficient looseness” in current judicial standards and exist-

ing state regulations,

“ . . . to permit an attack on private schools that would prevent them from being different from public schools: tuition tax credits would certainly increase the ammunition available in such an attack . . . ”³⁹

He also recognizes that:

“When President Reagan leaves office the Supreme Court will undoubtedly be less sympathetic to regulation of private schools than it was when he entered office . . . There would be continued efforts in our litigious society to bring them under the same laws, regulations, and judicial interpretations that affect public schools . . . ”⁴⁰

This is a reality that many proponents of TTCs fail to grasp. No matter how carefully a measure is drafted by conservative legislators, the prospect of what is likely to happen to that “airtight” legislation during a more liberal administration should give sufficient reason to pause and think.

Which brings us to the argument often raised by supporters of TTCs, an argument they seem to think carries more weight than the certain pitfalls: “We must break the monopoly of government schools.” Of course the monopoly must be broken. But by using the income tax, and thus, insuring the scrutiny, regulation and policing by the IRS? This is a *conservative* solution? Perhaps we should also have the fox guard the hen house?

Those who are truly interested in breaking the monopoly of the government schools would do well to study the history of compulsory education in this country, and then with their new enlightenment, work for repeal of compulsory attendance laws.

5. TTCs: New Opportunities

The new TTC-supported education/corporation partnerships will result in many new opportunities for the education establishment. Some have already been discussed; a few more merit attention.

PROFITS IN THE PRE-BORN AND PRE-SCHOOL MARKET

As mentioned previously, the pre-school set is seen as a particularly lucrative market because babies are now said to be able to learn from conception - - an idea that contradicts the prevailing pro-abortion notion that pre-born children are not living human beings and therefore, can be dismembered, ground up, or subjected to a slow, painful scalding to death via saline injection, up to the first 26 weeks of life (or later, when there has been a 'miscalculation' about the date of conception).

Also mentioned previously - - but it is important enough to bear repetition - - at the Minnesota Education Association meeting held in October 1982, Ruth Schai expressed concern that children under three are at home where there are no educational requirements. She would like to see this remedied and suggested that availability of "early childhood education" would provide opportunities for teachers to train the parents of these toddlers. If parents were required by law to be certified, teachers could do the training. If certification were not a requirement, teachers could serve as evaluators, going to

homes to check up on what parents were doing with their children. Teachers could also function as consultants or social workers with case loads of children, following the children through their entire school career.

The recently published *Paideia Proposal* which has been widely hailed as the guide for a complete overhaul of American education certainly compliments Ms. Schai's views:

"For the school to succeed in giving the same quality of basic education to all children, all must be prepared for it in roughly equal measure. Hence, at least one year - - or better, two or three years - - of preschool tutelage must be provided for those who do not get such preparation from favorable home environments."⁴¹

And:

"The sooner a democratic society intervenes to remedy the cultural inequality of homes and environments, the sooner it will succeed in fulfilling the democratic mandate of equal educational opportunity for all."⁴²

As this is written, New York State's education department is studying a proposal that would bring children to school at four years of age. Education Commissioner Gordon M. Ambach says "The research clearly shows that kids are capable of handling school at an earlier age."⁴³ Almost at the same time, the Vermont legislature is considering preschool for 3 and 4-year-olds. While local school boards would not be required to implement pre-kindergarten programs, the legislation would provide a financial inducement to do so. Which means that the ideas expressed at the Minnesota Education Association meeting and the proposal of "at least one year of preschool" promoted in the *Paideia Proposal* are meant as serious goals to be implemented and not simply wishful ivory tower talk.

With such a system of early "intervention," and with computers in most homes in the future, parents

would be expected to teach their children basic skills before they enter school - - leaving the school ample time to do what it exists to do: provide socialization, indoctrinate and engage in behavior modification. Teachers could diagnose children's needs and select appropriate software programs for parents to use at home.

Undoubtedly, parental participation/cooperation would be guaranteed through TTC-generated financial inducements.

THE ADULT MARKET

At the other end of the spectrum, there is "lifelong learning". Institutions accepting TTCs for adult education would provide teachers and other establishment personnel with ample job opportunities.

Michael G. Bruce reports,

"As the school-age population declines, educators are showing more interest in the education of adults. Fortunately for educators, the demand for adult education is growing."⁴⁴

Of course it is growing. With the schools turning out illiterates, the need for adults to learn the basic skills they should have been taught in elementary school would result in a growing need for basic skills education for adults.

He explains that adult education flourishes in Europe. In Norway, for example, 5 percent of adult Norwegians take courses from privately owned correspondence schools, which are subject to close public supervision.

"All correspondence colleges must be approved by a government-appointed committee, and all of their courses must be approved every five years. Moreover, students are reimbursed by the government for the greater part of their tuition."⁴⁵

In the U.S., the groundwork for TTC-supported adult education has been solidly set. Financial oppor-

tunities await those ready to follow the European system.

EVANGELIZATION OPPORTUNITIES

Tuition tax credits would serve another purpose: enhancement of the propagation of Humanism. As non-public schools are manipulated into, or required to use specified teaching materials and teaching techniques, as well as required programs (sex-ed, for example) in exchange for receiving tax credit money; and as non-public school personnel are required or expected to attend instructional conferences, seminars and workshops with public school teachers to “. . . help overcome traditional hostility and suspicion.”⁴⁶ so will Humanistic values, beliefs and behaviors proliferate.

A ‘good’ example can be seen in what has happened to Catholic schools. Once bastions of superior academic teaching and rigorous religious training, they are now for the most part, as secular as the most secular public schools. Non-Catholic parents can enroll their children without any fear of their becoming unwilling converts to Catholicism, and non-Catholic teachers can teach in them with no apprehension about their beliefs being compromised.

Catholic schools have already sold their birthright for federal funds. The downfall began in earnest in 1965 when the U.S. Catholic Conference bargained for federal ESEA money. In exchange for accepting Title I funds,

“For most Catholic schools this has meant emptying one classroom per school of its crucifix and bibles and using it as the Title I room, according to a Catholic elementary school principal who wished to remain unnamed.”⁴⁷

Having gone this far, we need not be surprised if, in exchange for TTCs, they simply throw out any remaining traditional religious instruction entirely. Which would be no great loss in most Catholic schools since religious instruction seems to be limited to Humanist Sidney Simon’s values clarification exercises or Humanist Lawrence Kohlberg’s theory of moral development which in each case, inculcates universal situation ethics behavior.

This Humanist infiltration has been unintentionally corroborated by Sr. Jeanne O'Laughlin, O.P. at Berry University, Miami, Florida. Sr. Jeanne says:

“Catholic school programs will stress the concepts of Justice and Peace through all areas of curriculum and all levels of education. Also stress will be on values education . . . ”⁴⁸

The reference to programs stressing justice and peace means that Kohlberg's theory will be used as well as global interdependence indoctrination.

The secularization of Catholic schools is also recognized in this accurate statement:

“During the years the number of religious-related texts (e.g., an English book with writings by or on the saints) has diminished, and with it the distinctiveness of classroom materials in some church schools.”⁴⁹

As already noted elsewhere, Milton Friedman has suggested that if the Supreme Court decides Catholic schools don't qualify for TTCs,

“. . . that really would not make too much difference . . . The parochial schools could be set up as independent, non-profit schools and religious instruction removed from them and given separately by the Church in Sunday school classes and the like.”⁵⁰

One would think that in the face of such a suggestion that portends total destruction of Catholic schools that the Catholic hierarchy would be running from even the distant prospect of tax credits. But such is not the case.

NEW AGE INFLUENCES

Most parents who are involved in school battles

(if they are aware of anything beyond “dirty textbooks”) are aware of the presence of Humanism. Unfortunately, few of them understand that in addition to fighting Humanism they need to be alert to “New Age” activities such as Hindu meditation (TM); use of hypnotism; trances, magic, chanting, tarot card reading, spells, witchcraft studies and guided imagery - - all designed to control or change behavior. These practices are particularly dangerous when coupled with courses that purport to teach “about” religion (comparative religions courses). In effect, they result in giving children the impression that all religions are equally valid and acceptable (or equally invalid and absurd). Many of these techniques and influences, most of which have the blessing of federally supported education theorists, have already found their way into non-public schools and will surely increase should tax credits become established.

SOME REALITIES

The current TTC bill before Congress is reported to cost \$4 billion over a 5-year period. Keeping this in mind, let’s make an assumption. If TTCs are established, private schools would raise their tuitions, (and continue to do so) at least by the amount that parents could claim on their tax return. Now let’s make another assumption. After 5 years Congress decides that it cannot or will not continue to fund TTCs. How many parents would be willing or able to keep their children in private schools? Would most children return to public schools (or whatever may constitute public education at the time)? While private schools appear at the outset to be the beneficiaries of TTCs, the ultimate victor could be the public schools. They could stand to gain much of the private school population. Also, it may well be that many private schools, having become so similar to public schools, just might opt to become part of the government school system. This could very easily happen.

Such financial dependence is seen in the results of a study conducted by Donald A. Erickson, director of the Institute for the Study of Private schools.⁵¹

Erickson studied the effects of a system of public

aid to private schools in British Columbia. Early on, he found that aid caused problems, such as increased paperwork, less responsiveness to parents by the schools and a dependence on funds that could result in financial problems for the schools if money became unavailable.

What happens when the money is cut off bears a striking resemblance to a very real existing situation. When federal aid to cities was first proposed many years ago (when our economy was in relatively better condition) those opposed to the scheme warned that the time might come when the federal government could not or would not continue to provide federal aid. As this is written, President Reagan says the federal government can no longer provide aid to cities, that they must take care of their own needs. Cities are already in dire financial straits, even with the federal aid they currently receive. Should all federal largesse be cut off, many cities would be flirting with economic disaster and explosive social situations. As an alternative, they may have to consider consolidation with neighboring cities, counties or towns. Consolidations are not unknown in the U.S. Such movements have always promised reduced expenditures and reduced taxes. But they have always resulted in bigger, more expensive and more bureaucratic governments. Consolidation may work for business, but for government and for education, it's an invitation to totalitarian control.

