

**WHY  
ARE  
YOU  
LOSING  
YOUR  
CHILDREN  
?**

**BARBARA M. MORRIS**

All rights reserved. No reproduction permitted  
in any manner in whole or in part.

Copyright © 1976 Barbara M. Morris  
Revised 1981

**THE BARBARA M. MORRIS REPORT**

P.O. Box 756  
Upland, California 91786

Write for current price

## CONTENTS

THE WAY IT WAS . . . . .	1
THE WAY IT IS . . . . .	3
VALUES EDUCATION . . . . .	19
SOME STRONG WORDS . . . . .	73
WHAT TO DO? . . . . .	80
REFERENCES. . . . .	91



# THE WAY IT WAS

Parents who have not lost one or more of their teenage children are a rarity these days. Children are lost in the degradation of drug abuse, living promiscuously, or have otherwise rejected parental and religious beliefs and traditional moral behavior. Others are dead from an overdose of heroin or pills, in prison, or just plain gone -- their whereabouts unknown. Each kind of loss is profound and devastatingly painful to the survivors -- the parents and the rest of the family.

It used to be that parents did not have to worry about losing their children. Families were close; they lived, in the main, by standards that gave structure, security and purpose to their lives. Violence, pornography, drug abuse and other manifestations of cultural decay were not a concern. Young people fell in love and bound that love in the commitment and responsibility of marriage. Children who fancied themselves mistreated perhaps entertained the thought of running away and may have even gotten to the street corner, but where

would they go? In times past, government did not see itself as the third parent to every child. If a "lost" child was found, he was returned to his home promptly. Parents were recognized as responsible for their minor children.

Not too long ago there were no government sponsored half-way houses or runaway homes where an errant youngster could find solace and support for ill-gotten independence. There were no hotlines to call where a troubled child could find confused consolation or quite possibly, disastrous advice from an impersonal stranger whose caring would last only as long as the phone call.

Also not too long ago priests, ministers and rabbis led with unfailing certainty, their congregations in the worship of God, and preached obedience to His immutable laws. Situation ethics theology was almost unheard of. Certainly, we never lived in a Utopia, but in just one generation, we have seen a sharp transition -- what life was like "then" and what we have now. We can see quite clearly that government no longer supports God-given parental rights. In many instances, churches are supporting and clergy are preaching and practicing situation ethics. And schools have openly become agents of social change, and as such, are promoting the principles or "articles of faith" stated in the **Humanist Manifesto II**. (1)

We can see a multitude of negative conditions militating against the family, but "education" which in fact is "miseducation" is clearly at the core of the problem. It is here that we must look if we really want to find and understand the answer to "Why Are You Losing Your Children?"

# THE WAY IT IS

**WHY ARE YOU LOSING YOUR CHILDREN?** is about the most deceitful hoax of modern times: The promotion of the non-theistic religion of Humanism in public schools.

It is also about "values education" (a form of behavior modification) which is used in schools as a means to promote the principles of the religion of Humanism. It should be immediately understood that "values education" is **not** intended to promote the traditional values that in the past kept our society relatively stable. The presumption behind the use of "values education" is that children must be regarded as "persons" and thus, must be given an opportunity to decide for themselves without any influence from authority figures, what they want to believe and how to behave. After exposure to values education, children very quickly learn to thumb their noses at parental values and authority and religious training. At the very same time that children are "liberated" from the "antiquated" values of their parents, via "values education," the education establishment is

quick to divest itself of any responsibility, usually claiming it's the parents' fault. While many parents obviously do not make the effort to instill socially acceptable values and standards of behavior, even the "worst" parents try to help their children to turn out better than they did.

The chaos which now exists in our society is to a great degree a monument to the success of destructive, Humanistic "values education" in all its forms. At this point that allegation may be difficult to believe, but anyone who takes time to investigate can arrive at no other conclusion.

This book will show that the use of values education constitutes a clear and indisputable violation not only of the theory of separation of church and state but a gross invasion of student and family privacy.

### **VALUES EDUCATION — FROM PURPOSE TO RESULT**

The **purpose** of values education is to **eliminate** Judeo-Christian values and to replace them with Humanist values.

The **goal** of values education is to develop manipulable, group-oriented, group-dependent Humanists.

Values education is a **process** that utilizes different approaches such as Clarification, Inculcation, Awareness, Commitment, Union, Analysis, Moral Reasoning, etc. The **process** can be applied in every subject from physical education to math to home economics.

The **result** of values education is seen in the destruction of nationalism, individual responsibility, absolute standards of behavior, moral order and positive, loving parent-child relationships.

To better understand the above statements, it is necessary to understand some of the major "articles of faith" of Humanist belief which appear in the **Humanist Manifesto II** (1) and which are



inculcated through the process of values education. They are:

**On Religion:**

"We believe, however, that traditional ... religions that place revelation, God ... above human needs and experience do a disservice to the human species ... We find insufficient evidence for the belief in the existence of a supernatural ... As non-theists, we begin with humans, not God ..."

**On Ethics:**

"... Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction ... We strive for the good life, here and now."

**On The Individual:**

"We believe in maximum individual autonomy ..."

"... intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures, unduly repress sexual conduct ... neither do we wish to prohibit, by law or social sanction, sexual behavior between consenting adults ... individuals should be permitted to express their sexual proclivities and pursue their life-styles as they desire."

**On a Democratic Society:**

"... a recognition of an individual's right to die with dignity, euthanasia, and the right to suicide."

"... All persons should have a voice in developing the values and goals that determine their lives ... Alienating forces should be modified or eradicated ..."

**On a World Community:**

"We deplore the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds ... the best option is to transcend the limits of national sovereignty and to move toward the building of a world community ..."

**On Humanity as a Whole:**

"... We urge that parochial loyalties and inflexible moral and religious ideologies be

transcended ... The commitment to tolerance, understanding and peaceful negotiations does not necessitate acquiescence to the status quo nor the damming up of dynamic and revolutionary forces ... What more daring goal ... than for each person to become ... a citizen of a world community."

## **GOALS OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE OF THE UNION**

Most of public education and much of private and church related education promote Humanist belief in "a commitment to the building of a world community ..."

Many influential people and institutions, public and private, are propelling us toward that world community envisioned in the **Humanist Manifesto II**. Gerald Ford, Henry Kissinger and Jimmy Carter, to name just a few prominent individuals, support world interdependence. During Jimmy Carter's stay in the White House, in support of his belief, he made a commitment to promoting global interdependence in the schools.

Through at least the past six administrations, our Constitutional Republic of 50 sovereign states has been manipulated to fit into the projected plan. When Richard Nixon was president, by Executive Order he divided the United States into 10 federal regions, each with its own capitol. This is an attack on the sovereignty of the states -- a necessary prerequisite for U.S. participation in a world government.

Our representative form of government has become but a shadow of what it was intended to be. We now have a "participatory democracy" -- a Humanist goal -- widely accepted particularly by young people who are taught in school that this is a democracy and not a Republic.

Indeed, in more ways than are visible, we are

on our way to becoming part of a "one world" community. Education has been and is now, in accord with the dictates of the **Humanist Manifesto II**, creating autonomous children with a world view who will accept chaotic democracy over a Constitutional Republic with representative government; and the religion of atheistic Humanism over Christianity and the Judeo-Christian ethic.

A child who is trained to be autonomous, who embraces tenets of Humanism is liberated from his parents, from their values, from religious teaching and from his cultural heritage. He is the universal child, the world citizen who will be comfortable in any situation any place in the world.

### **SOME DEFINITIONS**

Often heard are the words "humanism," "humane," and other words with the prefix "human" which are used to describe some facet of education. Such words have desirable connotations, and to most people, the definitions are interchangeable. When applied to schooling, it is usually assumed these words indicate children are being taught to be kind, considerate, generous human beings. It is also often assumed the reference is to the study of classical literature, thereby giving the impression that education is a civilizing process. But is this what is meant by "Humanistic education"?

William E. Russell, program officer for the federally funded National Endowment for the Humanities, writing in the August 1975 issue of the **Journal of Education**(2) of Boston University's School of Education, offered his definition of Humanistic education which included the following:

"An initial clarification to make is that the term "humanistic" is not the adjectival form of the noun

"humanities": Humanistic education does not mean education in the humanities disciplines."

And right he is! Humanistic education is **affective** education. Humanistic education "educates" or more accurately, manipulates the feelings, emotions, attitudes and values of an individual. As it happens, the "guidelines" for such **affective** education just happen to be the "articles of faith" found in the **Humanist Manifesto II**.

Why isn't this universally understood? Because there is a misunderstanding of the meaning of words. We are all using the same words, but depending on who we are or what we are, the same words mean something different to each of us.

But this is the reality: when terms such as "humanizing education" or "humanistic education" or any word with the prefix "human" is used to describe what is going on inside schools, **unless it's clearly defined otherwise**, these words and terms indicate the promotion and inculcation of the principles or "articles of faith" of the atheistic religion of Humanism as stated in the **Humanist Manifesto II**.

The bottom line is that just as other religions have their missionary fields to spread their beliefs, so the Humanists have one of their most fruitful missionary fields in public and often, in private and church related schools.

## HUMANISM — A RELIGION

If all of this is new to you, you are probably wondering about the reference to Humanism as a religion. After all, you are aware that recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading have been banned in public schools.

Then how can it be argued that a particular religion is being promoted in public and even in

private and church schools? The answer is simple: If you understand the principles of Humanist belief as expressed in the **Humanist Manifesto II** and can see that they are being translated through the curriculum, isn't that sufficient evidence?

Not only do many Humanists refer to their godless philosophy (and it's not really a philosophy, either) as a religion, but Humanism has been recognized as a religion in several court cases. If, for instance, you were to research the case of *Torcaso v. Watkins* (367 U.S. Reports 488 p. 495) you would find footnote 11 provides this information:

"Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others. See *Washington Ethical Society v. District of Columbia*, 101 U.S. App. D.C. 371, 249F 2d 127..."

The crux of the issue is this: **The promotion of atheistic Humanism in public schools is a hoax of such incredible magnitude, that few people are willing to believe it. And thus, the hoax, clothed in the semantic seduction of respectable words and phrases, is destroying not only our children, but our once Christian nation.**

### **"CHRISTIAN HUMANISM"**

When speaking before church groups, I often get the impression that the minute I convey a critical attitude about Humanism in the schools, a solid wall of hostility immediately goes up and anything I say after that is not heard or understood. Many times during a question and answer session, a

clergyman will fire a defensive multi-part question that often goes like this:

"Aren't you aware there is such a thing as Christian Humanism"? (The emphasis is usually heavy on "Christian")  
"Surely, you must be aware that Christ is our human brother as well as our Savior" (The emphasis is heavy on "human")  
"And shouldn't we be concerned about the human needs of our brothers and sisters?" (Which has no bearing on the discussion of Humanism but serves to denigrate the speaker and to puff up the ego of the questioner)

Sometimes, those clergymen who are preaching or practicing Humanist beliefs (particularly situation ethics) deliberately attempt to disrupt or confuse an audience to either hide or legitimize what they are doing. Most times, however, it is simply an honest misunderstanding as a result of not having listened carefully.

So what about "Christian Humanism"? The combination of words "Christian" and "Humanism" is redundant. Basic to Christianity is a human concern for our brothers and sisters in Christ. If anyone insists on qualifying "Christian" with the word "Humanism", then so be it if it helps a Christian be a better Christian. But let's not be confused. While in defense of "Christian Humanism" let's not close the mind, eyes and ears to the distinction between the philosophy of atheistic Humanism as expressed in the **Humanist Manifesto II** and promoted in public and many church schools, and the truly "humanistic" aspects of Christianity.

That it is not possible to be both a Christian

and a Humanist has been verified by Humanist Paul Kurtz. In a book edited by him, titled, **THE HUMANIST ALTERNATIVE: SOME DEFINITIONS OF HUMANISM** (3) Mr. Kurtz says on p. 177:

"Humanism cannot in any fair sense of the word apply to one who still believes in God as the source and creator of the universe. **Christian Humanism would be possible only for those who are willing to admit that they are atheistic Humanists. It surely does not apply to God-intoxicated believers.**" (emphasis added)

It could hardly be made more clear! If we are true Christians we need not embellish what we are with misleading verbal frosting. If we are concerned about our fellow human beings who have been created in the image and likeness of Christ, then as Christians we know how we are expected to relate to them and our Christian behavior will speak for itself.

### **CREATION OF THE AUTONOMOUS HUMANIST CHILD**

One of the goals of Humanistic education is the creation of new autonomous citizens of the world who will live by the principles of atheistic Humanism. How is this to be accomplished? An indication is to be found in these two very important Humanist statements of belief expressed in the Humanist Manifesto:

"All persons should have a voice in developing the values and goals that determine their lives ... Alienating forces should be modified or eradicated ..."

"We believe in maximum individual autonomy ..."

Applied to the school child, the above statements mean the child must decide for himself what he will believe and how he will behave and anyone who interferes -- any "alienating forces" (such as parents or religious beliefs of parents) are to be modified or eliminated. The child must be permitted and helped to become "self-actualized". He must be allowed and encouraged to "do his own thing". It can certainly be argued that a child will do what he wants to do regardless of what he is told or taught to do, but that is not the point. The point is that parents have a fundamental right to **teach** their children what they, the parents, want their children to believe. Parents have a right to instill certain religious beliefs in their children. They also have a right to suggest life goals for their children. If, after children are grown, they choose to depart from what they have been taught and decide to deviate from goals they have been led to achieve, then that is their right as adult human beings. Certainly, an immature child must be involved in value and goal formation to some extent, but it is not the province of the school to actively guide value formation or to suggest in any way to a child that he has a right to develop his "own" value system. No child develops his "own" value system. Values are learned "some place" and that primary "some place" should be the home and church.

### **AUTONOMY — WHAT IS IT?**

Many parents find it difficult to understand the meaning of "autonomy" or "autonomous behavior". There is, of course, more to the definition than saying it means "doing your own thing".

In the book **THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION** (4), in an essay



titled "On the Corruption of Education by Psychology", author Joseph J. Schwab defines autonomism, as applied to education, as a doctrine that pits the individual against society. He says,

"... The doctrine goes on to point out that the values and attitudes imposed by society take no account of the individual's own wishes and needs...The doctrine then concludes that the continued existence of the individual ... require that some individuals somehow escape from the domination of society if they can -- become each an 'autonomous man' ".

Schwab continues to explain that the study of sociology tells the student how society attempts to take him in, to make him conform. The child is provided with,

"... therapy by which he is encouraged to rebel and the practical training that will provide him with the tactics by which to achieve and maintain his autonomy."

In summarizing autonomism, Schwab hits the nail on the head with this observation,

" ... autonomism cannonizes adolescent rebellion."

Another discussion of autonomism appears in **THRUST** (5), March 1974 in an article titled "The Humanization of Education" by John Vasconcellos. The author clearly explains that the autonomous person will not "take orders" from any external authority -- he has become his own final arbiter of right and wrong. God, parents, teachers -- no external authority may tell the autonomous person

how to behave. The author says,

"In traditional Western culture ... man was impressed to look outward and upward, to the authority figure, for instruction on how he ought to be."

"Today this is radically changing. Many persons are looking inward and downward ... When persons radically change their self-concept ... then all social structures and relationships built on self-denial, repression and authority come sharply into question. Persons challenge the assumption that someone else knows better than they do, what's best for them. They question those institutions that tell them they need someone else to dictate to them how they ought to be."

This is a typical Humanist attack on authority, and for Mr. Vasconcellos, it is a bitter denunciation of the religion in which he was raised. He states he was raised a Roman Catholic, and he mocks the "authority figure who faced the wall and spoke in a foreign tongue" (meaning the priest saying Latin Mass facing the altar, which is a rare occurrence in Catholic churches since the reforms of Vatican II). He mocks "teachers who had all the mystery, grades and power." He objects to having had to "shut up, sit still, take in, conform ..."

Mr. Vasconcellos wrote this article as a California Assemblyman. There are many other legislators holding Humanist views, which is one of the reasons that more and more, our laws do not reflect or support the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic.

In Howard County, Maryland, there was a furor over a questionnaire administered in the schools by Johns Hopkins University. The supposed purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the effectiveness of "open education" (which is a euphemism for "Humanistic education". The term "open education" has nothing to do with placement of walls). Many parents were upset because many of the questions were an invasion of student and family privacy.

While parents were justifiably outraged, they did not understand the real purpose of the study. In an **Interim Report** (6) relating to the questionnaire issued by Johns Hopkins, it was explained that one of the goals of "open education" is to develop self reliance and autonomous behavior. The **Report** states,

"There are several reasons why developing self reliance in students may be an appropriate goal for schools. **A major part of the growing up process is developing a willingness to act autonomously, to no longer have to depend on one's family or others for excessive guidance and decision-making help.**"  
(emphasis added)

Common sense tells us that immature children, lacking wisdom and self control cannot be separated from parental guidance and parental decision-making help, and still be expected to behave with any great degree of responsibility. This was recognized by educator Thomas B. Gregory, in an article in the November 1971 issue of **Educational Leadership** (7). He warned that in developing autonomy,

"Internal controls may not

develop, and seeking autonomy may become the immature action of simply resisting further external control. As a result, seeking autonomy may include experimenting with asocial actions (delinquency)".

Doesn't this give a clue as to why children have become unmanageable -- why there is disruption, violence and disrespect for legitimate authority -- why there is an appalling lack of discipline in the schools? Children are deliberately encouraged to become autonomous -- encouraged to behave as if they are subject to no higher authority than themselves. They are encouraged to achieve maximum individual autonomy which just happens to be in accord with Humanist belief. It could be said schools are not deliberately promoting Humanist beliefs. Even if the intention is not deliberate, it doesn't change what is in fact taking place. Pleading ignorance or purity of intention will neither change reality nor make it any less offensive.

## **SELF ACTUALIZATION AND AUTONOMY**

Educators like to use the term "self-actualized" to describe the child who has become autonomous. The term "self-actualized" gives the impression the child is a "self-starter" or a person who gets things done. But what does it really mean? For Humanists, self-actualization is a major goal to be attained by denying salvation and damnation. The **Humanist Manifesto II** says,

"Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful. They distract humans from present concerns, from self-actualization..."

For Humanists, each man must become his own god. Each man must become autonomous to save himself, for there is no God to do it for him. Eleanor Howe, writing in **The National Educator** (8) of January, 1975, explains Abraham Maslow's view of self-actualization:

"Self actualizers have what Maslow calls 'psychological freedom'...He claims that self-actualized people all have clear ideas of right and wrong based on their own experience rather than blind acceptance of revelation. A characteristic of the self-actualized person is the low degree of self-conflict. He is not at war with himself, his 'personality is integrated'.

"In other words, the self-actualized person has had his conscience destroyed. He is completely free because he is not bound by Biblical moral laws. He does not have to resist satanic temptation because he no longer recognizes temptation. This man is, as Maslow says, 'his own God'."

So, the next time you hear an educator explain that children are being helped to become "self-actualized", be aware of what the term really means.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMANIST MANIFESTO II — HOW?**

How are schools promoting the principles and goals of the **Humanist Manifesto**? Is what is being done openly admitted? Only to the degree of

admitting to "humanizing education" or promoting a "humanistic approach" to education or "making education more humane" -- and who would find fault with that? No, it is not openly admitted that principles of the **Humanist Manifesto** are being promoted. Such an admission could possibly (but not likely!) result in the demise of public education.

The necessity for deception was made clear long ago by one-worlder Robert M. Hutchins in his book, **THE CONFLICT IN EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY** (9) in which he says,

"I am in favor of world government, and most of the other social aims that reconstructionalism proposes; but I do not see how the schools can preach world government unless the American people are willing to have this aim promoted in the schools. At the moment, I do not believe they are...A revolution cannot be brought about through the conscious inculcation of revolutionary doctrine in the schools."

The schools are now pretty open about preaching the world government Hutchins envisioned, but it's not called that -- not quite. The schools call it "global interdependence studies," "world understanding studies," "peace studies," "cross cultural understanding", etc. The point is, the deception is going on and most parents are totally unaware of it.

Through deception, children are being alienated from their parents, from their American heritage and from their religious beliefs and it's being accomplished primarily through a process called "values education".

# VALUES EDUCATION

Values education is a necessary part of contemporary education, for the goals of Humanism cannot be achieved without it. In defense of values education, educators like to point out that in years past, teachers "always" taught values. While teachers may "always" have taught values, those values reflected and supported parental and traditional societal values and therefore, there usually wasn't a conflict. But the days of universally accepted values and respect for parents' rights are gone. Today, it's "a whole new ball game".

Values education is a **process** and every subject in the curriculum can be used as a "meat grinder" to process or chop up what a child believes. There are said to be seven stages to the valuing process. Supposedly, what a person believes does not become a value unless it goes through these seven stages:

1. Prizing and cherishing
2. Publicly affirming when appropriate
3. Choosing from alternatives
4. Choosing after consideration of the consequences
- 5.

Choosing freely 6. Acting on one's beliefs 7. Acting with a pattern.

Beliefs are not considered values -- they are merely "value indicators". Such indicators include, among others, feelings, morals, thoughts, ethics, goals, attitudes, opinions, etc. They do not become values until they have been forced through the meat grinder of the valuing process.

In values education, nothing is sacred. Everything a child values, believes or thinks about is open to attack: religion, sex, family, friends, hair styles, death, war, authority, etc.

Think of all the positive values you have tried to instill in your children. Think of all the things you have taught them to believe. You didn't give them the opportunity to "choose from alternatives", but then, why should you? You didn't give them the opportunity to "choose freely", and again, why should you? In your maturity and judgement and in fidelity to your God-given responsibility for your children, you have taught them what **you** perceive to be right and proper.

## **THE NEED TO CHANGE VALUES**

When someone wants to do something "for your own good", you had better look for the real reason as well as the stated reason.

The stated reasons for values education vary, but they usually boil down to "parents are not doing their job" or "society is breaking down". While there is an element of truth in each of these claims, the real reason for values education is to promote Humanism.

In 1956 a book of essays was published titled **SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION** (10). One of the essays titled "Re-education: A Major Task" made clear the "need" to change values.

The authors of this essay acknowledge that in



the past, curricula stressed moral content to reinforce the teachings of the home and church. But, they insist, in a period of change "as now being witnessed in the United States", such teachings must no longer be considered valid. The authors say,

"...learnings laid down...can no longer be taken at their face value. Most of these learnings belong to old cultural patterns, which have been invalidated...by new economic, political, and social realities and must, therefore, be discounted...Education, then, will be required to penetrate the deeper layers of personality, and, thereby, to assist in the reconstruction of the loyalties, aspirations, points of view, and moral ideals of individuals. The task is no less than that of transforming the characters of men -- of creating new personality types adequate for the task of controlling the social arrangements emerging from the conditions created by science and technology."

The authors conclude with this statement,

"...one of the primary tasks of curriculum development is to build a program in which everyone can learn, through the processes of re-education, to become the kind of person demanded by the cultural patterns now in the making."

Bear in mind these words originally appeared in print about 1950. Such revolutionary thinking was

not a concern to most parents at that time nor would it have been taken seriously by most people. After all, to all outward appearances, the schools were doing the job they were supposed to be doing.

Today, those who would change the values of children are more sophisticated. The art of deceptive semantics has matured. Now the modus operandi is to worship autonomy and to appeal to individuals to decide for themselves what they want to believe. Since children are "people" who are said to be victimized by moralizing adults, they must be freed of imposed morality and helped to develop their "own" value system -- a neat trick that has yet to be accomplished by any immature child.

### **MORALIZING ADULTS CAUSE CONFUSION**

One of the most widely used books for values education is **VALUES CLARIFICATION: A HANDBOOK OF PRACTICAL STRATEGIES FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS** (11). The authors, Sidney B. Simon et al, claiming that young people have been bombarded with confusing influences, say,

"... the young person is ultimately left to make his own choice about whose advice or values to follow. But **young people brought up by moralizing adults are not prepared to make their own responsible choices.** They have not learned a **process** for selecting the best and rejecting the worst elements in the various value systems which others have been urging them to follow..." (emphasis added)

The authors also ask,

"...how does the young person choose his own course of action from among the many models and moralizing lectures with which he has been bombarded? **Where does he learn whether he wants to stick to the old moral and ethical standards or try new ones?**" (emphasis added)

So, in **SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION** you have the plain talk of the 1950's and in Sidney Simon's **VALUES CLARIFICATION** the new-speak of today. But it all boils down to the same thing: values, people and institutions are going to be changed.

### **PARENTS AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS ARE FAILING**

On the one hand, parents and adults are condemned for moralizing and on the other, they are condemned for not knowing how to impart values -- a "damned if you do and damned if you don't" situation.

As would be expected, religious institutions are also targets of the values educators. In a paper titled "Values" (12) by Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, the authors claim that inept parents and ineffective religious institutions are a problem:

**"...Most parents probably do not know how to impart values and most religious institutions have only minimal impact on the values of youth.** One could, of course, argue that these institutions should learn to be more effective. Until that

happens, however, it is unlikely that parents or religious institutions will change the way young people perceive and deal with values." (emphasis added)

The trouble with people like Harmin and Simon is that they **know** parents and religious institutions know how to impart values -- it's just that parent-taught values and values based on religious beliefs are not the "right" values! So it's not a problem of parents "not knowing how" that bothers the values indoctrinators. It's the values taught by "moralizing adults" that must be eliminated.

### **CLARIFYING RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

In an article in **Intellect** (13) of April, 1974, titled "Religion, Scientific Naturalism and the Myth of Neutrality" the author suggests,

"...open discussion of religious issues provide an avenue for the enhancement of self-understanding. High school students are preoccupied with identity concerns, with 'Who am I and where am I going?' questions that clamor for resolution. To argue that religious discussions belong only in the home or church is to deny the student the opportunity to clarify his beliefs."

The author righteously concludes with this statement:

"...The promulgation of any single faith in the public schools of a pluralistic society is

indefensible -- particularly when that faith masquerades in neutral garb."

If the foregoing seems incredible consider this: In **VALUES CLARIFICATION** (14) a strategy called "Diaries" gives the teacher a technique for clarifying religious beliefs of students. The teacher is told "the best place" to get information for values clarification is from the student's personal life:

"...Diaries is a strategy that enables the students to bring an enormous amount of information about themselves into class to be examined and discussed"

The procedure for using Diaries is then explained:

"For a whole week or longer, students (and the teacher) keep their own individual diaries. If they have chosen a Religion Diary, **they record all thoughts, conversation, and actions having to do with religion.**"  
(emphasis added)

It is then suggested that about a week later, students bring their diaries to school and share their entries with other students. Then the teacher is to ask values clarifying questions about the diary.