What federal aid has done to the states and localities, TTCs could do to private schools.

* * *

In summary, TTCs would provide unlimited financial and job opportunities for the government education establishment. There would be an unprecedented opportunity to transmit an assortment of alienating ideological, religious and pseudo-religious beliefs and practices, facilitating destructive changes in our society either by driving children from traditional Christian faiths or by compromising and/or synthesizing them into counterfeit New Age thinking.

6. TTCs and Computers

In spite of dreadful economic conditions, schools are finding money to purchase computers because (according to school officials) all children must develop "computer literacy."

But what is "computer literacy"? It is never defined in terms that make any sense.

The dictionary defines literacy as a "state of being literate." "Literate" is defined as "One who can read and write; pertaining to or learned in literature." Obviously, then, there is no such thing as "computer literacy". One can, however, attain "keyboard competence" but that doesn't sound nearly as impressive or imply as much, or conjure up the vision that a lot of money is going to be needed to cope with this "complex" undertaking.

In truth, there is nothing mysterious or complex about learning to operate a classroom computer. They are as elementary as computers can be. Satisfactory operation simply requires following a booklet of instructions. As with any new toy, it may take a little practice to get the hang of it but certainly, the quest for "keyboard competence" doesn't merit the amount of money being spent to teach teachers how to use computers and it certainly doesn't merit the anxiety-inducing media attention given to the necessity of achieving "computer literacy."

The goal is a computer for every child in every classroom. But why must every child have his own com-

puter? One reason is that it's profitable for the computer companies. Steve Jobs, head of Apple Computers has said that one day he just happened to sit next to a congressman on an airplane and that chance meeting resulted in introduction of legislation to give computer companies a substantial tax break in exchange for providing classroom computers.

However, right now there is a serious problem. Even if every child had a computer, good academic computer programs are in short supply. But not to worry. The U.S. Dept. of Education is ready with "Project Best" (Better Education Skills Through Technology. A detailed explanation of Project Best is included in the appendix.) Through this "technology initiative" the federal government will make certain that software is developed to meet federal education goals.

What kinds of programs will federal funds produce? Programs that teach basic skills? Yes, some will, but it must be kept in mind that in the near future most homes will have computers that parents can use (and will be expected, or even required to use) to teach basic skills. Computers equipped with appropriate academic software will help get incompetent classroom teachers off the hook. It's no secret that too many certified teachers are not "literate" themselves. The other side of the coin is that software developed by the government or by private enterprise with the aid of federal funds is likely to be heavily "affective" - - designed to shape the child's attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviors.

Because the child's "learning needs" (the definition of "learning needs" may have little if any relationship to anything academic) will have been previously determined by a "diagnostic, prescriptive learning clinician," i.e. a "teacher" - - the central computer (at some remote point, perhaps at the state level) to which the child's classroom or home computer is interfaced, will have been programmed to insure that those teacher-diagnosed "learning needs" are met, as well as any other "needs" considered necessary by state or federal governments. And if the child doesn't demonstrate that his "learning needs" have been met the first time around, he will be required to sit at his computer - - "recycled" over and over until he gets it right.

All states have now enacted legislation or administrative regulations modeled after federal mandates that guarantee the right of handicapped pupils to receive individualized instruction. Quite possibly, in the future, non-handicapped as well as handicapped children might be considered entitled to individualized educational programs (IEPs). What does this have to do with computers? Just that IEPs lend themselves very well to computer technology, creating one more way for the federal government to exercise control over education programs.

We should be aware of something else: Even though the news media, in an incredible display of fine-tuned orchestration, warns us daily that the U.S. is falling behind technologically, computers in schools have little if anything to do with development of competent computer operators for industry, or with grooming bright students to become the scientific wizards of the future. Yes, acquaintance with computers will be helpful to high school graduates, but with technology advancing as rapidly as it does, the child who develops "keyboard competence" while in school will have to learn to use more advanced (and different) equipment on the job - - if in fact he gets a job requiring computer competence.

All of this relates to the PPBS (Planning, Programming and Budgeting System) under which our government now operates. As a computer-compatible "tool" for management of people, money, services, resources and production, PPBS is widely used in business under many titles. In most states, school systems and the children in them are also managed by PPBS under the guise of insuring "accountability." Once schools are fully computerized, then government, and corporate educational programs as well as schools could be linked, with the federal government on the controlling end of the system.

But as much as the federal government is doing its best to tie a computer to every child, a study published by the federal Office of Technology Assessment has given this warning:

"Much remains to be learned about the educational and psychological effects of tech-

nological approaches to instruction. Not enough experience has been gained with the new information technology to determine completely how that technology can most benefit learners or to predict possible negative effects of its use. Given this insufficient experience, caution should be exercised in undertaking any major national effort, whether federally inspired or not, to introduce these new technologies into education.”⁵²

Obviously, that warning is going unheeded. Computers *will* be used in schools. The concern of the education establishment is not so much whether or not computers can “benefit learners” in an academic sense. Rather, the interest in computers is in their ability to facilitate control and change. After all, that is what government “education” is all about.

But what does all of this business about computers have to do with TTCs? Simply this: Once private schools accept TTCs, experience and common sense tell us that regulations will soon follow which will dictate among other things, curriculum content and teacher qualifications. (This is the situation in the Netherlands and other Socialist countries, which some advocates of TTCs would have the U.S. emulate.) Not only will private schools find regulation part of the TTC package, but in order to insure uniformity they will undoubtedly be encouraged and/or required to install computers with the expense sweetened by government financial assistance.

An article in *Today's Catholic Teacher* titled “Computers in Catholic Education” gives a clue as to what could be expected in the way of generous government assistance. Explaining that most Catholic schools not only have been able to take advantage of the constantly declining prices of microcomputers with their own funds, but that:

“Other purchases have been made with federal and/or state funds, gifts and donations. A **big plus** for schools still awaiting their first micro-computer is the availability, beginning this month, of substantial new federal ECIA funds

which can be used for that purpose."⁵³ (emphasis in original)

The result is obvious. Sooner or later, *all* schools would be using the same programs (just as many private and church schools now use the same books and other materials that government schools use); be tied into the same central data banks; and therefore, have the same goals and objectives.

Combine uniformity with computers and you then have the capability for nationalized total control of *all* education.

7.

TTCs:

Design for Collectivism

For an indication of the likely dimensions of education in the not too distant future, we need only look once again at Mortimer Adler's *Paideia Proposal* - - the ultimate plan for achieving uniformity of *all* education.

If there is one thing particularly outstanding about the *Proposal* it is a dreary emphasis on John Dewey's premise that a democratic society must provide not only the same quantity of public education, but the same quality, to "all with no exceptions."⁵⁴ Human beings are perceived as having, without exception, the *same* inherent tendencies, the *same* inherent powers and the *same* inherent capacities. Thus, "These are the facts of sameness that justify requiring the same course of study for all . . ." ⁵⁵

For all . . . without exception. . . It's a recurring theme. No choices permitted. The state will decide what everyone needs and that will be the end of it. Very neat and tidy.

According to the *Paideia Proposal*,

"The system of public education in this country has always been pluralistic and should remain so. Preserving pluralism need not and should not prevent the adoption by *all* our schools of the central features of our model as an ideal to be realized . . ." ⁵⁶ (emphasis in original)

What is the definition of the “pluralism” the *Paideia Proposal* would preserve? A common perception is that “pluralism” refers to the legitimacy of all points of view and their right to exist with equal dignity and tolerance. A dictionary defines pluralism as “The doctrine that there is more than one kind of ultimate reality.”

The “ultimate reality” of “pluralism” as the word is used in education is that it is a vehicle to enshrine collectivism. This is made clear in a book which supports and promotes tuition tax credits: *Society, State, & Schools*,⁵⁷ sold by the pro-TTC Education Voucher Institute (EVI). The authors take a dim view of individualism, lumping it negatively with collectivism while proposing pluralism as a superior compromise to either individualism or collectivism.

The contempt for the rights of individuals held by the authors of the book can be seen in this enlightening passage:

“Individualism makes the rights and liberties of individuals its ultimate concern; . . . Collectivism takes . . . the modern state, as the integrating norm for the entire social organism; it thus tends to undermine the rights of both individuals and plural associations. In practice, both collectivism and, paradoxically, individualism tend to bolster the power of a bureaucratic state. Pluralism, a third alternative . . . regards multiple associations, such as families, schools, the state, and churches, as the basic structuring principle for societal life . . . ”⁵⁸

If in fact individualism tends “to bolster the power of a bureaucratic state,” it is not because there is something inherently undesirable about individualism. Any “bolstered power” is simply the result of usurpation of power by bureaucrats who come to their exalted state through abuse and misuse of public trust. The Founding Fathers drafted our Constitution with protection of individual rights as a primary concern. Such contemporary disdain for individual rights is but a reflection of the

perversion and/or subversion of the intent of our Constitution, and the effectiveness of the socialistic/collectivist philosophy promoted relentlessly year after year in government schools.

The suggested pluralistic association between families, church and state as an alternative to either individualism or collectivism is an utopian dream that promises a "balance of power" between the stated entities but which simply does not and cannot exist. The powerless, those with the least amount of social and/or political clout, (parents) are offered the illusion that they are equal partners. But based upon past and current history it should be obvious that any association that includes the government is controlled by the government. It thus turns out that "pluralism" is but a form of socialistic "participatory democracy" that dissolves into collectivism.