When a child's religious beliefs are forced through such a "meat grinder" process, it is easy to understand why he has doubts about or outright rejects beliefs taught at home or church. Upon what foundation can immature, impressionable youngsters make wise decisions about religious beliefs parents have passed on to them? Who, in the secular classroom will help immature children defend religious beliefs they hold but may not as yet fully

understand? Does not such meddling constitute a serious and indefensible violation of separation of church and state and an intolerable invasion of individual and family privacy?

## **JUVENILE CRIME REQUIRES VALUES EDUCATION**

High crime rates and student unrest are often cited to justify the use of values education. This was demonstrated in THRUST (15) of October 1974 in an article titled "Value Education in the Public School" by Joseph Forcinelli. The author tells about a values education program that seems to be cutting crime, but he is critical of it because it appears to stress conventional morality.

He tells about the Character Education Curriculum produced by the American Institute for Character Education (AICE) in San Antonio, Texas, which emphasizes the right of the child to choose his own values. (Parents should understand that mention of this program does not constitute endorsement. While it has some good aspects, it also promotes socialistic goals and invasion of the child's privacy). The author is critical of the program because it centers on what he calls a "bag of virtues" approach to morality. He appears to be unhappy because, as he explains it, we have reached the point where "...conventional morality is almost wholly absent from our lives."

If in fact conventional morality is almost absent from our lives, would it not be proper for the public schools to support rather than tear down the conventional morality that still exists? The answer to that question would have to be, "No, it is not proper for the schools to promote conventional morality."

Why not?

Because the primary goal of public schools is

not "education" in the sense that most people understand the meaning of "education". **Schools have become agents of social change.** What is thought of as "education" has become a **process** for change which results in the creation of Humanists with a world view who will fit into a Humanist one-world community. Those teachers who are not promoting change are not functioning properly as change agents. In a paper titled "Values" (12) by Harmin and Simon, the authors make clear the role of teachers as change agents:

**"...it is even manipulatory for teachers to fail to raise controversial issues in school for that perpetuates the status quo. Forces for change do not have a fair chance."**  
(emphasis added)

Conventional morality represents the "status quo" -- it does not promote change and therefore it is not promoted in public schools.

### **VALUES EDUCATION: A CAUSE OF JUVENILE CRIME?**

It should be emphasized again that it is not possible for schools to promote conventional morality. In accord with Humanist belief, persons must be allowed to achieve maximum individual autonomy. They must be allowed a voice in the development of values and goals that determine their lives, and they must be allowed to choose the kind of behavior they will engage in. How can conventional morality be promoted at the same time? Clearly, it's impossible.

Reasonable, intelligent people who promote Humanist principles will have to wonder, it would seem, about the possible negative effects of Humanistic values education. To his credit, the

author of the previously mentioned article in **Thrust** (15) **does** wonder about the possibility of undesirable effects. He asks,

**"...one wonders whether values clarification may misconceive the function of the educational process. Can an educational system produce a dishonest and potentially dysfunctional product, and then merely say that these are legitimate expressions of individual preferences?"** (emphasis added)

He answers his own question by quoting a passage from **VALUES IN TEACHING** (16):

**" 'It is not impossible to conceive of one going through the seven values criteria and deciding that he values intolerance or thievery. What is to be done? Our position is that we respect his right to decide upon that value.' "**(emphasis added)

It is then rationalized that this is not as bad as it seems, because unacceptable behavior will be suppressed and certain values will not be tolerated by society.

Most people believe (and our laws support the belief) that murder, stealing and other crimes are intolerable, yet crimes of all kinds go on unabated. Where is the "social control" of unacceptable behavior?

Values education leaves the child with the belief that he has the right to decide what laws he will break or obey. But common sense tells us a child cannot be allowed to think he has a right to



the Humanist ideal of "maximum individual autonomy". He cannot be permitted to believe that he can with impunity legitimately value and engage in thievery or other anti-social, illegal or immoral activities.

The daily papers report on anti-crime recommendations made by "blue ribbon" citizen committees, politicians, ivory-tower theorists and other assorted opinion molders. Such recommendations include sending hard-core trouble makers to isolated detention camps or the use of more security guards in schools. Reasons cited as causes of juvenile crime include not enough teachers, uncaring parents, not enough community recreation centers or not enough federal money for "innovative" programs.

But few public figures speak about a major cause of juvenile crime: the teaching and promotion of anarchy-producing Humanist beliefs in public schools.

Juvenile crime will continue to run rampant as long as we are unwilling to face up to reality. In our contemporary society, many of those with the power and authority to make positive changes no longer believe in absolute standards of behavior mandated by Judeo-Christian morality. As long as that is the case, as long as the great "silent majority" remains silent, we will suffer the consequences of disobedience of God's immutable laws and we will deserve the repression that must eventually follow.

There are those who say the schools alone cannot be blamed for juvenile crime. Certainly, that is true. Interlocking forces are at work -- TV, magazines, newspapers, movies and perhaps the most insidious interlocking influence of all -- "rock music" with its generally anti-social, immoral, pro-drug, anti-Christian messages. But if from the first day the child sets foot in the school there were support for and promotion of conventional morality

and an effort was immediately begun to develop the intellect and teach what should be taught, then the spine of those deadly influences could be seriously crippled, if not destroyed. A child is told he is sent to school to learn. If what is offered to him to learn not only supports negative external influences but also starves his intellect, what should we expect the result to be?

It is no wonder intelligent kids commit violent acts in their schools and against their schools. They know they are being cheated and perverted and they are helpless to change the situation. Their anger is exacerbated and given legitimacy through values education and promotion of "maximum individual autonomy".

### **THE PURPOSE OF THE PROCESS**

The process of values education is designed to clarify, change and when considered necessary, to develop values. In **NEW PRIORITIES IN THE CURRICULUM** (17), the author clearly shows that changing, clarifying and creating values is a proper function for schools:

"... children need the opportunity to clarify what their values are and to differentiate them from tentatively held beliefs. One of the tasks of schooling, therefore, is to help youth **clarify** values.

"At times clarification may indicate incompatibility between two different values held by the same individual. At such a point the task of the school may be to help the individual **change** his values.

"Within some groups, a need may exist to **create** values not represented in the group or to provide children the opportunity to place their values in some type of hierarchy...In the process of arranging, new values may be created."

(emphasis in original)

Remember: **The purpose of the process of values education is to change, clarify (which also means "change") and create values.**

## TOOLS OF THE PROCESS

A set of reprints distributed by the Adirondack Mt. Humanistic Education Center (18) provides an excellent understanding of how every course in the curriculum can be used as a tool to change, clarify or create new values. What follows will briefly describe what is found in several of these reprints.

**Sex Education:** "Sexuality and the School" by Marianne and Sidney B. Simon

This paper opens with the charge that "...Too many teachers are not merely asexual, they are downright anti-sexual." The authors then charge that schools are guilty of "sexual destruction" and they enumerate what schools do that cause children "to wrinkle up like raisins in the sun". It's an emotional, distorted diatribe that typically presents theory and imagination as fact. But in their frustration the authors boldly get to the heart of sex education. Their concluding statement pleads,

"Some changes are desperately needed. Schools can no longer be permitted to carry out such a horrendously

effective program for drying up students' sense of their own sexual identity. **The schools must not be allowed to continue fostering the immorality of morality. An entirely different set of values must be nourslshed.**  
(emphasis added)

The Simons' apparent dream of a fully fornicating society is nearing reality. Sex education in the schools is fostering a set of values that is completely contrary to traditional Judeo-Christian values. Unfortunately, it is difficult to get many parents to understand that sex education is really a facet of values education and as such, the "facts of life" which parents assume sex education to be, is in fact, the very last thing with which sex education is concerned. The emphasis is on **education** for sexuality, not on sex **information**. There is a difference.

The fact that sex education is often mandated from kindergarten through grade twelve should clearly indicate that more than the mere "facts of life" are being imparted. Obviously, it does not take 12 years to teach the physiology and functions of the human body, but it may take that long to develop a value system which conflicts with what has been taught at home and church. Humanistic sex education may very well take 12 years to "take" because there is constant competition with Judeo-Christian values. Humanist belief demands that everyone has a right to maximum individual autonomy and the right to pursue any or all sexual proclivities.

As the Simons say, "The schools must not be allowed to continue fostering the immorality of morality." Hence, the need for a lengthy **process** of Humanistic sex education to overcome existing Judeo-Christian morality.

**Sex Education:** "Teaching Health Education With a Focus On Values" by Edward H. Betof and Howard Kirschenbaum (18)

This paper demonstrates how the pooled ignorance of children in a group which is led by a facilitator helps a child create or change his values. The authors suggest a series of questions for students to answer:

"(a) Think to yourself for two minutes about the following questions:

-- Do your sexual habits conform with your knowledge and feelings about love, V.D., pregnancy, abortion?

-- Do you care?

-- Why or why not?

(b) Next, find someone in class you feel comfortable speaking to. Together compare your thoughts and feelings about the previous question."

Think about it -- "together", sharing their ignorance and immaturity, they are to reinforce their confusion and doubt. What of a positive nature is a child to gain by sharing details of his "sexual habits" with others? What is to be gained by listening to a recitation of the "sexual habits" of others? Will it provide new information with which to experiment? Will they discuss religious teachings that place restrictions on sexual behavior? If one child's behavior is shaped by religious beliefs and the other child's is not, whose code of sexual conduct will carry more weight, particularly if the child with religious beliefs finds his views to be the only such views in the class?

**Science:** "Teaching Science With A Focus On Values" by Merrill Harmin, Howard Kirschenbaum, Sidney B. Simon. (18)

The authors of this paper state that the factual approach to teaching science may have been adequate "in an earlier, less complex and confusing world" but teaching the facts of science alone is not enough today. The authors ask,

**"...How can we deal with values in our science teaching while avoiding the problems of indoctrinating students with our own values, or equally bad, unquestioningly inculcating society's values, many of which we believe are fraudulent."**(emphasis added)

In teaching values through the science curriculum, a lot of "fraudulent values" can be undone. Consider these suggested questions for students to answer,

"Where do you stand on oil companies getting a depletion allowance?

Which, if any, of these worry you at all or more than others?:

Converting the Florida Everglades into housing for senior citizens.

The cities spreading out over the earth's surface, leaving less and less space.

When you get married, do you think you will give an expensive ring to your wife, or if you are a girl, do you think you will want one?

Would you give your eyes to science when you die?

Would you dissect a cat?

Why not use live people in the same way?"

These and other questions in this paper serve no useful purpose and are likely to provoke a lot of negative non-productive thoughts and attitudes and instill feelings of collective and personal guilt. Questions such as these are not unique — they are typical values education invasions of privacy.

**Mathematics** "The Search For Values With a Focus on Math" by Merrill Harmin, Howard Kirschenbaum, Sidney B. Simon. (18)

To change or create new values through math, the use of personalized word problems that lead to a discussion of values is suggested. Also suggested is the use of "time diaries" in which all activities for a given period of time are entered.

A suggested problem and values questions arising from keeping a time diary are given:

"What fraction of your time is spent doing things you really and truly enjoy? (How can you make this fraction bigger? Is your goal in life to enjoy yourself? If not, what is it?)"

In thinking about the above, be aware that a Humanist goal is to "strive for the good life, here and now". Humanists do not believe in salvation or damnation. They believe this life is all there is and as much pleasure as possible must be derived from what is "here and now". With this understanding, the above questions are loaded with opportunities for a child's religious beliefs to be subjected to ridicule. If a zealous Humanist teacher asks the questions, what would be the attitude toward the child who has been taught his goal in life is to work out his eternal salvation? Would the child's belief be respected and left alone, or would the teacher attempt to change, or create a new life-goal for the child?

A word problem on how to make change (money) provides the opportunity to promote the

"recycle" and anti-free enterprise mentality. And if you've ever wondered why so many young people prefer the torn and tattered look, this next question may provide some insight,

"Here is a flyer from a discount store listing several sale items. Pretend you are a checker. How much change would you have to give a person if he bought each of these items and gave you a \$5 bill? A \$20 bill? (Do you think you might be able to buy some of these items less expensively in a Goodwill or Salvation Army store? Would you rather pay less in one of these stores or would you prefer to buy in a regular discount or department store? Why?)"

The next question seems harmless enough, but the answer can reveal a lot about a child and his family:

"Compare the annual cost of subscribing to various magazines you like to read with the cost of buying them each month on the newsstand.(What magazines do you read? How do you decide what to read? Do you think you will want to read different magazines when you are older?)"

Implied, it would seem, is the question "what magazines come into your home?". Think about the titles of magazines you as parents purchase and subscribe to. Are they political? Left or right? Religious? Financial? Any of them you would rather not have your child discuss in the classroom?

These and other suggested questions



demonstrate how a math class can be misused as an invasion of privacy of the child and his family.

**Environmental Education** "Teaching Environmental Education With a Focus on Values" by Clifford E. Knapp. (18)

This paper shows how guilt about "social sins" is instilled in youngsters. Students are asked to keep a time diary and to respond to questions about how they **might** have contributed to pollution; how many hours they use electricity; and if they could, do they want to use less? Finally, after having been made to feel guilty, pupils are asked if they are proud of how they spend their time.

An autobiographical questionnaire is also suggested for teachers to "examine the student's behavior" about pollution. Suggested questions include,

"Have you ever:

Thrown refuse on the  
ground or in the water?

Burned trash outside?

Reported a violation of a  
fish or game law?

Asked your mother to  
change her laundry detergent to  
a less harmful one?"

The author then concludes with this "fact" designed to instill fear:

"...if we don't teach  
environmental education with a  
focus on values now, the next  
generation may not be around to  
do it for us."

Only someone who perceives himself to be more omniscient than God would dare to make such a doomsday prediction.

Change "environmental education" to any other subject and the result is the same. All subjects can be used to change or create new values.

## **TECHNIQUES TO DO THE JOB**

There are many approaches or techniques that can be used to change, or create values. An excellent explanation of eight approaches or techniques is found in an article titled, "Approaches to Values Education" (19). They are as follows,

1. Evocation, 2. Inculcation, 3. Awareness, 4. Moral reasoning, 5. Analysis, 6. Clarification, 7. Commitment, 8. Union.

Of the eight, six are discussed below.

### **Inculcation**

The basic purpose of this approach is "to instill or internalize certain desirable social or human values into students." (19) Methods that can be used to inculcate desired values are badgering, mocking, providing incomplete or biased information, behavior modification, or by example of the teacher's behavior.

Promoters of values education quite often insist they are not engaging in indoctrination ("inculcation") or that they are not teaching values. But here we see evidence that teaching values and indoctrination are very much a part of values education.

### **Awareness**

The basic purpose of using this approach is to help students become aware of and to identify their values and the values of other students. Until students can be "opened up", values cannot be changed, clarified ("clarified" means the same thing as "changed") or created.

In **NEW PRIORITIES IN THE CURRICULUM** (20) the author very clearly explains the value of the awareness approach in clarifying values:

"Until an individual has **brought to the level of awareness** the values he holds and how he arrives at them, he can do little to change or create values." (emphasis added)

Once students become aware of their values, then they can be changed:

"After persons begin to **become aware** of their values and priorities, they may wish to make some changes." (emphasis added)

As to the creation of values, the author says they can be created in a number of ways, one being through the creation of awareness:

"... schools can assist in **bringing, to the level of awareness** major value questions with which children and youth must deal." (emphasis added)

In other words, according to the last statement, what the student may not have thought of will be brought to his "level of awareness" if it is considered necessary. How often has it been said that children today are much more "aware" or "wiser" at an earlier age than they used to be? That children are "wiser" at an earlier age is not a natural phenomenon; it is not a natural maturity. As a matter of fact, it is not maturity at all. It is a "forced flowering" that all too often does not accompany necessary wisdom.

Two of the most useful methods for bringing about awareness are role playing and group discussions. Both are very powerful psychological techniques used extensively in schools. Group discussions in particular, under the guidance of a trained teacher-facilitator, are particularly effective

in achieving value or behavior change. Parents should have a good understanding of the mechanics of group dynamics if they are to understand what makes their children, teenagers in particular, behave as they do.

In the essay, "On the Corruption of Education by Psychology" (21) the author explains, quite unintentionally, it would appear, why we are losing our children to the tyrannical authority of groups. He explains how group dynamics works in education, and what happens during and after the formation of a group:

**" ... the first affective aim of education is to train persons to become willing and useful members of groups, to recognize the supremacy of group activity ... For such an education, discussion is a useful method...Discussion therefore becomes first, the playing out of roles that stand in the way of group formation (catharsis), then the discovery of the rewarding warmth...sense of strength that arise from the solidarity, the 'groupiness' ... and from the relinquishment of private responsibility. After these stages, the function of discussion is to guard the integrity of the group." (emphasis added)**

The author goes on to emphasize that whatever intellectual activity is pursued, the activity must not destroy the group. Above all, the 'groupiness' must not be jeopardized.

Apply this process not only to groups in school, but to groups formed outside school among friends. Allegiance to the all important group is something parents often fail to understand -- that in many cases, their children's loyalty to the family is secondary. Those working with juvenile crime will tell you that parents often will not believe it when they are confronted with the fact that their children have been involved in unlawful activity which has been inspired by "the group". Parents fail to understand that while a child may be putting on a "good front" at home for the sake of family harmony, he must be faithful to the group and to the group activity.

Many parents make the mistake of thinking they "have it made" with their children because "we have good communication". This is very naive. Parents shouldn't insist their child wouldn't do "this" or "that" unless they have some pretty tangible reasons for so believing. And even then, they can't be sure, sad to say. Today kids are fabulous "con artists". They have mastered the use of situation ethics which they have been taught in values clarification and they have become dominated by group control.

All of this is not to imply that parents should not trust anything a child does or says. But given existing circumstances, parents might be able to save themselves (and their child) a lot of grief by being realistic.

About role-playing: A book could be written about the negative behavior that can result from use of this psychological "treatment". Indeed, role-playing is "treatment" which should only be used by trained medical personnel, yet it is used by untrained, unqualified classroom teachers.

For just one example of how destructive role-playing can be to a child's home-taught value system, let's look at lesson plan No. 37 in a book

titled **ROLE-PLAY IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: A HANDBOOK FOR TEACHERS** (22).

The teacher is instructed to have children role-play finding a wallet. The children are to discuss whether or not to try to find the owner. One would think there would be little need for discussion of the pros and cons of locating the owner. It would seem the **only** thing to do would be to find the owner. But apparently, the author would not agree. She says,

"The attitude of many children will be 'Why bother to return the money?' Presumably the class role-models will provide exposure to different values. **The teacher should try to keep the discussion non-judgemental.** The attitude is: let's explore many different possible courses of action and their consequences; then **each of us is free to choose our own pattern.**" (emphasis added)

Thus, a child in such a classroom has learned his parents were wrong to teach him not to steal and the church is wrong to teach God's unqualified Commandment 'Thou shalt not steal'. The child learns "each of us is free to choose our own pattern," meaning, stealing is okay depending on the circumstances.

The author of this book also reveals how role-playing can invade the privacy of the family. In Chapter 3, "Some Do's and Don'ts", the teacher is told,

"Be alert to role-playing as a projective technique. A child when role-playing may be portraying a person who is at the root of his problem. The teacher may want to follow up

this insight by consulting the supervisor or guidance counselor. For example, at a recent session a boy who was known to be very aggressive and hostile role-played a father as a very harsh and cruel man." (23)

The moral of the above passage? Your discipline methods at home may become the target of school personnel who are ever alert for any or all forms of abuse or neglect -- real or suspected. It is also the moral of the above passage that role-playing can result in a lot of damage to a child's relationship with his parents. It is a behavior modification technique that is more routinely used than parents realize.

### **Clarification**

This approach to values education is the most widely used, most controversial and probably the easiest to understand. "Values clarification" means what it says. The values you have passed on to your child -- the values you send him to school with, must be clarified (i.e. changed). They are not acceptable "as is" because you did the unforgivable -- you decided for your child because it is your God-given responsibility and right -- what values you want him to hold. Those imposed values which he did not freely choose, must be clarified. He must be given the chance to decide, immature and unwise though he may be, whether or not he wishes to keep, modify or discard what you have taught him. Are you skeptical? You don't believe that is the purpose of values clarification? Let us see once again what Sidney Simon, one of the authors of **the** book on values clarification, has to say: (11)

"... young people brought up by moralizing adults are not prepared to make their own

responsible choices. They have not learned a process for selecting the best and rejecting the worst elements contained in the various value systems which others have been urging them to follow." (24)

On another page he adds,

"... how does the young person choose his own course of action from among the many models and many moralizing lectures with which he has been bombarded? Where does he learn whether or not he wants to stick to the old moral and ethical standards or try new ones?" (25)

The answer to that question is: "in the classroom!"

Values clarification involves exposing personal, private values of the child to the scrutiny of his peers. Your child's values are forced through the "meat grinder" of public exposure and group discussion. He is then forced to decide what he wants to do with the shattered value system that has been disintegrated, torn apart, examined, discussed and criticized. Does he want to (is he able to) put the mess back together and claim the values originally fed into the grinder? It's up to him to decide, with the help of the pooled ignorance of his peers and the influence of the teacher (be it deliberate or not) whose own value system may not be the same as yours. As the emerging Humanist child, he has a right to have a voice in determining the values and goals that affect his life. As a Humanist child, he has a right to achieve maximum individual autonomy. He has a right to decide what he wants to believe and how he ought to behave, even before he is capable of making sound judgements.



Values clarification drives a wedge between parent and child, between child and legitimate authority and between the child and religious training. It is a powerful vehicle to create chaos, anarchy and alienation. It can set into motion a struggle between parent and school for the very soul of a child. Considering that the school claims him as a captive for five or more hours a day, five days a week, who is likely to win the battle?

There are some Christian teachers who claim they use values clarification techniques to instill Christian values. They may be instilling Christian values, but they are not doing it with values clarification. Basic to values clarification is the premise that a child must be given the opportunity to choose from among alternative and competing values. A Christian teacher may explain other value systems. But the Christian teacher cannot tell a child or lead him to believe that he has a "right" to choose for himself what is right or wrong. The teaching of Jesus Christ is not subject to interpretation, mitigation or change. Either we believe what Jesus taught or we don't. He didn't give his followers the option to choose from among alternative and competing values and still remain part of His flock.

One of the most widely used activities in values clarification is the "survival game" which teaches children that some humans are more valuable than others and that it is acceptable for people to make life or death decisions about other human beings. Because of the possible psychological harm to students, survival games were banned in several Maryland counties (Howard County, Prince Georges County and Montgomery County) to the dismay of some teachers who saw the ban as a violation of their academic freedom. As usually happens, however, there are reports of the games still being used in spite of the directive. Which

shows once again that after a teacher closes the classroom door, anything can happen. (see p. 72)

### **Commitment**

This approach to values education openly promotes group dependence and aims to:

**"...stimulate students to perceive themselves not merely as passive reactors or as free individuals, but as interactive members of a social group and system ..."**

(19) (emphasis added)

And,

**"The commitment approach uses all the methods of previous approaches, especially those of analysis and clarification. Unique to this approach, however, is the action project which is used as a means to clarify and restructure one's value system ..."** (19) (emphasis added)

Remember the essay previously mentioned, "Re-education: A Major Task" (10) -- restructuring of personal value systems was advocated by the author. Now, 25 years later, we can see it actually being put into practice.

An activity which illustrates this approach is "consumer comparison shopping". When pupils study the differences and similarities between merchandise and credit costs between low income and middle income neighborhoods -- this is the commitment approach to values education -- "the action project which is used as a means to clarify and restructure one's value system."

## Union

Here we have a technique useful for creating world citizens:

**"The fundamental purpose of the union approach ... is to help students perceive themselves and act not as separate egos but as part of a larger, interrelated whole -- the human race, the world, the cosmos. Experiences are provided which stress the mutual interdependence of person and environment, thoughts and feelings, conscious and unconscious, body and soul, essence and existence." (19)**  
(emphasis added)

And,

**"Some of the techniques which can be used with this approach include transcendental meditation, prayer, Zen Buddhism, self-hypnosis, dream analysis, mind expanding drugs ..." (19)**  
(emphasis added)

Imagine any or all of this going on in the "neutral" schools! Surely, the author could not be serious about using mind-expanding drugs to achieve the purpose of this values clarification approach, or could he?

One must really wonder. Many programs in schools supposedly intended to stop or prevent drug abuse have been halted by the government because it was determined such programs did in effect, encourage drug abuse. How could this happen if such

programs were created by "experts" who supposedly knew what they were doing? Overall, in spite of so much money spent on so-called preventive drug abuse programs, drug abuse goes on, and on and on.

It is indeed curious. The federal government can do any repressive thing it sets out to do. The IRS, the FBI and CIA can put a stop to anything when the will exists. If the Drug Enforcement Agency wanted to stop drug abuse, it could be done. Has drug abuse been permitted to flourish unabated in order to promote the creation of manipulable "world citizens"?

Why is TM, a Hindu religious practice, which promotes a tranquil acceptance or unconcern with life's problems, a course offering in many educational institutions? Why has teacher training in TM been financed with federal funds? Why is this religious practice given such intensive, extensive favorable coverage in the mass media?

Is this what it is all about -- the development of a "world community" through drugged, tranquilized, hypnotized masses of befuddled people who could not care less about anything?

Before this possibility is discounted as absurd, the fundamental purpose of the union approach to values education along with the techniques that can be used, should be re-read. In terms of what is happening today, what conclusions must be drawn?

### **Moral Reasoning**

Many Catholic and Protestant schools use the "moral reasoning" approach to values education in religious education classes, often at the expense of traditional training. It is also widely used in public schools. It seems many educators now consider the popular "values clarification" too gimmicky, or not "scientific" enough. This is not to suggest that values clarification is on the way out. In many areas, it's just getting started.

What are the usual reasons cited for using the moral reasoning approach to values education? Generally, they are as follows:

- \* In the case of public education, there is the unsupported contention that parents are not adequately providing the moral development of their children. Therefore educators have taken it upon themselves to fill the void which they insist exists.

- \* Where it is admitted that parents do teach values and do attempt to direct the moral development of their children, the argument is that children must be allowed to develop and adopt their own ethical principles and ways of making decisions. After all, parents don't have all the right answers, right? "... we ought not to be overbearing or self-righteous in asserting that ... we are automatically plugged in to some supernatural source of principles or rules, or that we are plugged directly into God and hence guaranteed the truth of our position." (26)

- \* Young people must learn to sacrifice themselves for others. For instance, wouldn't it be a noble gesture if a young person "... engaged in premarital sexual intercourse, not out of overwhelming passion, but in the belief that it would be gratifying and beneficial to a distraught companion?" (27)

- \* Children must learn that "justice" is the highest good. "... would we want our children's strict adherence to the law, or would we prefer them to be capable of violating the law if they have good and honest reasons for so doing?" (28)

The moral reasoning approach to values education is the product of Lawrence Kohlberg, a Harvard psychologist who considers himself a disciple of Humanist John Dewey. How did Kohlberg arrive at his theory of moral development? Over several years he observed the development of some children and concluded that people go through three levels and six stages of moral development. Basically, the levels and stages are as follows:

### **Pre-conventional level**

Stage one: The child is responsive to and accepts adult authority without question. He knows he will be punished if he is bad and rewarded if he is good and he behaves accordingly. This stage is characteristic of children up to about the age of seven.