Nevertheless, in *Society, State & Schools*, pluralism is seen as a "workable paradigm" which ". . . is demonstrated by the educational policies of such democratic countries as England, Canada, Israel, Belgium and the Netherlands."⁵⁹

THE DUTCH MODEL

It is the Netherlands in particular that many advocates of TTCs hold up as the model for the U.S. to follow. The Dutch system is indeed "pluralistic." Parents are free (subject to certain conditions) to send their children to schools of their choice, with the state paying all costs. However, the problem with this "pluralistic" system is that the government determines the curriculum and controls teacher qualifications. What is more critical in a school than curriculum content and a teacher's academic ability and philosophical orientation? If parents have no control but merely the appearance of control through consensus decisions, how "pluralistic" or "democratic" is it? What of any consequence is left for parents to control? ("Consensus decisions" means decisions pre-determined by those in authority, leaving others with less authority free to explain "why" there is disagreement, but not free to effect a change in the pre-determined decision.)

The authors argue that:

“ . . . countries such as Canada, Israel, Belgium and the Netherlands place regulations on independent education not unlike the regulations placed on independent education in the United States.”⁶⁰

This is not entirely true - - not yet. Yes, U.S. private and church schools must meet certain regulations promulgated by state and federal governments, but this does not include the government's right to mandate curriculum content. U.S. private schools, although often choosing to use the same programs and materials as government schools, and employ teachers certified by the state, nevertheless are still free to choose their own curricula. Private and church schools in the U.S. are not required to allow government appointed “inspectors” to walk into classrooms at any time to check up on what is being taught, as is the case in the Netherlands.

The authors of *Society, State & Schools* continue:

“Thus the adage that increased aid to independent education necessarily brings with it increased government control is not supported by our comparative data.”⁶¹

In fact, they *have* shown that the “adage” is true! They go on to state that in the Netherlands, as a result of the Primary Education Act of 1920,

“ . . . the traditional distinction between public and private schools was virtually erased, since all schools were recognized as part of the common or public effort to provide education.”⁶²

In almost the same breath they reveal that recipient schools must meet “certain conditions.”

PLURALISM'S BOTTOM LINE

In their plan for achieving pluralism, the authors of *Society, State & Schools* propose several “strategies” which include:

“. . . income tax deductions for the cost of education, tax credits deducted directly from taxes due, or our preferred plan, tuition grants or vouchers made payable to the school of one's choice.”⁶³

Thus, the “pluralism” that would insure uniformity and control is to be had with the assistance of tax credits or vouchers!

Opponents of TTCs point out that the uniformity and controls that would accompany tax credits would be detrimental to church schools. This view is supported by the authors' claim that their definition of pluralism,

“. . . brings with it a cosmic perspective that embraces the concerns common to all men. It disavows special pleading for the privileged status of established groups and vested interests. . . The rights that it affirms for one group in society it also insists upon for others.”⁶⁴

What this “cosmic perspective” proposes, then, is an ersatz mystical universal religion of sorts in which parents, church and state would by “common consent” agree to a lowest common denominator level of religious beliefs. If “established groups” cannot espouse “special pleading” for their own personal beliefs but must agree to a “cosmic perspective” that is “common to all men” then real religious freedom is denied and a “universal” religion has been established.

Those who would disagree that a “cosmic perspective” has any religious meaning are reminded that “religion” need not be defined in terms of religious creed. Frederick E. Ellis writes,

“Defining religion solely in terms of a higher being we call “God” and whom we must worship is unsatisfactory. The word God does not refer to the same thing in the minds of those who use the term; what is God for one person is no god at all for his neighbor. There is no universal meaning of the word God which can

be arrived at through common consent. Religion must be taken in a broad sense; the definition must be sufficiently flexible to take in those religions which, say, to a Western orthodox Christian viewpoint would not be considered religious and would be judged by conservative Christian standards to be atheistic. For example, Buddhism would not be considered a religion because it does not recognize God in the Christian sense. And yet, its devotion to Nirvana, the highest good, entitles it to classification as religion. He who regards his particular faith as the only genuine religion fails to comprehend fully the nature of religion. No one has a monopoly upon it.”⁶⁵

John Dewey would have agreed with this definition of religion. In his book *Education Today* he wrote:

“Our schools . . . are performing an infinitely significant religious work. They are promoting the social unity out of which in the end genuine religious unity must grow.”⁶⁶

Schools are performing an “infinitely significant religious work”? In bringing about a “genuine religious unity” - - in our “pluralistic” schools? Yes, because what he is talking about is no different than the “cosmic perspective” that “embraces the concerns common to all men.” It’s universal “religion”!

So let us beware of those selling tax credits as a means to achieve the nirvana of pluralism which in turn would result in a “cosmic perspective” that “embraces the concerns common to all men.”

The authors of *Society, State & Schools* also mislead when they propose that:

“Under the present American system this freedom cannot be realized by all for there is only one real choice: state-run education. True democracy offers a variety of alternatives;

this criterion is fulfilled only in a structurally pluralist society.”⁶⁷

This is at odds with the *Paideia Proposal* which states that public education in the U.S. “. . . has always been pluralistic and should remain so.”⁶⁸ Which is quite correct, if we accept the definition of pluralism as an association between parents, schools and the state in which all participants are supposed to possess equal power. It is also pluralistic if we accept the reality that the government in this troika holds the controlling hand through the plethora of government determined curricula already flooding schools, public and private alike.

The allegation that under the present American system there is no real choice is hogwash, pure and simple. Parents *do* have the right to send their children to schools other than government schools. To be sure, they must pay for the privilege, but the opportunity is there. And it will remain only as long as the government does not become involved in private education through tuition tax credits, vouchers, or any other scheme that purports to facilitate a spurious “freedom of choice.”

But it appears the real reason the authors of *Society, State, & Schools* display such fondness for pluralism is that they simply are not satisfied with a system of tax credits or vouchers that would cover just a portion of educational costs:

“Such legislation, if properly drafted . . . would be a significant step toward enhancing freedom of choice. . . such legislation would be designed to move toward full parity of the cost of education.”⁶⁹

Conveniently neglected is the reality that “full control” follows “full parity”!

8.

TTCs:

Beyond Today

The *Paideia Proposal* with its plan for uniformity in education is proposed as a necessity in order to prepare youngsters for good jobs in a future world dominated by computers.

In a *Washington Post* article of January 9, 1983, James O'Toole, a member of the *Paideia* committee writes,

“Those who will succeed in the workforce will be those who have learned how to learn - - the unthinking jobs all will be done by machines. The French have anticipated this phenomenon. They have remade their once class-segregated educational system into a single track in which all children now receive the same basic liberal education that was, until recently, preserved for only a privileged few. This new system complements a national effort to be on the forefront of the computer revolution.”

What O'Toole doesn't mention is that the French government (like the Dutch government) funds private as well as public education. Neither does he reveal a shocking situation developing in France as this is written.

The revelation comes in an Associated Press article published in a small Arkansas newspaper (*Jonesboro Sun* January 22, 1983). Interestingly enough, it appears the story was not published in any major metropolitan daily.

From the article titled "French Socialists To Take Over Schools," we learn that after waiting 19 months for the right time to strike, Francois Mitterand's socialist government is going to proceed with plans to take control of private schools that receive state aid. Ninety-three percent are Roman Catholic schools. Secular schools which do not receive aid are not affected. Teachers at the private primary and secondary level will be subject to government jurisdiction, the same as public school teachers.

The French people should have known what was coming. During the 1981 presidential campaign, Mitterand vowed to reorganize the school system into a "unified secular public education service." The government has put off fulfillment of its pledge because of strong sentiment for "freedom of choice" in education. (Does the "freedom of choice" rhetoric sound familiar?)

Using the same argument advanced by the U.S. National Education Association (NEA), the French National Education Federation, representing 800,000 public school teachers, complains that public support for church schools is damaging public schools by draining funds. Bringing two million children in church schools under state domination should eliminate a lot of their worry. It will certainly mean an increase in job opportunities.

In the announcement to integrate the more than 9,000 private religious schools, Education Minister Alain Savary said the purpose was "to assure a better material, moral and social management of national education."

Parents wishing to send their children to private schools would be limited to facilities within their district, as with public schools.

What parents are supposed to be grateful for, no doubt, is that each school would have "limited freedom to set its own curriculum and emphasis within the framework of national standards," as is the case in the Netherlands. Understandably, private schools worry they may lose their identity. A Catholic education spokesman complained that:

"Mr Savary's project indicates a will to abolish all legislation that for more than 20 years has defined the relationship between private and state teaching establishments."

The government is to begin implementing the take-over at the start of the next school year in 1983. In recent months tens of thousands of parents are said to have taken to the streets in protest.

The conservative Mayor of Paris, Jacques Chirac, said the takeover threatens "the free choice of schools by parents, the basic character of private education, the freedom of management of these establishments."

The conservative Paris newspaper, *LeFigaro* said it was worse than that:

"Private schools are no longer threatened. The propositions of Alain Savary on the future of private education are equivalent to a sentence of death."

What should all of this say to the United States? As the voters become increasingly dependent on government handouts, and as public schools continue to intensify their indoctrination of young minds into preferring socialism and collectivism, then those who are elected to Congress and the Presidency will increasingly demonstrate socialistic tendencies in their approach to legislation and in their philosophy of the purpose of government. Presently, the supposedly conservative Reagan administration is committed to tuition tax credits - - with appropriate safeguards, however temporary. There is no guarantee that a new Congress or another President would honor what is written into law today. What it comes down to is that if TTCs should become established, then the future freedom and autonomy of private and church schools will be in direct proportion to the degree to which this country has become socialistic. It's a simple as that.

THE AUSTRALIAN SITUATION

Perhaps a look at the Australian situation will also help clarify our picture of the future. Federal funding of both public and private schools in Australia is relatively recent. The first modest initiatives for support of private schools began in the 1950s as tax deductions on the federal income tax. Direct government support began in the 1960s in the form of limited special purpose programs

for capital projects in both the private and public sectors. By the end of the 1960s, pressure for more extensive funding of operating costs produced a collection of recurrent and capital programs, including a modest per capita grant to private schools.

At a Tuition Tax Credit Seminar held in Washington, DC in 1981, Joel D. Sherman said that,

*“Commonwealth funding has evolved incrementally. . . This progression supports the view that public policy is incremental in nature and that policy initiatives tend to develop a momentum of their own. Once directions are set, they are often difficult to reverse. . . the Australian experience suggests . . . that once policy actions have been taken, they often produce general public acceptance and decreased opposition.”*⁷⁰ (emphasis in original)

Sherman also explains that major government funding for non-government schools “was grounded in a rationale based on pupil needs.”⁷¹ Which sounds very familiar. One major argument in the U.S. advanced in support of TTCs is that they would benefit “the poor” - - a proposition which is discussed elsewhere in this critique.

It could not be more certain, as Sherman says, that “once policy actions have been taken, they often produce general public acceptance and decreased opposition.” The most recent information from Australia supports his appraisal - - and then some.

An article in *The Adelaide Advertiser* of December 6, 1982 (cited in the newsletter of Educational Light Ministries, Booleroo Centre, South Australia 5482) captioned “Non-government school teachers yesterday called for the integration of Australia’s private schools into one education system” reports:

“The national conference of the Independent Teachers Federation, meeting in Adelaide . . . decided to press for ‘provision of a socially responsible and optimum pattern of education for all Australian students’.”

Before continuing with excerpts from this astounding article, it should be stressed that these are *independent, non-government teachers* calling for “integration” of private schools into the state system!

Federal secretary of the federation, Mr. P.J. Lee stated:

“The funding policies of the Federal Government, where more money goes to the private school system, has led to intolerable divisiveness in the public debate about education.

“The federation rejects these Federal funding policies and believes it is time for a totally new look at the educational patterns.”

The article goes on to say:

“The conference decided to call on all State school and independent school organizations to cooperate in investigating ways in which the integration of the private schools could occur.

“Mr. Lee said the conference also expressed serious reservations about a number of new schools teaching ‘accelerated Christian education.’

“He said these schools, which received Federal funding, were using an imported US fundamentalist Christian Curriculum.

“The curriculum was seriously deficient, focusing on a narrow range of skills and eliminating important social education.

“The schools were proliferating, attracting Federal and State funds, yet were not accountable for the education they offered.”

Doesn't that last paragraph just about say it all? What makes us believe that the same greedy, hateful thinking would not dominate deliberations about whether or not to regulate TTC-supported Christian schools in the U.S?

THE FRUIT OF PATIENCE AND GRADUALISM

Just as state intervention in education in Australia grew “incrementally,” this gradualism preceded the take-over of church schools in France. In private correspondence with Baron Arnaud de Lassus of *Action Familiale et Scolaire*, Baron de Lassus writes,

“The parents having become accustomed to having the private schools directly financed by the state, and the teachers having become accustomed to being directly paid by the state, the state now threatens to take away the subsidies to the schools and the teachers who refuse to be integrated into the system of the state’s education. The process is perfectly logical; it’s a totalitarian process; but one has to recognize (admit) that it has been done by politicians who had the sense of gradualism and who were smart enough not to go too fast.”

The key words to bear in mind are *gradualism* and *patience*. Many who are proposing and/or supporting tuition tax credits in this country are well aware of the end product, and they are relying on patience and gradualism to get them to their destination. Would that well-intentioned supporters of tax credits had the ability to understand.

Given the reality that now exists in France as a result of aid to church schools, and the distinct possibility that the same situation could develop in this country, where are things headed?

When we reach the point where computers are available for every child in every classroom, public and private;

When we reach the point where the differences between public and private schools are indistinguishable because of regulations imposed as a result of having accepted tax credit money or vouchers by any name;

When we reach the point where the curriculum in public and private schools is in the form of uniform computer software (or print media where software is inappropriate) developed by the government, or developed

to government standards by government-supported agencies;

When we reach the point where communications satellites can tie schools together not only on a national basis, but internationally;

(Twenty-three satellites are expected to be in operation by 1983 and by 1985 there will be even more in orbit, 20,000 miles over the Equator, beamed to North America. Canada and the United States, for example, are using communications satellites to deliver education to people in the very rural parts of these nations. France is making a major commitment to utilize microcomputers in its schools. About three years ago the French government announced a ten-year plan to place 10,000 microcomputers in French schools. (Undoubtedly, many of those computers will be placed in the newly nationalized church schools that have been accepting government financial assistance, to insure uniformity and control of the curriculum.) England has made substantial investments in development of videotext, a technology that can be utilized for education in non-school settings. The Federal Republic of Germany and the U.S. are marketing interactive videodiscs which can be used in a wide variety of educational situations.)

When the National Education Association sells a cassette tape, "Satellite Communication: Potentials for Education" which "offers a brief background and history of NEA involvement in satellite communications, begun in 1971";

When government and private sector partnerships supported by TTCs generate government-controlled education programs;

When this and more is taking place, then it doesn't take too much imagination to see the potential for control of education on a global scale, particularly when programs and curricula will have been "homogenized" and "universalized" to the point where they will be acceptable to all nations of the world, thereby rendering national boundaries meaningless, as far as education is concerned. Even now, school children in the U.S. are learning in social studies classes that the U.S. is but a part of "nine nations" of Northern America. They are given new maps which show that state lines have been eliminated and national

boundaries of the U.S., Canada and Mexico have been obliterated.

Add all of this to the extent to which "one world" is promoted through "global education" in public, private and church schools with the blessing and assistance of the federal government, then it should be obvious that truly, we are being "set up" and our children are the victims being used to do it.

And as incredible as it may seem, when all factors - - globally uniform curricula brought about through controls inherent in government intervention; computers, satellites and evil men lustung for the power to control the world - - are taken into consideration, TTCs, without exaggeration, could be the "silent shot" that started a carefully orchestrated "war" designed to change the face of the world.

9.

TTCs:

Specious Arguments

Pro and Con

There are many popular arguments offered by proponents in support of TTCs. Some of them sound good but do not hold up upon close examination. Others are downright dangerous.

There are also arguments advanced by those who say they are opposed to TTCs, but their protestations are dreadfully transparent -- they are not "anti" at all.

One of the most widely appealing arguments in favor of TTCs is that poor children would at last be given a chance to attend schools formerly closed to them. Supposedly, a tax credit for poor parents would solve a lot of social and educational problems.

Researchers James S. Catterall and Henry M. Levin provide difficult to dispute evidence that current TTC legislation would not help poor children. They state:

"Families with low incomes below \$10,000 pay relatively little in taxes. Those families with incomes below \$5,000 pay no taxes and would simply have no use for a tuition tax credit. Those between \$5,000 and \$10,000 average \$313 in taxes paid . . . So on the basis of tax liability alone, the poorest families would be barred from participation in tuition tax credits."⁷²

They also point out:

* That 6 percent of white families could not participate in a TTC plan because they pay no taxes. Over 20 percent of all white families lack the tax liability to enable them to participate fully.

* Nearly 15 percent of Hispanics have no tax liability and almost 40 percent could participate only in a limited way or not at all. (Of course, it is possible that the government may just decide to give families with low incomes sufficient money to cover TTCs).

* Blacks would really be the losers because more than 22 percent have no tax liability and nearly 50 percent have no tax liability above the \$500 needed to assure full participation in such a tax credit.

The poor and minorities have always been used to justify spurious socialist, economic and political causes. But history shows they have yet to reap the benefits of the many promises made in their name. What has happened, however, is that a lot of irreversible damage has been done to *all of us* because of disastrous programs and policies implemented supposedly on behalf of the helpless. TTCs would chalk up yet another non-victory for those least able to help themselves, and instead, work to the advantage of those who have less than noble motives.

“THE EDUCATORS ARE AGAINST IT
SO WE MUST BE FOR IT”

Anyone who can be convinced the education industry is *really* opposed to tax credits can be convinced there is a tooth fairy.

If there is one thing that sticks in the craw of the educationists, it is the existence of private, autonomous schools. As previously mentioned, every child in a private school means loss of revenue for the government school. Why then would liberal legislators, traditionally the steadfast friends of government schools, continue to introduce or support legislation which would permit and even encourage a mass exodus of children from government schools? Does it make sense? On the face of it, of course not.

However, if it were possible to devise a scheme that would result in destruction or control of those despised competitors, then TTCs make sense. All you have to do

is generate support for TTCs. But how do you generate that support? Simply by applying the Marxist bromide: "Create conflict, then reach a compromise and finally take control. In the case of TTCs, it would work something like this:

* Creation of conflict: Do not respond to continuous, unrelenting parental pressure for an academic education. Talk a good semantic game about intending to "improve the schools," or "we're making the schools more effective," - - but in practice, continue to use the schools to bring about radical social, political, religious and economic change.

* The compromise: Use TTCs or vouchers to encourage parents to send their children to private or church schools.

* Take control: Use TTCs to regulate private, church and home schools (curriculum, teacher training, quotas, certification, mandated adherence to government regulations of all kinds) to the point where there is no real distinction between public and private schools. Teachers, programs, and funds could "skate" back and forth between systems with little difficulty. Teachers and other school personnel would have access to a wider variety of job opportunities. Those schools that would not knuckle under would suffer financially and likely go out of business. Any way you look at it, the education establishment would have won.

It bears asking again. If the NEA, AFT, PTA and other change agent entities are opposed to TTCs, why aren't they listening to the majority of parents who have been begging and pleading for years for a traditional academic education for their children? Why isn't the establishment bending over backward to keep children in government schools in order to maintain its monopoly and the income each child represents?

Why has public education been permitted to disintegrate to the point where parents are looking for alternatives? Could it be that as more parents leave or threaten to leave the government system, there will be a greater demand for TTCs? After all, those parents who don't want to "pay twice" for an education just might welcome some financial relief. Clearly, the education establishment recognizes that whatever "public solution" is devised, it cannot lose!