Stage two: Proper behavior at this stage consists of that which satisfies the child's own needs and sometimes the needs of others if it is to his benefit. This is the pre-adolescent stage of "you do for me and I'll do for you."

### **Conventional level**

Stage three: At this stage proper behavior is what pleases others, primarily the peer group.

Stage four: This is the "law and order" stage that is characterized by obedience to authority, duty, fixed rule and concern for social order. It is considered a very low level of maturity.

### **Post-conventional level**

Stage five: At this stage what an individual personally considers to be right takes priority over any law or social contract. For instance, if an individual determines that government has violated a generally agreed upon principle, that person has the right to engage in revolution to correct the injustice he believes has been done by government.

Stage six: Doing what is right at this stage is determined by individual conscience. "Justice" is what counts. Laws may be broken if they conflict with an individual's personal view of what is just.

Kohlberg believes that most adults do not progress beyond stage four. The moral reasoning approach to values education is designed to lead more people to the ultimate or highest degree of morality, characterized in stage six by situation ethics and maximum individual autonomy, which just happen to be tenets of Humanist belief.

The moral reasoning approach requires that a

child be constantly stimulated to move to higher levels of morality. How is that done? The technique is quite simple:

1. Determine where the child is in his thinking.

2. "... upset the equilibrium of the individual by setting up a situation where he experiences sufficient conflict in resolving a problem..." (29) This is done by having the child examine and discuss unrealistic, fabricated "dilemmas" that have no solution. A dilemma cannot have a solution for that would mean there was a "right" answer. In values education, there are no "right" answers. "... teachers should help students to reflect on alternative responses to moral situations. When a good moral discussion class ends, students should feel that it is incomplete. They should leave the classroom still wondering about the best response to a difficult moral problem." (30)

In considering dilemmas, children participate in group discussions (to promote attitude change) and they role-play to develop empathy -- to learn how it feels to be in the place of others. "When one puts oneself in another's place, **one gains ... a view of the other as being fundamentally equal to oneself.** A child, at this stage, sees himself for the first time as an individual equal to others. **If authorities make mistakes, then they are like him.**" (31) (emphasis added)

In addition to the dangers of role-playing previously discussed, role-playing is also a useful tool to break down respect for authority and a key technique used to lead a child to stage six at which point he will believe there is no authority higher than himself. When children role-play their parents, a policeman, or any other authority figure, including God, they become the person they role-play and thereby eliminate all fear of the person or what that person represents.

3. The teacher can then ask questions that will lead the child to the next stage of moral development. To determine how effective the process has been, pre and post tests can be given.

To demonstrate how the moral reasoning process can be carried out in the classroom, we can look at the values education program being piloted in Tacoma, Washington schools. It's called "The Ethical Quest in a Democratic Society" (39) and uses Kohlberg's approach to moral development.

The proposal that was submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities for funding of the Ethical Quest program explains in great detail how the moral development of Washington children will take place. On page 28 of the proposal, it is shown how a ninth grade English curriculum can be used as a moral development tool.

What follows are three verbatim examples from the proposed ninth grade Ethical Quest curriculum. Each example is followed by my commentary.

## **NINTH GRADE ENGLISH CURRICULUM**

### **1. Value: Right to Life**

#### **A. The Pearl** by John Steinbeck

1. Moral Dilemma: The doctor's refusal to give medical aid to the baby Cayotito, because the parents are paupers is a conflict between the overt ethical standards of a society and moves (sic) where everything, including human life, is measured by money standards.

#### **B. Current Issues**

##### **1. Health Insurance Bill**

a. Become familiar with what the health insurance bill actually is.

b. Hold debates between students who have chosen opposing sides of the issue.

c. Have a class election to determine



whether or not the bill would pass if the class were the Senate.

### C. Related Personal Activity

#### 1. Moral Dilemma Resolution

Present a moral dilemma wherein a man's wife is dying from a rare form of cancer and can only be saved by a newly invented drug. The man does not have the money to pay for it and the druggist refuses to negotiate saying, "No, I invented the drug and I'll charge what I want." The man breaks into the drug store and steals the drug. Was he right or wrong to do it. Why?

### Commentary

In A.1. students are presented with an unjust, unrealistic and negative picture of the medical profession. Note the value to be considered is "right to life." There is no indication these ninth graders would be confronted with the "ethical standards of a society" which allows the mass murder of millions of unborn babies each year.

B.1.: To what degree can ninth graders understand all the facets of socialized medicine ("national health insurance")? Why should this be a concern of ninth graders, anyway? Are there not more appropriate matters that ought to be taking their time? Clearly, this dilemma is an invitation to political activism at an early age -- before a child has sufficient knowledge, experience and maturity to deal with complex issues.

C.1.: As a pharmacist, I take strong exception to this unrealistic dilemma. I know of no pharmacist who would withhold medication from one in need. This dilemma is also unrealistic in that our welfare system is so well developed that no one need be without proper medical care. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a pharmacist working in or owning his own business would have the time or facilities to

engage in independent research and development. But assuming the pharmacist did "invent" a cancer cure, you may be sure the FDA or other government agency would regulate and restrict its distribution. A good example of such a restricted anti-cancer medication would be the controversial Laetrile.

The logical result of consideration of this dilemma is that students will likely see all pharmacists as greedy, profit-hungry exploiters of the sick and poor; which, by the way, is pretty much the attitude already held by many, thanks to "consumer advocates" who often unfairly militate against honest businessmen who try to realize a fair profit for their labors. Above all, students are clearly left with the idea that breaking into and entering the drug store was a legitimate option, depending on the circumstances. Then we wonder why youngsters can justify such acts outside of the classroom.

Overall, taking A, B and C together, the student will most likely acquire a negative attitude about the medical profession under the free enterprise system and a positive attitude about the need for the Kohlbergian "justice" of socialized medicine.

Now, to the next example in the proposed ninth grade curriculum.

## II. Value: Honesty

### A. **The Pearl** by John Steinbeck

1. Moral Dilemma: The passages dealing with the pearl buyers' monopoly constitute, at this level, a criticism of any social system which permits one man to exploit the profits of another man's labor.

2. Moral Dilemma: **The church, also, is part of the exploitative system;** the priest preaches a yearly sermon in which he warns the villagers not to rebel against the divinely appointed

order of the universe. (emphasis added)

B. Current Issues

1. Watergate

a. Were loyal workers exploited in an attempt to "cover up" the bigger issues?

b. Why didn't these intelligent, educated young men realize their wrongdoing before they were caught?

C. Related Personal Activity:

1. Moral Resolution Dilemma:

Example: Two students described by one school official as "superb" students stole the answers from the New York State Regents Exam. The school was a religious one, and the outstanding scholars had often spoken out about the alleged immorality of persons involved in the Watergate scandal. The students were found guilty of the theft and of attempted sale of the test answers. **Under what circumstances would you steal the questions or answers to a test scheduled for one of your classes?** (emphasis added)

a. if I was sure I would not be caught

b. if I desperately needed a passing grade

c. if my best friend desperately needed a passing grade

d. if I believed the testing procedure was unfair

e. never

### Commentary

In A.1. we see a not too subtle criticism of the profit motive which is an integral part of our free enterprise system. In A.2. we see an attack on the "exploitative" church and an attack on respect for authority as taught by the church.

In B, the questions asked call for more background information and greater understanding of

politics than ninth graders could possibly have. What can ninth graders achieve by discussing something very few people really know anything about?

In C we see an attack on the morality of students who attend church schools. Above all, note the question that legitimizes thievery: "Under what circumstances would you steal the questions and answers to a test scheduled for one of your classes?" Right there it is made clear to the child that there is no absolute prohibition against stealing -- the choice is his. A "wrong" choice is a "good" choice if his reason for stealing is in accord with his personal sense of "justice". Note also that the list of answers places "never" at the bottom of the list, almost as an after-thought.

Now, to the final example in the proposed ninth grade curriculum.

### III. Value: Equality

#### A. **The Pearl** by John Steinbeck

1. Moral Dilemma: Jauna is shown to be obedient to Kino even when it is against her better judgement. For example, she accepts a savage beating from him and there is "no anger in her for Kino," for he had said, "I am a man," and ... that meant "half-insane and half glad."

2. The doctor regards the Indians as animals, referring to the treatment of their ills as the work of a "veterinary".

#### B. Current Issues

##### 1. Fishing Rights of Northwest Indians

a. Discuss both sides of the issue

Film suggestion: **As Long as the**

##### **Rivers Run**

##### 2. Feminist Movement

a. What are the goals of NOW?

b. What are some community projects

NOW is concerned with?

##### 3. Bussing (sic) in Boston

a. What are the issues?

b. How were the schools in Tacoma integrated?

C. Related Personal Activity

1. Moral Dilemma Resolution

a. Make an arbitrary decision that the students are aware of and treat one group in a superior way and one group in an inferior manner: then reverse it.

b. Girls and boys role-play opposite points of view.

### Commentary

In A.1. we see a set-up for male-female antagonism. It follows the feminist movement's propaganda which depicts men as oppressors of women.

In B.1. we can see preparation for some emotional discussion of an "oppressed minority". Upon what information and from what source would students discuss both sides of the issue?

In B.2. we see favorable propagandizing for the radical women's lib group, The National Organization for Women (NOW). Note there is nothing mentioned about goals or concerns of traditional women's groups in the community. Is this fair?

In B.3 we see the busing issue -- laden with opportunities for emotional discussions about civil rights, oppression and the need for "justice".

In C.1.a. we see a technique to create feelings of antagonism which could erupt into violence.

In C.1.b. the role-reversal activities will help boys and girls see each other as equals. This will help to eliminate the traditional male-female differences in thinking and behavior.

Taking A, B and C together, there can be seen a definite orientation to political activism of a

particular type and the creation of a particular mind-set about women's rights and civil rights. If this isn't indoctrination, then what is it? It should be kept in mind that it has always been the custom of internal revolutionaries to help "liberate" free nations by exploiting racial differences and minority grievances. Such "liberation" usually begins by "educating" the young to become revolutionaries on behalf of the "oppressed peoples" while at the same time, never really presenting them with any true corrective action plan. The end result is always enslavement of the total population. What is being suggested here is political indoctrination which has no place in the compulsory, tax supported schools, especially when such indoctrination is presented under the guise of "moral education".

\*\*\* \*\*

The moral reasoning approach can be worked into every subject in the curriculum — not just in English. That this is so is shown in a booklet titled, **Values Education Approaches and Materials** (32). On page 66, under the heading "Materials Using Moral Development Approach" we find this example:

TITLE:	Comparative Political Systems: An Inquiry Approach
CURRICULUM:	Holt Social Studies Curriculum
DEVELOPERS:	Edwin Fenton, Anthony N. Penna, and Mindella Schultz
PUBLISHER:	Holt Rinehart and Winston, 383 Madison Avenue, New York, New York, 10017
DATE:	1973
GRADE LEVEL:	9 (10-12)

Under "Rationale and Objectives", it is explained that "... one of the stated objectives of

the new Holt curriculum is the clarification of student values. The authors state that they do not attempt to instill a particular set of values in students but to **help students think for themselves and reflect upon the validity of the values they have learned at home or in the community.** This program emphasizes rational processes; the Kohlberg theory of moral development is outlined in the teacher's guide..." (emphasis added)

Next, on page 69 is an example of a values program that stands on its own as a values education curriculum:

TITLE:	First Things: Values
CURRICULUM:	First Things
CONSULTANTS:	Lawrence Kohlberg and Robert Selman
PUBLISHER:	Guidance Associates, Pleasantville, New York 10570
DATE:	1972
GRADE LEVEL:	K-3 (4-6)

Under "Procedures and Activities" for this curriculum, it is explained that "Sometimes children examine their own behavior patterns..." and "Students' right to privacy are **not** protected by any 'I pass' procedure. It is hoped that the small group structure will encourage openness." (emphasis added)

It is of utmost importance that children **not** be protected from invasion of privacy for "...students who do not reveal what they really value in the classroom cannot grow morally in school." (33) They must reveal to others their innermost thoughts and feelings if they are to progress to the ultimate stage-six morality. **"...one cannot establish a self-identity independently of others. One's relationships with others make a person what he is...** Any positive relating to another is in effect the creating of a new society or a new move into an

old society... Once it is established that we need others, stage five and six reasoning necessarily follow." (34) (emphasis added)

The "First Things" curriculum has been tested in six second grade classes. Results show that after using the materials for only five weeks on a twice weekly basis, "...those students reached a higher level of moral reasoning than students who had not used the materials." It was also found that "...students using these materials have become 'more socially aware of their ideas and **better able to integrate other's thinking with their own.**'" (emphasis added)

Please note that this program is designed to begin with kindergarten children. The process is started early because it has been found that when people do not move to the next higher stage fast enough, they tend to become "locked in" to a lower stage of morality, making it difficult to advance to a higher stage.