“TAX CREDITS VIOLATE THE SEPARATION THEORY”

One of the education establishment's principal objections to TTCs is that church schools would benefit and therefore constitute a violation of the separation of church and state theory.

Let's examine the current opposition that says TTC legislation would result in financial benefit to church schools - - in particular, the despised Catholic schools.

Let's look at a stunning expose (however unintended) of the alliance forged between the National Education Association (NEA) and the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) in the development and passage of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education ACT (ESEA) - - the legislation which has been responsible in large measure for the rapid decline not only of government schools, but also, of Catholic schools.

(Here it should be noted that the staff of the USCC is a Catholic bureaucracy not often in agreement with the Vatican or with lay Catholics. It would be accurate to say the USCC is to Catholicism what the National Council of Churches is to Protestantism.)

The fascinating, largely unknown link between the NEA and the USCC has been revealed in a government publication published by the federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, an agency whose purpose seems to be dedicated to the regionalization of America. The chapter which unfolds this incredible story is titled “Passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: The Long Awaited Triumph”⁷³

We learn that President Johnson had decided to make federal aid to education a top domestic priority in 1965. Such federal aid was to be provided to abolish poverty. (Ah, the poor! What would politicians ever do without them?)

“The major task of initiation was performed under the leadership of Francis Keppel, then U.S. Commissioner of Education. All knew that the primary obstacle would be to resolve the church-state issue in federal aid. As one Con-

gressman put it: 'We were all sensitive to the start of another holy war - - at least those of us from two-religion districts.' Keppel assumed responsibility for developing a proposal that would do this . . . '74

Here is the part that is so incredible:

"The main participants included representatives of the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) and the NEA. Commissioner Keppel was in an excellent position to work with these major interests, having developed good relations with them on previous legislation . . .

"The negotiations produced a number of 'understandings' . . . which formed the basis of the education legislation. The key breakthrough was acceptance of the 'child benefit' concept. Federal aid was to focus on educationally disadvantaged children in both public and parochial schools; it was not to be considered aid to the school itself. This principle was embodied in Title I of ESEA, which distributes federal funds directly to school districts. . . based on . . . expenditures on education and the number of school-age children from low income families." 75

(Note in the above that the "key breakthrough" was to be the "child benefit" concept - - that it was not to be considered aid to the school. So it is with tax credits legislation - - much is made about tax credits serving to benefit children and parents, not the schools. Clearly it was the "foot in the door" in 1965.)

Since Title I was not enough to satisfy the special interests, five more Titles were added to the ESEA, with Title III most responsible for so many of the disastrous affective programs implemented as "innovations."

How was it that the NEA and the USCC could come to terms on this legislation. Pure expediency, worship of money and application of situation ethics that would make any Humanist proud:

"Failing to cooperate, Catholic representatives believed they might be written out of a massive

permanent federal aid program. The NEA, on the other hand, feared that a failure to cooperate on the legislation would produce dire consequences during implementation.”⁷⁶

And thus, differences were forgotten and the NEA/USCC “marriage” became a little known reality. Which should silence NEA objections to *any* future possibility of aid to church schools.

In order to ensure rapid approval,

“. . . the decision was made to rush the legislation through Congress before agreements could unravel and latent conflicts could emerge. Bills were introduced in Congress on January 12, 1965 the same day the legislation was revealed by the President. Initial efforts focused on the House side, where the dangers of latent opposition were the greatest. Only ten days after its introduction, hearings were begun on the proposal in the House Education Subcommittee. “. . . The legislation had largely been developed in secret and then sprung on Congress with the expectation that it be passed immediately and unamended. *The religious compromise had solved the major problem of most Democratic aid proponents. . .*”⁷⁷ (emphasis added)

Long before the USCC and the NEA came to terms on the “child benefit concept” Dr. Robert M. Hutchins was promoting federal aid to church schools. That such federal aid might be perceived as aid to religion was seen as “incidental to an overriding public benefit.” Virgil C. Blum explains:

“Dr. Robert M. Hutchins sees no constitutional difficulty in federal aid for the education of church-related school children in secular subjects. The fact that such education ‘is ‘permeated’ by religion’ or that federal aid for such education is an ‘aid to religion,’ he says ‘is immaterial.’ The benefit that accrues to religion, Hutchins argues, is ‘incidental to an overriding public

benefit.' Consequently, 'such incidental benefits,' he reasons 'do not invalidate the legislation'."⁷⁸

And so it is that protestations against TTCs on the basis of violation of the "separation theory" are a hoax. If an "overriding public benefit" can be shown, apparently anything is permissible. It's called doing an end run around the problem.

Private and church schools receive a tremendous amount of money right now. TTCs would not reduce the amount -- just insure more government control.

It is assumed that all readers know that Robert M. Hutchins was a dyed-in-the-wool leftwing radical and supporter of a world government. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand why he would be supporting aid to church schools. He knew it was not a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow but government control and therefore, he could argue that "aid to religion" as a by-product of government support for church schools would be "incidental to an overriding public benefit."

Of course his definition of "public benefit" would be open to question. But based upon what we know about his political orientation, we can fairly assume that to him, "public benefit" would mean a desired "government control."

PARENTS DESERVE A TAX BREAK

Another popular argument in support of tax credits is that parents shouldn't have to "pay twice" -- once to support government schools and again for private school tuition. No argument there!

However, the answer is not in tax credits allowed by the government. The rational solution is elimination of what we call "public education." That's a difficult idea to reckon with, but it's the *only* solution.

Because we won't accept that solution, there is a tendency on the part of some supporters of TTCs to become confused.

For example, is it more important to protect the right of parents to educate their children as they wish than it is to protect private schools from government con-

trol? Obviously, it is equally important to protect both the rights of parents and the autonomy of private schools. There should not be a conflict. We shouldn't have to decide between the two. And we don't need to. We understand that God has given parents the right to function as the primary educators of their children. We also understand that private and church schools should not be put in a position where they fear for their autonomy.

As things exist in this country, parents now have the opportunity to send their children to private or church schools of their choice. They must pay for that privilege, and they should. It shouldn't be subsidized by the government. At the same time, private schools, if they do not accept government assistance, (for the most part) are free to teach as they please.

Then why is it that Bob Baldwin in an article "Parents Deserve Tax Credits" in the February 1983 *Moral Majority Report* confuses the issue? He avers,

". . . to place more emphasis on protecting the schools from governmental control than protecting the primary rights of parents to educate their children is to have one's priorities out of line with the Word of God."

One must wonder how private schools might react to that assertion.

But the tax credits issue really has nothing to do with "the primary rights of parents to educate their children". Issuance of tax credits will do nothing to give or insure those primary rights. Nor will tax credits put things right with the "Word of God". Parents already have their God given rights with or without tax credits. One thing is certain: with tax credits, those parental rights may be in grave jeopardy.

There is no need to sacrifice the autonomy of private schools to ease the financial burden of parents who opt for private education. There is no need to institute TTCs to insure that parents don't have to "pay twice." The solution is simple: No government intervention in education. Private and church schools supported by those who use them. For "the poor" - - education provided by "free societies" and institutions truly desirous of providing a "public benefit."

OUR COUNTRY CAN'T SURVIVE WITHOUT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The education establishment's seemingly favorite argument against TTCs is that parents would desert public schools in droves (what does that say about the quality of public education?) and thus cause their demise, which would be (so the argument goes) a disaster for our country.

Anyone who sincerely believes this proposition is ignorant of the history and goals of the public school movement. Those goals are the same collectivist, statist goals today as when they were first promulgated.

Ever since compulsory schooling was imposed on this country in the early 1800s by a minority of Socialist/Unitarian Harvard elitists, we have allowed ourselves to become enamored of the myth that government controlled schooling is the best way to insure an educated citizenry. That parents continue to parrot this idiocy is a monument to the education establishment's enduring ability to propagate a self-serving fantasy, by brainwashing the same "conservatives" who themselves have been through the system.

Just look at the condition of our country today. The truth of the matter is that thanks in large measure to compulsory public schooling during the past 75 years, we no longer have a Republic, but a Socialist participatory democracy controlling each and every one of us from the cradle to the grave. Our current disastrous economic situation could not have developed to the degree that it has during the past 75 years had children not been steeped, gradually but relentlessly, in socialism, statist economics and Orwellian, altered, biased or ignored history. Our various "social revolutions" - - free sex, women's liberation, family disintegration, drug abuse, acceptability of euthanasia - - and the premeditated murder of over a million preborn babies a year - - could not have developed as quickly and as pervasively had they not been spawned in and given legitimacy by the government schools - - even taking into consideration the devastating influence of TV in recent years.

For example, in the Introduction of a new book titled *Teaching American History: New Directions* pub-

lished by the National Council for the Social Studies, we read:

“The past decade and a half have been an especially eventful period for the writing of American history . . . new interpretations have gained ground . . . new fields of historical research have emerged, and established fields are undergoing radical redefinitions.”⁷⁹

It concludes:

“The new research offers teachers the possibility of helping students construct a new definition of history, as well as new perspectives on the past.”⁸⁰

The Foreward to this same publication laments,

“Because of the misguided back-to basics movement now in vogue, there is serious risk that history teaching, rather than helping students develop keen historical insights and understandings, will again emphasize blind patriotism, myths, and the mastery of facts. Every nation has its myths, national symbols, and heroic stories that are used to help students develop loyalty to the nation-state. . . However, socializing students into the national culture . . . should be balanced with instructional components that demystify our nation. . . ”⁸¹

For just one example (there are many which could fill pages) to show how long the subversion has been taking root, consider the following 1947 NEA call for world government:

“Finally, lay the ground for a stronger United Nations by developing in your students a sense of world community. The United Nations should be transformed into a limited world government. But that cannot happen until the psychological foundations have been laid . . . Teach those attitudes which would result

ultimately in the creation of a world citizenship . . . We cannot teach loyalty to a society that does not yet exist, but this we can and should do, teach our children and, if we must, ourselves those skills and attitudes. World government, when and if we get it, will be the product of *planned education*.⁸² (emphasis added)

More recently, the NEA in conjunction with its affiliate, the Massachusetts Teacher Association and the radical Union of Concerned Scientists, developed an anti-nuclear curriculum, "Choices: A Curriculum on Conflict and Nuclear War"⁸³ now being "piloted" in 35 states. The 10-lesson course is designed to "help students understand the power of nuclear weapons, the consequences of their use, and most importantly, the options that are available to resolve the conflicts between nations by means other than nuclear war."

One way junior high students will learn these imperatives is by keeping a "daily peace journal," engage in games of "conflict resolution" and listen to the song by the late John Lennon, "Imagine" so they can envision what it would be like to live in a nuclear-free world. While this particular program is designed for junior high pupils, anxiety-inducing anti-nuke programs are started with children much younger. Then we wonder why the media finds it necessary to run never-ending horror stories about young children who are filled with worry and fear; who despair that they may not have a future; why there are so many child suicides - - while pretending the causes are unknown! This type of child abuse is just one tiny facet of the destructive nature of contemporary "planned education."

Another result of "planned education" can be seen in the plight of the Vietnam veterans. Men who fought, died and sacrificed in what they thought was in the service of their country, in a no-win "police action" or war game, returned home to find not a welcome befitting heroes, but the quiet shame accorded the scapegoat. Little wonder they were confused and bitter - - obviously no one had read the "no-win" policy to them.

Finally, years later, everyone will recall the media hype about the memorial to those who died in this debacle. The same theme of shame prevailed - - though pro-

bably not too many made the connection with the stipulation that there would be no United States flag flying over the memorial. Thankfully, the Vietnam vets who did come home chose not to ignore this insult to their dead comrades, as well as the men who had gone before them in other wars - - they insisted on an American flag! It was a hard fight because of the same lack of public interest, support or understanding that had been their misfortune throughout the war. They did get their flag, though indeed it was placed so as to "demystify" our nation.

To be sure, there would have been no such requirement about not having a flag had the powers that be been certain that they could have gotten away with flying the "world flag" - - the "Flag of Earth."

Perhaps the treatment of heroes as goats has a more far-reaching implication. Perhaps it was not so much a rejection of the U.S. fighting men which prevented the deserved welcome - - but rather the guilt and shame of the American people who left them holding the bag. It would be very hard for sheep to honor heroes, knowing they were responsible for abandoning them to the wolves.

How did this shameful state come to be? How many youngsters, not old enough for combat, learned in school that not only the Vietnam war itself was to be declared immoral, but the American men who fought in it (but who certainly did not "participate" by their own choice) were to be despised and/or ignored?

Clearly, for all these and other obvious reasons, unless there are some drastic changes in what our children are subjected to as "education" our country *will not* survive as a sovereign nation!

10.

The Responsible Alternative

Because education has become such a giant industry controlled by the NEA, AFT and their satellite organizations and because so many people depend on it for their living;

Because of the low-key but powerful influence of tax exempt foundations specializing in educational change;

Because of the financial resources of the federal government;

Because of the Humanistic thinking and goals that undergird and pervade all teaching techniques and curriculum content;

Because the PPBS "accountability" system in place in every state will lock in established state-mandated "learning goals" for every child;

Because once there is a computer for every child in every classroom, the state-mandated pre-determined "learning goals" for every child will be assured with no deviation permitted by the PPBS, regardless of how much parents protest or work for change or improvement;

Because of all these factors, there is no way in the world parents will ever be able to turn the government schools into what they ought to be. The cancer that is called "public education" has been spreading and eating away for too long. The situation is terminal, having been brought on by the education establishment itself. We ought to demand the government schools be allowed to die the death they deserve.

What is the answer to the non-education children

must suffer in government schools? The solution is repeal of compulsory attendance laws which would give parents the right to educate their children as they see fit. It's amazing that parents are trusted to clothe, feed, and provide their children with moral or religious training as they choose, with the state intervening only when there is clear evidence of abuse or neglect. But when it comes to allowing parents to make educational decisions, they are treated as mental incompetents or uncaring idiots. This type of family interference must cease.

(About government intervention in cases of abuse/neglect: Such "intervention" by the state seldom does anything to correct any problems for such children - - in fact, suspected or alleged parental abuse/neglect is often replaced by "certified professional" abuse, as evidenced by all too frequent accounts of abusive private foster homes and government-run homes for delinquents and runaways. Also, it is not entirely true that the state does not interfere with moral training provided by parents. The school does indeed intervene, most insidiously, with a misnomer called "values education" which has no other purpose than to force children to shed values taught at home so that they can find their "own" values - - which any rational adult knows is impossible. A child simply does not have the wisdom and maturity to develop his "own" values out of thin air.)

The argument that removal of compulsion would result in many children being cheated out of an education is ludicrous. The certainty is that many more children would be receiving a far better education than they now receive. And for those few who might "fall through the cracks," it would be a blessing for them in light of the destructive abuses to which they are now subjected in the name of "education."

Let's look at reality.

What kind of an "education" has an oppressive tax burden purchased and compulsory attendance and truancy laws provided? Do we really have the audacity to call it "education" when thousands of young people "graduate" from high school unable to read, write and do simple arithmetic?

Are we insane enough to call it "education" when the hordes of illiterates have been taught in "sex edu-

cation," relentlessly, from kindergarten through grade 12, not only the "how-to" of sexual activity, but that they have the "right" to engage in sexual intercourse whenever, wherever and with whomever they choose? When such "sex education" has resulted in an epidemic of venereal disease and abortions with its accompanying disregard for human life, as evidenced in an epidemic of violent behavior toward human beings of all ages? (Training in the basics should be attended to as assiduously!)

Dare we call it "education" when children have been taught in "drug education" that it's their decision whether or not to use drugs? When they have learned through 12 non-stop years of values clarification exercises interspersed throughout all subject areas, that theft, violence and disrespect for legitimate authority are permissible if they decide their own value system and the situation justifies it?

What can we call "compulsory education" when it results in children recognizing the "imperatives" of global interdependence without having been taught even the most basic essentials of American History? When children have learned, in "social studies," that the "benefits" of socialism and "participatory democracy" are preferable to a representative constitutional republic? When they have been deliberately led to believe their "own" values are superior to the antediluvian values of their know-nothing, repressive parents? When they have been urged from the very first day they set foot in the school door to become part of a peer group, and to be loyal to that peer group no matter what, at the expense of responsible, individual behavior?

In an editorial on WMHT on June 6, 1973 (10 years before this critique is written), Mrs. Kenneth Bradt, Chairman of Citizens for Parental Rights, Schenectady, NY, summed up the results of compulsory education when she said in part:

"Education, we have been told repeatedly, will solve most of the problems in the world: eradicate poverty, ignorance and crime; enable all to become self-sufficient, responsible adults capable of earning a living and raising not only living standards but cultural standards as well.

But today, after a century of compulsory education, the welfare rolls are the highest in history, the prison population is increasing at a faster rate than the population of the U.S.,⁸⁴ drug addiction,⁸⁵ alcoholism,⁸⁶ VD, immorality and obscenity⁸⁷ are ever increasing. Remedial reading courses must be taught at all levels, including college, and 25 percent of the students who get into college cannot read at a high enough level to do the required college work; but students are capable of blowing up and vandalizing buildings, robbing and beating up students and teachers in their pursuit of "academic freedom." What is most significant is that we can get men to the moon and back, but we cannot overcome the evils here on earth, nor, apparently even recognize our enemies. We are losing our freedom because education by the State inevitably becomes education *for* the Almighty State."

All of this and worse is what we are afraid to give up?

Repeal of compulsory attendance laws will lead to a regeneration of our society. Parents *do* care about their children and want the best for them - - even poor parents. (Although being poor has come to be equated with stupidity, incompetence and lack of caring about one's offspring, it's simply not a valid generalization.)

But what about the poor, if compulsory attendance laws were repealed and government were kept out of the picture entirely, financially and otherwise? In the early days of our country, "free societies" provided an education for children of the poor. Americans are the most generous, compassionate people in the world. It is ridiculous to insist that those in need of an education would be denied one for lack of money.

And perhaps this would be a good place to recall that our Founding Fathers were not products of "public education." (For an enlightening discussion of the roots of compulsory education in America, a thoughtful reading of

Is Public Education Necessary? by Samuel Blumenfeld, published by Devin-Adair, is absolutely essential.)

The benefits of bonafide free choice in education are many. True educators would be separated from the change agents. Job opportunities would be abundant for all those qualified to provide a real academic education.

(It is difficult to find the "correct" words to convey the meaning of parent-controlled education. Terms such as "free enterprise," "parental choice," "free choice," "free market alternatives," and others have been given questionable meanings by many promoters of TTCs. It is important to understand that any such choice of terms or words must carry the certainty that *compulsion* by the state, or government funding and/or regulation of any kind are *not acceptable*.)

Once the deliberately induced illiteracy and moral anarchy now rampant in compulsory attendance schools are no longer given legitimacy and real education begins to take place, our current social and moral disorder will begin to heal. The child who is taught to read (all children, even those diagnosed "dyslexic" or "learning disabled" - - labels designed to perpetuate illiteracy) and whose intellect is developed and whose mind is trained to prefer disciplined thinking and acquisition of a structured body of knowledge, will no longer find a reason for rebellion and escape in drugs, sex and the demoralizing aberration called "rock music."

Too simplistic? Unworkable? Impossible? Only to those who have no faith in God, no self-confidence, no gumption, no faith in freedom, no trust in the innate care and concern of even the "worst" parents. It is impossible only to those who are lacking vision, simply because they choose to remain mired in myths and supposed constraints perpetuated by those who stand to profit by continuation of the status quo. The simple truth is that while we are still a free nation, we can accomplish whatever we really want to accomplish. But that freedom is tenuous. We are losing it by default.