\*\*\* \*\*

Now let's move to another source to demonstrate the moral reasoning process in the classroom. A little booklet titled "Moral Reasoning: The Value of Life" (35) provides an excellent illustration. This booklet is one unit in the Public Issues Series of the American Education Publications (known as AEP unitbooks) which have been and are being used in many high school classrooms. The dilemmas presented to the students in this booklet include these titles:

"Should the Baby Live?" (A true story about a mother who totally rejected her mongoloid baby)

"Shipwreck of the William Brown" (About Eskimos who push their aged out on the ice to die of exposure)



"Condemned to Die" (About the death penalty)

"The Value of Nonhuman Life" (About the killing of baby seals)

After consideration of these loaded dilemmas which project anti-life attitudes and the biased, leading questions suggested for the student to think about and discuss, the student will, without a doubt, be confused at best or at worst, suffer a total collapse of any positive values he may hold about the inviolability of human life. And then we wonder why teenagers think nothing of committing "senseless" acts of violence!

Check to see if these AEP booklets are used in social studies classes in your high school -- private, public or church school. If your school system has a list of approved textbooks and teaching materials, check it out for yourself. If you are a pro-life worker, it is absolutely vital that you examine all booklets in the series. You will be shocked.

At the beginning of this discussion of the moral reasoning approach it was pointed out that it is widely used in Catholic and Protestant church schools. Why is Humanist Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development being used in church schools? A Catholic parent asked a religion education teacher at a Catholic high school why Kohlberg's Humanistic theory was used in place of traditional religious training. The reply was, "We don't know what else to do. You can't lay down absolutes to these kids. They are too skeptical."

It is entirely understandable that religion teachers don't know how to cope with teenagers who are skeptical, cynical, egocentric hedonists. For years, children in many Catholic and Protestant church schools have been put through a process that stresses an inquiry approach to learning, moral

relativism and autonomous situation ethics. When these teenagers begin to apply what they have been taught during their early years under the guise of religious education, it is no wonder that religion teachers can't cope with teenagers who won't respect or yield to legitimate authority or accept absolute standards for behavior.

But to say "we don't know what to do" is a cop-out. Certainly, it's difficult but not impossible to redirect the autonomous teenager who is firmly convinced he has a right to do "his own thing". It is better late than never to attempt to impress upon young savages the hard-to-swallow fact that an orderly society cannot tolerate the amorality of "stage six" persons who think they can make their own laws, or decide what laws they will or will not obey.

There must be rules; there must be just and legitimate authority. Anything else is anarchy. What Kohlberg is selling is wishful thinking at best, and at worst, it's a deliberate attempt to help destroy our society.

Those religion teachers who use Kohlberg's theory because "we don't know what else to do" are to be pitied for the barrenness of their faith. Nevertheless, for such teachers to carry over their religious bankruptcy into the classroom, to sow the seeds of moral anarchy in the minds of immature youngsters -- this is a serious abrogation of the right of parents to instill in their children, Christian beliefs based on absolutes. Conscientious parents either expect to have those beliefs reinforced in the school or just left alone.

How many religion teachers are honestly telling trusting parents "we are using Kohlberg's atheistic Humanistic method of moral development in lieu of teaching orthodox religious doctrine"? How many have the honesty to explain precisely what Kohlberg's theory involves, or how it will affect

their children's behavior, value system and spiritual welfare?

Kohlberg's stage six Humanist morality is the morality of Satan. Religion teachers who claim to believe in God and in salvation through Jesus Christ cannot use Kohlberg's moral reasoning approach to moral development. Why can't such teachers teach as Jesus taught **and** teach **what** Jesus taught? What is the hang-up? Those religion teachers who use Kohlberg's theory, who understand what they are doing, and who persist in what they are doing are working for Satan.

The effect of Humanistic moral reasoning on our society has been shattering, and for far longer than realized. We now have a generation of totally autonomous stage six young adults. For many, if they have any ethics at all, they are entirely situational. Moral reasoning and other Humanistic values education techniques have destroyed a generation of youngsters, many of whom under more favorable circumstances, would have become stalwart soldiers of Jesus Christ. Instead, they have become missionaries of atheistic Humanism. And to think that "good" Christians stand still for it!

The March 1, 1976 issue of **Newsweek** magazine reported on Kohlberg's theory in action. According to the article, more than 6,000 public school districts across the nation including elite prep schools (not to mention church schools!) are "using sophisticated audio-visual aids that are based on Kohlberg's six stages and produced by Guidance Associates, a subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich."

After 18 months of experimentation at a high school near Harvard, the **Newsweek** article said teachers found little moral progress but lots of chaos and disorder. "Insults and profanity sometimes punctuate the chaotic sessions..." And rules? "Everytime it comes to enforcing a rule, we make

an exception", complained a Kohlberg advisor. This article pretty well says it all about the anarchy that can be expected when God's immutable laws are thrown out in favor of a Humanist theory.

In summary, let's look at what Kohlberg and his moral reasoning approach to moral development have accomplished.

1. Kohlberg has set himself two stages above God -- he has ordained himself the ultimate arbiter of what constitutes morality. For Kohlberg, true to Humanist belief, there is no higher authority than man. His theory is supposedly of a higher morality than the Judeo-Christian ethic: "The good [in the Judeo-Christian ethic] is what God allows and the bad is what God forbids. Disobedience will lead to being condemned to the everlasting fire of hell. **This is a low stage of moral development ...**" (36) (emphasis added)

2. Humanistic moral reasoning has resulted in a generation of young people who are adherents to the major principles of the religion Humanism -- primarily, maximum individual autonomy and situation ethics.

3. Application of the process of moral reasoning has resulted in negation and usurpation of parental authority and prerogatives, accompanied by alienation of children from parents and rejection by children of their traditional cultural heritage in favor of "alternate" lifestyles.

4. The process of moral reasoning has resulted in young people placing gratification of immediate desires above law and legitimate authority.

5. Application of the moral reasoning process has resulted in youthful disrespect when faced with situations where they must be subject to and respectful of authority.

6. Promotion of the belief that the highest morality exists above and beyond the Ten

Commandments and the teaching of Jesus Christ in the Bible is an attempt to establish the primacy of Satan. And from the condition of our society, it would have to be agreed that the attempt has been highly successful. Satan is having a field day!

## **OPPOSITION TO VALUES EDUCATION**

Promoters of values education know they are doing something they ought not be doing. Opposition to values education does exist and proponents readily agree that it does. In an article "Kohlberg & Simon -- An Exchange of Opinion" (37), Kohlberg expressed his opinion that widespread use of values education "...is likely to meet public opposition and possibly court tests."

In this article, both Simon and Kohlberg recalled being involved in a "flap" in New York. Simon had received some money to train teachers in values education and, the pair complained, "An orthodox Jewish, right wing group got hold of it and just raised hell." The protesters believed that "values shouldn't be dealt with in the school, but should be left for the church and home."

Name calling and ridicule are effective weapons used by educators to subdue irate parents. It's unfortunate, but such tactics do cause a lot of parents to retreat. No one likes to be called names or have his ethnic background or religious beliefs held up to ridicule. However, parents are going to have to be relentless and develop a thick skin if they are serious about saving their children.

## **BOOTLEGGING AND KEEPING OUT THE "MORALIZING CRAP"**

How is it possible to sneak values education past trusting parents? Those parents who have been

involved in fighting sex education from the beginning will recall the recommendation given by a well known sex educator on how to get sex education in the schools without parents knowing about it: "Sneak it in", was the suggestion.

Of course, it is no longer necessary to sneak in sex education. It's in most schools and in the main, with little opposition. But what about values education? Parents are aware it's going on to some degree, but they often assume values education means traditional values are being promoted. On the other hand, many parents are totally unaware of it because it is "bootlegged" as something else. For instance, in a paper titled "Doing Something About Values" (38) author Farnum Gray tells about an interview with Sidney Simon which is most revealing:

"Simon says that when he was teaching at Temple University, **'I always bootlegged the values stuff under other titles. I was assigned to teach Social Studies in the Elementary School and I taught values clarification. I was assigned Current Trends in American Education and I taught my trend'.**" (The word "my" emphasized in original. Other emphasis added)

The author then added,

"Simon's closed-door policy brought teaching success without controversy."

Incredible, isn't it?

In the same article, Simon is said to insist that we've got to get rid of the "... right answer syndrome. That's one of the most destructive ideas -- a single right answer that we all have to arrive

at." The author also reports that Simon "... warns that **teachers must be alert to keep 'moralizing crap' out of their work with values.**" (emphasis added)

All of this sums up values education quite clearly: Keep out the "moralizing crap" (Judeo-Christian morality); get rid of the "right answer syndrome" (absolute standards of behavior) and above all, bootleg or sneak in values education so parents won't know what's going on.

**Betrayal of your trust. Is this why you are losing your children?**

## **FEDERAL FUNDS FOR VALUES EDUCATION**

A federally funded revolution "of the highest priority", began in Tacoma, Washington in 1976.

Officially called "The Ethical Quest in a Democratic Society," (39) it is actually a values education program. It is to serve as a pioneer program and model for the nation, "and perhaps the whole English speaking world." (A proposed ninth grade curriculum for this program was discussed in the section dealing with Lawrence Kohlberg's moral development theory.)

Values education has been pretty much a part of what educators call the "hidden curriculum". Under the guise of the "Ethical Quest" program, this "hidden curriculum" has been brought out of the closet with an initial \$250,000 grant from the government-funded National Endowment for the Humanities.

The idea for the program was developed in 1974 in Washington, D.C., at a meeting that included congressional leaders, members of a consulting firm and personnel from the Washington State Office of Public Instruction. Citing the Watergate fiasco to show the need for values education, the Tacoma

school district was chosen to carry out the program "because of its heterogeneous community and because of the district's reputation for excellence in carrying out specially funded programs." In other words, the Tacoma school district has functioned as an exceptional change agent, and as its prize, it was awarded another change agent program.

The goal of the Ethical Quest program is to have each student, over a thirteen year period, examine his values "deliberately and openly and in as comprehensive a manner as his mental development will have allowed." In the process of examination of values, the Delphi technique will be used, which will require the student to "either move to the group judgement or state a reason for his belief that a minority position is in order." In other words, a student does not have a right to believe what he wants to believe. He has to defend and justify his position.

If you think that sounds like an unvarnished indoctrination technique guaranteed to develop a group mentality and controlled thinking, you could be right. James P. Shaver, of the Bureau of Research Services at Utah State University, and a participant in a workshop held on the Ethical Quest program, openly advocates indoctrination. He said,

**"I argue that schools should, without blushing, be involved in indoctrination. It's indoctrination of a particular kind.**

**"... I think we need to indoctrinate, but we need to be extremely careful about what we indoctrinate and we need very careful rationale in terms of the indoctrination we carry out. The primary emphasis ... would have to be**



**on the rational processes of  
teaching kids to think."**

An emphasis on teaching kids to think rationally means that the Ethical Quest program is not designed to teach absolute standards of behavior. Shaver made this clear by pointing out that morality is relative. "If the thrust," he said, "is on trying to make kids more honest, then I have a hunch the thrust won't get very far."

In the proposal submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities for funding of the Ethical Quest program, a shocking admission was made that puts to rest the assertion often made by values educators that values clarification (a technique used in values education) does not teach values. It is stated in the proposal that the process of values clarification "can be made to appear noncontroversial and morally neutral. But as much as proponents of 'values clarification' might abhor the McGuffey Readers, they are proffering a contemporary equivalent. **The process of values clarification is not morally neutral but comes laden with a particular set of suppositions and assumptions. The value system of 'values clarification' prizes an affective approach to life ... To this movement an individual who is open and understanding of his emotions and drives has 'good values'. One may well agree with that, but one must recognize it as a particular set of values.**" (emphasis added)

It is being said right out in the open: The process of values clarification is not morally neutral -- it involves teaching a particular set of values! Judeo-Christian values? Of course not. Would the "neutral" school in which the Bible cannot be read aloud or the Lord's Prayer be recited, be allowed to promote Judeo-Christian values?

The degree to which such indoctrination has been going on, and the reason it goes unnoticed and

unchallenged was made clear by another Ethical Quest workshop participant, Charles Quigley, director of the California program "Law in a Free Society". Quigley said, "we have been dealing in California with terribly controversial subjects for a long time and in a very vigorous way but we have had almost no complaints whatsoever ... the only time we get into trouble is when some teacher tries to indoctrinate in some area where there is a reasonable dispute. So long as the focus is on helping kids ... to make wise decisions ... you have no problem." In other words, it is not what you do but the way that you do it that determines whether or not you have a problem. Does it sound familiar? Remember Sidney Simon doing his thing behind the closed classroom door to avoid controversy?

Another reason indoctrination passes unnoticed much of the time is that program goals, as explained to parents and the public, are generally couched in such loose terms that they are accepted as harmless or even desirable.

A detailed timetable for implementation shows that by 1978 nationwide dissemination of the project was to be completed. Also scheduled for 1978 was the private publication and distribution of project materials including a book whose purpose is to "encourage other schools to experiment with comprehensive values-ethics curricula..."

The values indoctrinators justify their mission by stating with great certainty that the family no longer passes down stable values from generation to generation. Obviously, some families do not, but most families still do. Such families try very hard to train children to adopt values based on religious beliefs and traditional social and family custom. What the values indoctrinators are really saying is that children must not be burdened with the horse and buggy values of parents. They must be helped to find their "own" value system, and thus, the need for

revolutionary indoctrination programs such as the federally funded "The Ethical Quest in a Democratic Society." Remember, it is admitted this program employs a technique that is **not** value-free. At the same time it is said the program would help youngsters find their "own" values! Do we need a ton of bricks to fall on us to understand what is going on in the schools?

Baltimore, Maryland

B 16 THE SUN, Saturday, January 25, 1975

## *Student 'survival' games banned in schools*

*Columbia Bureau of The Sun*

The Howard county public school superintendent has issued a directive prohibiting "survival" games in the school system "which are related to having the students make value judgments."