A whole generation of children has been critically injured mentally, emotionally and spiritually, as has been our country, while we have been manipulated into fighting dirty textbooks, reverse censorship and other conditions

that won't and can't be eliminated. You can't change what you don't control. And parents certainly don't control the government schools. They merely pay the taxes that keep them in operation and they provide the raw material - - their precious children.

Conservatives and Christians *must* redirect their priorities. We must work for the freedom of all children to have the best academic education possible; not on terms of the NEA, the foundations, the universities nor the federal government - - but on parents' terms. There is a need to reinforce and give respectability to the truth that children are the responsibility of parents, not the state. And that is what we need to keep in mind as we work to achieve the right to educate children without "benefit" of government assistance of any kind - - even at great personal financial sacrifice.

Looking at what compulsion has produced in the past 75 years, how can we continue to support government education (and worse, endanger private schools by injecting the government into their operations, via tax credits or vouchers) and still consider ourselves sane, intelligent, thinking people who cherish freedom?

Let's give our children and grandchildren a fighting chance for a free, productive future. Let us make certain they are *educated*. Let us do it without government intervention of *any kind*.

Appendix

P.P.B.S. and PUBLIC EDUCATION

By

Gail Dearborn

What does PPBS mean? It stands for Planning, Programming and Budgeting System.

What does this have to do with public education? **EVERYTHING!**

Do we have it in our state? It is in Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire and many other states under other names: Financial Accountability; Management by Objectives; Management Information System (MIS); Performance Based Education (PBE); Needs Assessment; Competency Based Education; Uniform Accounting System; Program Analysis Information System.

As the title becomes known and understood by the public, the experts rename the program hoping to disguise it from those who recognize the dangers of the system. How did we get it without knowing about it? The Maine Board of Education voted it in as a "practical" means of getting the most education for the tax dollar.

What exactly is PPBS? It is a system to help the Federal Government develop ITS goals and objectives and re-shape policies using the power of the purse (budget).

PLANNING: Experts determine the final goal or end product to be achieved.

PROGRAMMING: Steps taken to reach the final goal or to produce the end product.

BUDGETING: Programs found ineffective in reaching the final goal or in forming the desired end product will be denied budget approval, i.e.: sound educational programs which do not fit into the experts' plans will be killed by withholding necessary money.

When PPBS is applied to government or industry, a tangible product is involved. If it does not turn out "as planned" it can be recycled, re-designed, and reprogrammed again and again until it is consistent with pre-set standards.

When PPBS is applied to education, the product is

a child with attitudes, feelings and behaviors. If these do not measure up to the pre-planned goals and objectives, he will be re-cycled, or re-programmed until his attitudes, feelings and behavior match the government's goals and objectives.

Behavioral objectives of modern education rate students as to:

1. What he knows (cognitive learning)
2. How he feels (affective learning)
3. What he does (psychomotor)

PPBS is not:

1. a system of fiscal accountability although it has been so defined to State Boards of Education.
2. cost effective budgeting.
3. a cost reduction system.

PPBS is:

A system to identify programs which are *making the desired changes in students.*

Where do teachers and administrators fit in? "PPBS requires a whole new way of thinking by administrators and teachers. It is not just a new way to budget, nor is it merely relating budget to program. The experts insist on this understanding. It entails extensive planning and delineation of goals and objectives, priorities and alternative ways of achieving one's objectives." (from the National School Public Relations Association article, "P.P.B.S. and the Schools")

PPBS means "control" - - with computers at the heart of the system. (The Apple Corporation and others are trying to get Congress to grant them a tax advantage so there can be a "Computer in every school.")

A student's test scores expressed in symbols are computerized to a Regional Data Collection and Processing Center where a student profile is developed - - then sent on to a multi-state-national center (bank) for permanent storage.

Should we fear federal control of education? "Many state Departments of Education are engaged in assessment because they have been forced to - - sometimes willingly, sometimes not so willingly. Federal regulations and directives now require that many funded projects include

provisions for regular evaluative assessment, sometimes specifying testing both before and after instruction or other program components." (Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP) publication "Developing A Large Scale Assessment Program," Chapter 2 p. 9)

Harry Wolford, Director Division of Computer Services and Statistical Reports, Ohio Dept. of Education, wrote the following in a November 1981 letter: "We have worked for some time to consolidate and streamline our state data acquisition systems and, simultaneously, structure them to interface with the federal handbook series and the federal CCD (Common Core Data). It's our opinion that we should be able to aggregate detailed data collected for state use and satisfy federal data collection. Thus, the OCCD/CCD linkage." (OCCD is Ohio Common Core of Data)

Don't citizens have control through their school boards? Local steering committees under whatever name, select goals for their schools, but when goals are printed for the public, about all that is left of their work are the names of the committee. These people have been used to make the pre-determined goals acceptable to the public.

"I believe PPBS can be used to "humanize" our schools" . . .

Harry J. Hartley, author of the 1969 *Phi Delta Kappan* article, "Education Planning-Programming-Budgeting: A Systems Approach," observed in 1973, "PPBS . . . is running into the emergent trend of humanism (Consciousness III, counter-culture types). I believe PPBS can be used to humanize our schools because it directs attention to program priorities based on human values."

In September 1976, Mr. Hartley reported, "PPBS may simply disappear from sight but the mode of thinking that PPBS supports will probably continue to increase. Even though the initials PPBS are likely to self-destruct in the near future, the need for better planning and control systems will increase."

* * *

The above is just part of a paper which is reprinted with the permission of Mrs. Dearborn. Although it was written for Maine parents, it can be applied to any state. For a copy of the complete paper, write to GEM, Box 124, Cushing, ME 04563. Single copy \$1.00

PROJECT BEST

A Plan For Computer Controlled Curriculum

By

Bettina Dobbs

Project Best (Better Education Skills through Technology) may prove to be anything but the BEST for members of the very teacher unions, associations and groups of educators now so enthusiastically supporting Secretary T.H. Bell's new Technology Initiative. Teachers will be downgraded to mere technicians. Local educators will find themselves with even more stringent regulations to follow, with little or no scope for creativity in developing a school system responsive to the unique character of the local community. Community leaders who conscientiously invested much time and effort in setting goals and objectives for a better local school system will be frustrated by the nearly uniform curriculum which will be dictated by outside research firms such as National Evaluations Systems, Inc., of Amherst, Massachusetts.

Project Best is being developed by the Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT) under a two-year grant of \$855,282. AECT was, until recent months, a part of the NEA (National Education Association). Also involved in the development of *BEST* are Secretary Bell, Assistant Secretary Donald Senese of the pivotal Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), the American Association of School Administrators, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, The National Association of State Education Media Professionals and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (See *Human Events*, May 22, 1982, for more details.)

The existing educational power structure will be strengthened through "videotape modules," "audio-conferencing," "electronic mail," "computer software" and "national teleconferences." The first national teleconference was held in June with an estimated 45 state education agencies (SEAs) taking part. Another national

teleconference is planned for 1983, but an *International Teleconference* is planned for 1984! (emphasis added)

Ralston and Meek, writing in the *Encyclopedia of Computer Science*, regarding ARPANET (Advanced Research Projects Agency Network of the U.S. Department of Defense) say "[It] has proved that message switched networks are well adapted to interconnection of diverse computers and terminals. Since the network is operational and growing, it is conceivable that it will shift from a government-supported research and development activity to some *National Service Organization*." (emphasis added)

This should give us additional pause to reconsider, especially as the *Project Best* brochure states: "In addition, the State Team approach and the communications network with professional associations and other groups established by the project will serve as a model for the states in *implementing similar efforts in other areas of education, or in such program areas as health, human services, housing, transportation, etc.*" (emphasis added)

A memorandum to the OERI from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) details some 43 projects with proposed funding and delineates the type of commitment. Project number 6, Elementary/Secondary and Higher Education Sampling Frames, states, "This project will produce computer listings of public and private schools and public school districts and become the basis for sample selection from *all* Federal agencies." (emphasis added)

Another project which has Departmental priority, *Census Mapping*, "... is to provide tabulations of 1980 Decennial Census data for each local education agency in the U.S. ... in fiscal '83 the Center (NCES) will hold a number of seminars to disseminate, demonstrate the application of the projects results. Plans are presently being developed in conjunction with CCSSO."

The CCSSO is comprised of the public officials responsible for education in each state. This embraces the state superintendents and commissioners of education in the 50 states plus the District of Columbia and six extra-state jurisdictions. A thoughtful perusal of the CCSSO Policy Statements would be worthwhile. For example, "The Council supports the development of a

practical, economical and controllable (emphasis added) system to obtain reliable data on student achievement. This data should be used to determine means for improving education." Controllable by whom? And how controlled?

And the Council proposes that Congress and the President authorize a National Commission on Education Goals and Priorities . . . to accomplish the goals of economic stability and national security. Somehow, it is difficult to reconcile these goals with those of classroom teachers and local educators.

All states are well along in setting up PPBS (Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems) known under various titles as Management by Objectives, Thorough and Efficient, Education Assessment Plan, etc. The NCES Handbook II - Revised (Financial Accounting) clearly spells out the objectives. Many education associations, some of which are members of the *Project Best* Advisory Council, helped in the development of Handbook II - Revised. The education goals for Maine, Alaska, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Georgia, for example, are all nearly identical. The potential for invasion of privacy (student profiles on computer tape) should be of great concern.

Dissemination of the curriculum, in-service training materials, software, administrative education policy materials, technology information, etc., will be accomplished in the states through the National Diffusion Network (NDN) and the State Capacity Building Projects (SCBP) as well as through *Project Best*. The NDN has recently been strengthened by moving it into regional offices. Under SCBP at least 45 states have received, over a period of five years, an average of half a million dollars each to set up a sophisticated, computerized, dissemination system whereby State Departments of Education provide pre-selected curriculum materials from computerized data banks.