Mr. Thomas Goedeke, the superintendent, has told supervisors and principals that the so-called "survival" games "are not educationally sound for students in our kindergarten through grade 12 programs."

"For example," he went on, "students must not be placed in the position of having to decide who should or should not receive life-saving drugs or who should or should not be admitted to a bomb shelter. Students should not be placed in the position of making decisions related to survival based upon age, wealth, race, sex or other similar criteria."

Dr. Goedeke said in an interview yesterday:

"Generally, youngsters are not mature enough to make these kinds of judgments."

The superintendent issued the directive in response to complaints from several parents about the practice of the game "spaceship earth" at Hammond Middle School.

According to him, the social studies students at the school were to decide, as part of a scenario, who on the spaceship would receive a limited amount of life-saving medicine.

Dr. Goedeke said that in issuing his directive on the survival games he was "concerned about placing youngsters in a life-or-death type of situation."

"Survival games" have been banned in the following Maryland counties: Howard (above), Montgomery, and Prince Georges.

# SOME STRONG WORDS

## A WORD TO PRO-LIFERS

During many years of research, writing and talking with parents it has become very clear that pro-life efforts **must** concentrate on education.

A youngster goes through twelve years of insidious anti-life indoctrination, from sex education to environmental education and most everything else in between.

For instance, many parents know of the social studies program called "Man: A Course of Study" (MACOS). In the March/April 1974 issue of **Faith** (40) Mel Gabler says this about MACOS:

"Man: A Course of Study", better known by the abbreviation MACOS, is a social studies course for the fifth grade. By some it is hailed as one of the greatest programs ever developed; it supposedly teaches why man is "more human" than "other animals". Completely humanistic, the series is strongly evolutionary and animalizes human beings. MACOS is being used in 43 states and 16 foreign

countries, supposedly teaching "the real beauty of man."

"In MACOS, wife-swapping is taught as a necessity; men practice cannibalism; baby girls are killed. The 11 year old students "role-play" leaving their grandmothers to die. The MACOS booklets are filled with such cruelty, violence and death."

Bear in mind that the above description represents just one bit of anti-life indoctrination at the elementary level.

Now, consider this example of anti-life conditioning at the other end of the educational spectrum:

In a paper titled "A Cross Cultural Approach" (41) by Roderic Gorney, M.D., lecturer in psychiatry at U.C.L.A. School of Social Welfare, we can see a sophisticated replay of one of the MACOS stories.

Dr. Gorney says "we can learn some important things" about the traditional Eskimo society. He explains how the loved ones of useless, aged or dying Eskimos simply "dispatch" the unwanted to die alone. He gives an account of a grandfather who asks his 14 year-old grandson to plunge a knife into the old man's heart and the boy obeys. In another account, Dr. Gorney tells how old people "will often ask to be pushed out on the ice to die alone."

The horror of it all is that Dr. Gorney doesn't stop at story telling. He offers food for thought:

"I think we might give some thought to how it may be possible for a man, not simply to be left to die unavoidably, but to be pushed out to his death deliberately by his loved ones, who thereupon take no further care of him, do not even speak to him again. To be able to sustain that experience with a sense of comfort and legacy calls for some thought as we consider the role of our discipline, psychiatry and that of the medical profession generally in guiding our patients, and indeed ourselves to the final separation."

To give tacit approval to such uncivilized behavior indicates how far beyond the abortion mentality we actually are. Gorney's proposal brings to mind Dr. Frederick Wertham's book, **A SIGN FOR CAIN** (42) in which Dr. Wertham tells of the role of the university professors and the psychiatrists in the barbarities that took place in Nazi Germany.

Considering Dr. Gorney's position as a respected educator, what kind of influence does he have on his receptive students? Overall, can the continuous string of anti-life attitudes be seen from elementary school through college?

Not to be overlooked are the anti-life influences that are present in sex education. Planned Parenthood, federally funded programs, programs developed with tax exempt foundation grants -- these and other entities promote and provide a constant stream of Humanistic anti-life information and services.

After so many years of anti-life conditioning the pro-life movement appears on the scene to try to undo the mischief. How many youngsters can be reached in time to turn them around? The pro-life movement doesn't have a fraction of the resources that the anti-life lobby has. Pro-lifers do not have the schools (obviously!), the mass media and certainly not the money, be it public or private. Pro-lifers must continue to do what they can. But efforts "after the fact" are too often futile, frustrating attempts to close the barn door after the horses have run off.

The work of pro-lifers will be frustrating and unending until it is understood that prevention efforts must focus where the abortion mentality takes root -- in the schools.



## **A WORD TO THE CLERGY**

In writing this section I am asking for more Divine guidance than usual because what I have in mind to say is none too kind. That's because I've had it "up to here" with those who wear clerical garb but actually seem to be wolves masquerading in the clothing of sheep.

Parents are trying to raise their children to hold the belief and certainty that the most important goal in this life is to achieve eternal life with Jesus Christ. But alas, too many clergymen are doing absolutely nothing to support parental efforts. In fact, many clergymen have joined the ranks of the forces of destruction.

Whatever happened to "sin"? Why won't you talk about it to parents and their children when they attend your church on Sunday? Why are you ignoring sin in religious education?

There is no intention to disparage your legitimate social concerns, but are you so busy promoting some nebulous, semantically misleading notion of "love," "peace," "community," or "social justice" that you don't have time to preach and teach about the reality of sin and that it is sin that is separating us from God and destroying our society?

What are you telling our children when parents are not around? Are you such a devoted advocate of situation ethics morality that you are telling unmarried youngsters (or people of any age, for that matter) that fornication is okay as long as they are "in love" and "not hurting anybody"?

Do you then have an answer for these same youngsters when they contract VD? Do you, oozing with acceptance, assure them the only reason they got VD is because scientists have not yet developed a vaccine? Of course, you responsibly insist they be treated immediately so they won't infect future



partners, and you "lovingly" admonish them to be more careful next time.

Do you assure young girls the only reason they became pregnant is because they failed to have "responsible sex"? Or do you tell them the plain, nitty-gritty truth that the ONLY reason they became pregnant is because they committed the sin of fornication, and to prevent future recurrences, they should sin no more?

What do you tell youngsters about stealing? Do you tell them that generally, it's not advised, but permissible if they have a good reason? If you have led a child to believe he has a right to steal a "necessity", whatever it may be, for whatever "good" reason, then are you willing to share the guilt and consequences if that same child stretches your bankrupt situation ethics morality and holds up a liquor store or beats an old woman on the street and snatches her pocketbook because he "needs" the money for a drug fix?

Are you so busy with grapes and lettuce boycotts (or whatever is currently the fashionable thing to be protesting) that you cannot find time to fight the very real sin of abortion and the sins that lead to abortion? Are you preaching the specious logic that it's okay to murder the unborn because a woman has a right to control her own body? Are you then willing to share the guilt when young people, without reverence or respect for human life in all stages, think nothing of killing other human beings to get what they want for their own selfish purposes?

Are you looking the other way, ignoring the sin of homosexuality and the sins that are committed as a result of pornographic books, magazines and other forms of "entertainment"? What kind of example are you setting for youngsters and adults when you ignore these evils or insist they must be tolerated because this is a "pluralistic society"?

What are you doing to help parents raise their children to live as Jesus would have them live? Do you preach sermons that are helpful and supportive of parental duties and obligations? Most parents want to be "good" parents, but many are so confused about what they are supposed to do with their children that it is pathetic. Many parents are victims of the pervasive "new morality", just as much as their children. Often, their sense of right and wrong has been tragically warped or obliterated by conflicting messages they receive from society, TV and the mass media in all its forms. They hear "Parents are not strict enough," "Parents are too strict, they must allow their children to develop their full potential," "Parents set a bad example," "Parents stifle their children's creativity with their archaic morality". Added to these conflicting "stop" and "go" signals is "parent effectiveness training" which essentially teaches parents how to compromise and allow their children to do as they please without a hassle. Is it any wonder parents are confused and unsure of themselves?

What are you doing to clear up parental confusion? What are you doing to assure them of their rights and to advise them of their God-given responsibilities? Are you moving families closer together or are you driving them apart? Are you subtly giving parents the back of your hand when you mediate a clash between parental values and children's immature desires?

Very briefly, what are you doing to be faithful to your commitment to Jesus Christ, in support of parents?

The bottom line is that if you are not working for Jesus Christ then you are working against Him and you are working for someone else whose name is Satan. It is one or the other. There is no middle of the road. The clerical collar and religious garb must mean faithfulness to the teaching of Jesus Christ. If

it doesn't then it should be taken off and left off.

Obviously, this chastisement does not apply to all clergymen. I praise and thank God for the many, many good men and women who are giving their lives to Jesus in a manner that deserves the utmost praise, respect and gratitude. They know this "sermon" has not been intended for them and will not be offended by it.

# WHAT TO DO?

Many parents, disgusted with Humanistic education are seeking refuge in "alternate" public schools. This "innovation", promoted quite often by the most unlikely people proposes that parents should have a choice in the kind of education their children receive -- Humanistic education for those who might want it and traditional basic education for others.

On the surface the idea seems ideal, but it is not a solution. It is just as easy, if not easier, to subject children to values education through a basic education curriculum as it is through a Humanistic curriculum by "bootlegging" values education. Having seen how this has been done, this possibility should be recognized.

## **JOHNNY IS TO BE EXCUSED FROM SEX EDUCATION CLASSES**

If it is clear that the entire curriculum is or can be infused with Humanistic values education,

then it should also be clear that sending children to school with stern-sounding notes or legal-looking forms directing the principal or teacher to excuse a child from this class or that course is rather meaningless. The underlying philosophy remains. If a child is excused from an identifiable sex education course, parents may belatedly find that sex education was included as a "module" in home economics, environmental education, history or math. The point is, the philosophy of Humanism cannot be avoided with notes and directives. However, this is not to say that such efforts are totally without merit. Anything that can be done to shake up the system in the long run is worth a try. It's just that such measures are unrealistic tools to do the job that needs to be done on a timely basis.

Also, in considering alternate schools that are part of the public school system, thought should be given to what may be mandated by state laws, or by-laws promulgated by the State Board of Education. For instance, in Maryland, "Family Life and Human Development" (sex education) is mandated by the State Board of Education. It applies to **all** public schools. How would a basic education curriculum get around this requirement? The teaching of Family Life and Human Development requires getting into "interpersonal relationships" which has been severely criticized for serious invasions of student and family privacy.

Parents who see "alternate" public schools as an answer should be certain that they look at the situation with their eyes open. A dress code, flag salute every morning, or homework every night are not guarantees of **anything**.

### **WHAT ELSE IS THERE?**

The best alternative is to put children in a private or church school that is known to be

providing a traditional basic education. Such schools are not easy to find, because as we have seen, many private and church schools are using the same books, teaching materials and teaching techniques as the public schools. This is readily admitted. An article in the January 1976 **Educational Leadership** (43) titled "The Changing Catholic Schools", correctly points out that there is **"... an almost common curriculum among Catholic and public schools ... the pervasive social underpinnings for both systems seem to be nearly identical now, and the curricula which stems from their shared basic values will probably continue to look more and more alike."** (emphasis added) There is more truth to that statement than most Catholic parents are willing to believe.

In the absence of a good private or church school, parents might consider teaching their children at home. Whether or not to try home education is a tough decision to make but a lot of parents are doing it. They realize they are better qualified to teach their own children than a public school teacher who has been trained to function as a Humanist missionary, with or without knowing it. Here are a couple of leads to follow up on:

Christian Liberty Academy  
203 E. McDonald Road  
Prospect Heights, IL 60070

Christian Liberty is Lutheran but accepts all children. Everything parents need to teach their own children at home is provided. The Academy keeps all necessary records, provides a diploma upon graduation and helps parents with possible confrontations with authorities.

Our Lady of Victory School  
P.O. Box 5181  
Mission Hills, CA 91345

OLV provides a **traditional** Catholic curriculum.

Home Education Resource Center  
337 Downs Street  
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

HERC is under the direction of Mrs. Meg Johnson who is teaching her children at home. She has some excellent materials available including a monograph titled "A Preliminary Guide for Preparing to Teach Children at Home". Send a SASE to Mrs. Johnson for preliminary ordering information.

S.U.A. Phonics Department  
1339 E. McMillan St.  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206

This is one of the best sources of materials for phonics instruction. Send a SASE for preliminary ordering information.

Mrs. Kathryn Diehl  
554 N. McDonel  
Lima Ohio 45801

Send a SASE for information on available reading materials and programs. Mrs. Diehl is the author of a highly acclaimed book, **JOHNNY STILL CAN'T READ BUT YOU CAN TEACH HIM AT HOME.**

### **PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM THE REAL WORLD**

There are many good parents who will not remove their children from a bad school situation because they feel children should not be over-protected -- that sooner or later children must learn how to cope with the real world. Such parents depend on their positive efforts at home to counter the negative influences in the school and in society

at large. For some children this will work, but for far too many, it will not. The combined external influences militating against the good influences of the home are just too overpowering in many, many cases. Be assured it is a crushing blow when parents find that all their best efforts have not prevented their children from getting into drugs or other undesirable activities. The bottom line is that children must be adequately **prepared** to deal with the real world.

An article in the February 1976 TODAY'S HEALTH (44) explains why young people join cults and become alienated from their parents, from values, from loyalties and from society. According to author Max Gunther, young people who become involved with cults have totally rejected their parents. They are confused and uncertain and have no strong beliefs. Have we not seen that values education promotes alienation and rejection of parental values, and thus, ultimate alienation and rejection of parents themselves? Have we not seen that situation ethics morality and the process of values education erodes values and beliefs, causing confusion and uncertainty?

What did this author find was the key to keeping children from becoming alienated?

- \* Give children a clear set of values.

- \* Give them a firm, easy-to-understand code to live by (such as the Ten Commandments, perhaps?)

- \* Encourage children to be leaders, not group dependent (remember, fostering group dependence and group loyalty is a major activity in the schools).

- \* Remove children from a controlled situation.

The last point refers to bodily removing youngsters who have joined a cult but the same idea could certainly be applied to schools. Children are captives in the school for five or more hours a day,



five days a week. Destruction of children and family ties in the controlled school situation can be just as devastating as if children had been physically isolated and in a cult or commune.

If parents see their children are being destroyed by Humanistic education, they are foolish to try to change the status quo at their children's expense. There simply isn't enough time, for one thing. A child has only so many years in which to grow, develop and be educated. During that time it is impossible to change a system that has been flourishing for so many years.

Protect children from the real world? Certainly not forever. But give them a good headstart. Give them the tools they need to cope with what is indeed a real world. Make sure they have the values they will need and the education that is absolutely necessary if they are to become more than just empty faces in the crowd being shoved and manipulated by the elite who have somehow managed to make it to places of power.

### **"RED TAPE AND HARASSMENT — PROBLEM OR CHALLENGE?"**

Many parents hesitate to start their own school because of the red tape and harassment that can accompany efforts to be recognized as legitimate or accredited.

Most parents want to work within the law. To do so it is first necessary to determine what state and local laws pertain to education in general and to private education in particular. Most state laws dealing with non-public education require that such education be "equivalent" to public education. A library should have the code of state or local laws, and these should be studied carefully. "Know your rights" is basic.

Even when parents do determine their rights, the education establishment may decide to make it

as difficult as possible. When harassment does become a problem, many times it is not because a school seeking accreditation is lacking proper facilities or has not met reasonable prescribed standards. Usually, it is simply a matter of the government flexing its muscle in an effort to maintain a monopoly or to keep the federal funds flowing. For every seat that is vacated in a public school there is loss of revenue.

But things are changing ever so slowly. The crack in government monopoly of education came when the Amish won their right to be free of the tyranny of government education. In recent years, that crack has widened considerably with hard-won victories. Take for instance, the case of *Vermont v. LaBarge*, in which the Vermont Supreme Court held on April 6, 1976 that children cannot be forced to attend public schools if they are receiving an "equivalent" education elsewhere.

The case involved several children whose parents were sending them to a non-accredited religious school. The parents were tried under a truancy law which did not require children to attend either public school or an approved private school -- only that children receive an "equivalent" education.

In the decision, Vermont Supreme Court Chief Justice Albert W. Barney said,

"The United States Supreme Court, in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 long ago decided that a state could not compel all students to be educated in public schools. As recently as *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, that court has also stated that compulsory school attendance, even in an equivalency basis, must yield to First Amendment concerns. In

the light of what is involved in 'approval' the state would be hard put to constitutionally justify limiting the right of normal, unhandicapped youngsters to attendance at 'approved' institutions."

This is a landmark decision for the whole United States. It is a tremendous victory for all parents who want their children to have an education that is not merely "equivalent" to public education, but an education that is far superior! Government monopoly of education cannot go unchallenged. There must be freedom of choice without harassment. Only if more parents are willing to make the kind of sacrifices the Vermont parents made, will there eventually be educational freedom of choice without government control or interference.

## **WHAT ABOUT ACCREDITATION?**

Many parents who might be inclined to tackle the elementary education of their children hesitate to operate their school beyond the lower grades because they are afraid their children may not get into college unless they have graduated from an accredited high school. Let's look at the matter of accreditation realistically and ask a few questions.

\* Do you really want to be accredited if it means government interference? Which of your principles and goals are you willing to sacrifice for the price of accreditation?

\* Why do you want your children to go to college? Just to be able to say they've been to college, or perhaps you hope that a college degree (which is becoming increasingly meaningless) will insure a better paying job? Or do you want them to go to college so they can enter a profession or acquire a specific skill?

\* With the exception of preparing to enter a profession or learning a marketable skill, why would you want your children to spend four more years having their values altered and their minds bent out of shape?

\* With public elementary and high school education as poor as it is, would your children, as graduates of a public school, score high enough on a college entrance exam, enabling them to get into a college that still has high academic standards? It is a heartbreaking experience for many parents when they learn their child -- an "A" student in a public high school, does poorly on the SAT simply because of "grade inflation".

\* How often have you read that colleges must provide remedial programs in reading, writing and math? Shouldn't this tell you something about the value of "accredited" public schools? Could a conscientiously run parent school do any worse than government schools are doing? Think about it.

\* Will your children survive the indoctrination and alienation process of government education? You, as a physician or lawyer may hope that your son or daughter will follow in your footsteps -- and there is absolutely nothing wrong in hoping for that. Would your child, after 12 years of anti-establishment, anti-parent indoctrination want to enter your profession or any profession for that matter, or would existence in a hippie commune or bouncing around with temporary, no-future, dead-end jobs be more to his liking?

\* Do you seriously believe that your child, as a product of a non-accredited school, with a high grade on a college entrance exam, would be turned down by a good college just because your school is non-accredited? What guarantees do you have that as a graduate of an accredited high school, but with a low exam score, that your child would be accepted by any worthwhile college?

If you are worried about accreditation as a pre-requisite for college, then you have not grasped the reality that today's education is a process for changing the student and society, and not a means to educate in the sense that you understand the meaning of "education".

Surely, it must be clear that we are into an elitist situation in our society. The vast majority of youngsters have not been and are not being educated. They are being processed to take their place as drones in a planned society and in a world community that is controlled by a few. Those who control and who will be in control are those who either by virtue of exceptional intelligence and innate ability or superior education will rise above the masses; or those who are in control of money -- their own or others. If you don't have money to leave to your children as a source of power, you should at least want to assure them an education that will enable them to become leaders.

### THE BOTTOM LINE

It takes courage to do what needs to be done, but the task is not impossible. Think about the comment made by Jim Townsend, editor of **THE National Educator** (45) in the March, 1976 issue on the subject of the Hindu practice of TM being taught in public schools:

"Two thousand years ago,  
Christians would have dismantled  
such schools brick by brick. Of  
course then, they only had to  
worry about the lions' dens."

Jim is right. Compared to what those early Christians had to suffer, our problems are mighty pale by comparison.

Today we don't need to dismantle public schools brick by brick. Let those who want them have them. But we must make it clear that if indeed

this is a pluralistic society, as we are constantly told it is, then those who disagree with the philosophy promoted in public schools must be free to have a bonafide choice, and if the choice is not allowed it must be taken, even at the expense of much suffering and sacrifice.

What it all boils down to is the realization that parents are going to have to make an honest and realistic assessment of what they want for their children. They will have to decide how much they are willing to do for their children, and then DO IT.

Many parents think they don't have the ability to do what they know needs to be done. You never know how much you can do until you try. And try you must if you really care. Parents who are unwilling to try to make positive changes have no grounds to complain. It means their expression of concern is mere talk to placate their conscience. Constant whining and spineless complaining will not get a child educated!

We don't have lions' dens to worry about -- yet. If your conscience is prodding you to make changes for your children and their future but your courage is dormant, then pray for the help you need. All things are possible when you truly want and seek the help of God.

## REFERENCES

1. Humanist Manifesto II, in THE HUMANIST September/October 1973.
2. "The Humanities in Humanistic Education," William Russell in Boston University School of Education JOURNAL OF EDUCATION, August 1975 Vol. 157, No. 3 p. 19.
3. THE HUMANIST ALTERNATIVE "Some Definitions of Humanism," Paul Kurtz, Prometheus Books, 1973 p. 177.
4. "On the Corruption of Education by Psychology," Joseph J. Schwab in THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION, Donald Vandenberg, editor. University of Illinois Press, 1969, pgs. 15, 16, 17.
5. "The Humanization of Education," John Vasconcellos in THRUST, March 1974, Association of California School Administrators, p. 12.
6. "Interim Report: School Organization and Student Outcomes" Report No. 166, December 1973, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore Maryland, p. 9.
7. "The Continuing Search for Identity: The New Culture," Thomas B. Gregory in EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, November, 1971, Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C., p. 125.
8. THE NATIONAL EDUCATOR, January 1975 p. 16. Educator Publications, 1110 S. Pomona Ave., Fullerton, CA 92632.
9. THE CONFLICT IN EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, Robert M. Hutchins, Harper & Brothers, p. 50.
10. "Re-education: a Major Task," B. Othanel Smith et al in SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION, William O. Stanley et al, editors, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1956, p. 447.
11. VALUES CLARIFICATION: A Handbook of

- Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, Howard Kirschenbaum, Hart Publishing Co., 1972, pgs. 16, 18.
12. "Values," Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Adirondack Mt. Humanistic Education Center, Upper Jay, NY 12987.
13. "Religion, Scientific Naturalism and the Myth of Neutrality," Michael B. McMahon in INTELLECT, April 1974, pgs. 431,432.
- 14 Op Cit., VALUES CLARIFICATION, p. 388.
15. "Value Education in the Public School," Joseph Forcinelli in THRUST, October 1974, Association of California School Administrators, p. 15.
16. VALUES IN TEACHING, Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., p. 169.
17. NEW PRIORITIES IN THE CURRICULUM, Louise M. Berman, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., p. 169.
18. Various articles and reprints sold and distributed by Adirondack Mt. Humanistic Education Center, Upper Jay, NY 12987. Some cited in text.
19. NEWSLETTER, Social Science Education Consortium, November 1974, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302. Single copies free.
20. Op. Cit., NEW PRIORITIES IN THE CURRICULUM, pgs. 169, 171, 172.
21. Op. Cit., THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION, p. 12.
22. ROLE-PLAY IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: A HANDBOOK FOR TEACHERS, Pauline Furness, Ph.D., Hart Publishing Co., N.Y.,1976. p. 108.
23. Ibid. p. 35.
24. Op. Cit., VALUES CLARIFICATION: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, p. 16.
25. Ibid. p. 18
26. MORAL DEVELOPMENT: A Guide to Piaget and



Kohlberg, Ronald Duska, Mariellen Whelan, Paulist Press, 1975, p. 81.

27. Ibid. p. 93.

28. Ibid. p. 93.

29. Ibid. p. 104.

30. "Teaching Strategies for Moral Dilemmas: An Application of Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development to the Social Studies Classroom," Ronald E. Galbraith, Thomas M. Jones in SOCIAL EDUCATION, January 1975.

31. Op. Cit., MORAL DEVELOPMENT, p. 56.

32. VALUES EDUCATION: APPROACHES AND MATERIALS, Douglas P. Superka, Patricia L. Johnson, Christine Ahrens, ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, 1975.

33. "Moral Education and Teacher Neutrality," David C. Bricker in University of Chicago SCHOOL REVIEW, August 1972, Vol. 80, No. 4, p. 626.

34. Op. Cit., MORAL DEVELOPMENT, p. 98.

35. MORAL REASONING: The Value of Life, American Education Publications, Middletown, CT, 1972.

36. Op. Cit., MORAL DEVELOPMENT, p. 84.

37. "Kohlberg & Simon - An Exchange of Opinion," Adirondack Mt. Humanistic Education Center, Upper Jay, NY 12987.

38. "Doing Something About Values," Farnum Gray, Adirondack Mt. Humanistic Education Center, Upper Jay, NY 12987.

39. THE ETHICAL QUEST IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Education Programs, Education Projects Program, Washington, D.C., November, 1974.

40. Distributed by Educational Research Analysts, P.O. Box 7518, Longview, Texas 75601.

41. "A Cross Cultural Approach," Roderic Gorney, M.D., in THE RIGHT TO DIE: DECISION AND

DECISION MAKERS, Vol. VIII Symposium No. 12  
November 1973, Group for The Advancement of  
Psychiatry, New York, NY.

42. A SIGN FOR CAIN, Frederick Wertham, M.D.,  
Macmillan & Co., New York

43. "Curriculum in Context: The Changing Catholic  
Schools", Gregory M. Holtz, in EDUCATIONAL  
LEADERSHIP, January 1976, Association for  
Supervision & Curriculum Development, Washington,  
D.C., p. 296.

44. "Brainwashing: Persuasion by Propaganda," Max  
Gunther in TODAY'S HEALTH, February 1976,  
American Medical Association.

45. Op. Cit., THE NATIONAL EDUCATOR, March  
1976, p. 15.

THE BARBARA M. MORRIS REPORT

P.O. Box 756

Upland, California 91786

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Barbara M. Morris is a nationally recognized authority on the philosophy of contemporary education. She lectures and writes on such topics as sex education, Humanism, values education, drug abuse education, death education, and global education.

Publisher of **THE BARBARA M. MORRIS REPORT**, Mrs. Morris is also staff correspondent for the **NATIONAL EDUCATOR** and education writer for **WASHINGTON DATELINE** news service. Her articles have appeared in many newspapers and magazines including **SPOTLIGHT**, **PHI DELTA KAPPAN** and the Canadian journal, **OUR FAMILY**.

Her many publications include **WHY ARE YOU LOSING YOUR CHILDREN?, BETRAYING AMERICA IN THE SCHOOLS** (written with Joan M. Masters) and **CHANGE AGENTS IN THE SCHOOLS**. She is an education consultant to **INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**, publisher of **CHRISTIAN INQUIRER**.

Barbara Morris is a graduate of Rutgers University and is a registered pharmacist.



