Soon the Commission on Excellence in Education will publicize information on effective schools and will encourage local schools to model their programs accordingly.

A National Curriculum beginning with the innocent-appearing three Rs in place will become an established

fact. Other areas of the curriculum such as health, character (probably Kohlberg), citizenship (probably the American Bar Association) and social studies will be added.

Teacher burnout will become epidemic as a result of the depersonalized, non-intellectual subservience to machines and the bureaucracy of technocrats.

Parents and school board members will find themselves stonewalled in attempts to understand what is taking place in their schools, as curriculum materials will be on computer discs in place of textbooks. (Only those publishing firms, professional organizations and government agencies admitted to participate in *Project Best* will decide the software to be promoted through the various data banks. Thus another educational monopoly will come into being.)

Citizens will ask how this could have happened under an administration which pledged to abolish the NEA constituted Department of Education and to return education to local control.

* Bettina Dobbs has a Masters degree in Education and in 1982 she served as Technical Consultant to the National Diffusion Network (NDN), U.S. Department of Education. She is also president of GEM (Guardians of Education for Maine). This article was written for and originally appeared in the September/October issue of *The Capsule*, a publication of Caravans for Christ, Inc. 1205 W. 5th St. Terr., Cameron, MO 64429. It is reprinted here with the permission of Mrs. Dobbs and Caravans for Christ, Inc.

REFERENCES

1. Shanker, Albert; NASSP Bulletin, March, 1982, "Public Service? Tax Credits?", P. 80.
2. Sand, Peggy; The Oregonian, October 20, 1982, "Radical shifts urged in public education".
3. Gold, Gerard G.; Educational Leadership, November, 1982, "Public Education and the Private Sector", P. 4.
4. Kirst, Michael W.; The Education Digest, November, 1982, "Helping Educators Cope with the Funding Squeeze on Schools", P. 13.
5. Lines, Patricia M.; Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1982, "State Regulation of Private Education", P. 123.
6. Cronin, Joseph M., and Kenyon, Regan; NASSP Bulletin, March, 1982, "State Government, Its Relationship to Private Schools", P. 28.
7. Kirst, Michael W.; The Education Digest, November, 1982, "Helping Educators Cope with the Funding Squeeze on Schools", P. 13.
8. Seeley, David S.; Educational Leadership, November, 1982, "Education Through Partnership", P. 43.
9. Ibid.
10. Lines, Patricia M.; Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1982, "State Regulation of Private Education", P. 120.
11. Cronin, Joseph M. and Kenyon, Regan; NASSP Bulletin, March, 1982, "State Government, Its Relationship to Private Schools", P. 31.
12. Cole, Robert W.; Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1983, The Editor's Page, P. 386.
13. Crisis in Child Mental Health: Challenge for the 1970's: Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, Harper & Row, 1969, P. 75.
14. Adler, Mortimer J.; The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto, Macmillan, 1982, P. 38.
15. LaForgna, Judith P.; Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1982, "Schools in the Workplace", P. 129.
16. Cronin, Joseph M. and Kenyon, Regan; NASSP Bulletin, March, 1982, "State Government, Its Relationship to Private Schools", P. 21.
17. Finn Jr., Chester E.; NASSP Bulletin, March, 1982, "Public Service, Public Support, Public Accountability", P. 70.

18. Cronin, Joseph M., and Kenyon, Regan; NASSP Bulletin, March, 1982, "State Government, Its Relationship to Private Schools", P. 30.
19. Ibid. P. 31.
20. Ibid. Pgs. 30-31.
21. Lines, Patricia M.; Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1982, "State Regulation of Private Education, P. 119.
22. Ibid.
23. Calvin, Allen D., and Keen, Patricia; Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1982, "Community Foundations For Public Schools", P. 126.
24. Education Week, February 16, 1983, "Two Corporations Establish New Fund for Calif. Schools".
25. Daily Report, February 19, 1983, "Grant to keep Chino students from fighting". P. 11.
26. Robinson, Sharon P.; Today's Education, April/May, 1982, "Questions For Teachers", P. 27
27. U.S. Chamber of Commerce Task Force on Economic Growth Report, "The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment, 1966.
28. Finn, Jr., Chester E.; NASSP Bulletin, March 1982, "Public Service, Public Support, Public Accountability", P. 69.
29. Finn, Jr., Chester E.; American Education, May, 1982, "Public Support For Private Education, Part I, P. 5.
30. Finn, Jr., Chester E.; NASSP Bulletin, March, 1982, "Public Service, Public Support, Public Accountability", P. 72.
31. Ibid. P. 73.
32. Glazer, Nathan; Tuition Tax Credit Seminar, Washington, D.C., October 21, 1981, "The Future Under Tuition Tax Credits", P. 17.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid. P. 18.
35. Twin Circle, April 13, 1980, "Challenging the public school monopoly."
36. Glazer, Nathan; Tuition Tax Credit Seminar, Washington, D.C., October 21, 1981, "The Future Under Tuition Tax Credits", P. 18
37. Ibid. P. 19.
38. Distant Drums, August, 1982, P.O. Box 72, Lonsdale, MN 55046

39. Glazer, Nathan; Tuition Tax Credit Seminar, Washington, D.C., October, 1982, P. 19.
40. Ibid. P. 20.
41. Adler, Mortimer J.; *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*, Macmillan, 1982, P. 38
42. Ibid. P. 39.
43. Euchner, Charlie; *Education Week*, February 2, 1983, "New York Considers Enrolling Students At Age Four", P. 4.
44. Bruce, Michael G; *Phil Delta Kappan*, November, 1982, "Demand Is Growing for Adult Education", P. 210.
45. Ibid. P. 211.
46. Cronin, Joseph M., and Kenyon, Regan; *NASSP Bulletin*, March, 1982, "State Government, Its Relationship to Private Schools", P. 31.
47. Hanneman, Mary; *The Catholic Bulletin (MN)* "MCLU suit to test legality of Title I teaching program", October 28, 1982, P. 2.
48. O'Laughlin, O.P., Sr. Jeanne; *Education*, Summer, 1982, "Future Of Catholic Schools: A Perception", P. 324.
49. Cronin, Joseph M., and Kenyon, Regan; *NASSP Bulletin*, March, 1982, "State Government, Its Relationship to Private Schools", P. 22.
50. *Twin Circle*, April 13, 1980, "Challenging the public school monopoly".
51. *Education Week*, December 15, 1982, "New Projects Suggest a Rise In Private School Research", P. 11.
52. Office of Technology Assessment, Summary, "Informational Technology and Its Impact on American Education, P. 9.
53. Matheny, Ruth; *Today's Catholic Teacher*, September, 1982, "Computers in Catholic Education", P. 63.
54. Adler, Mortimer J.; *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*, Macmillan, 1982, P. 15.
55. Ibid. P. 43.
56. Ibid. P. 34.
57. McCarthy, Rockne, et al; *Society, State, & Schools*, Erdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1981.
58. Ibid. P. 10.

59. Ibid. P. 11.
60. Ibid. P. 144.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid. P. 142.
63. Ibid. P. 12.
64. Ibid. P. 40.
65. Ellis, Frederick E.; *The Three R's Plus*, in "Religion In The Public Schools", U. of Minnesota Press, 1956, P. 355.
66. Dewey, John; *Education Today*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, NY, 1940, P. 84.
67. McCarthy, Rockne, et al; *Society, State, & Schools*, Erdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1981, P. 144.
68. Adler, Mortimer J.; *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*, Macmillan, 1982, P. 34.
69. McCarthy, Rockne, et al; *Society, State, & Schools*, Erdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1981 P. 173.
70. Sherman, Joel D.; *Tuition Tax Credit Seminar*, Washington, DC, October 22, 1981, "Public Finance of Private Schools: Observations from Abroad", P. 20.
71. Ibid. P. 21.
72. Catterall, James S., et al; *Sociology of Education*, April/July, 1982, "Public and Private Schools: Evidence on Tuition Tax Credits", P. 144.
73. *Intergovernmentalizing the Classroom: Federal Involvement in Elementary and Secondary Education*, ACIR, A-81, Washington DC, March, 1981, in "Passage of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act; The Long Awaited Triumph", P. 31.
74. Ibid. P. 32.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid. P. 33.
77. Ibid. P. 34.
78. Blum, Virgil C.; *The Commonweal*, January 31, 1964, "Freedom and Equality", P. 513.
79. Downey, Matthew T., Ed.; *Teaching American History: New Directions*, The National Council For the Social Studies Bulletin No. 67, 1982. P. 1.

90 / Tuition Tax Credits: A Responsible Appraisal

80. Ibid. P. 3.

81. Ibid. P. x.

82. Johnson, Julia; *The Reference Shelf*, Vol. 20 No. 5, "Federal World Government", P. 233.

83. *Human Events*, December 25, 1982, "Brainwashing the Kids on Nuclear War, P. 5.

84. Norval Morris, Dean of the University of Chicago Law School, stated in 1977, that serious crime had risen 70 percent in the U.S. in the past 10 years while population had grown 7 percent, "and the gap between the amount of crime reported and the amount of crime experienced is vast."

85. Drug addiction cost New York State about \$4.3 billion in 1978. The use of marijuana by public high school students in New York State doubled between 1971 and 1978; the use of cocaine tripled. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that the sale of marijuana (although illegal) is the third leading business in the U.S. - \$48 billion.

86. A 1960 report stated that the U.S. was "producing alcoholics at the rate of more than 1200 a day - over 50 an hour, around the clock"! A 1977 poll indicated that the heaviest drinkers were those with college degrees - 82 percent, compared to 71 percent for those with a high school education, and 46 percent for those with only an elementary school education.

87. A 1977 Gallup Poll revealed that nearly half of persons with a college background have seen an X-rated movie compared to one-third of persons with a high school background, and only one person in six among those whose formal education did not go beyond grade school.