



State Solidarity Erodes On Common-Core Tests

TN Note: The so-called Common Core Education Standards developed by private- and non-governmental-organizations continue to lose support for implementation, as parents and educators both see that education for America's children is not being served.

Only 21 states still plan to use shared tests designed for the common core, a continued erosion of the unity that emerged six years ago, when 45 states embraced the standards and pledged to measure student learning with common assessments.

The high school testing landscape is even more fragmented, as states increasingly choose the SAT or ACT college-entrance exam instead of common-core tests.

An *Education Week* survey of states' testing plans in English/language arts and math—the two subjects covered by the common core—found that states have continued in 2015-16 to drift away from the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, or PARCC, and

Smarter Balanced tests. (The full results from that survey will be released soon.)

Those assessment systems were crafted by two groups of states to reflect the Common Core State Standards, which were the product of an initiative launched by the nation's governors and chief state school officers. The U.S. Department of Education awarded \$360 million in grants in 2010 to the two consortia to create the tests.

Here's how states' assessment plans break down in 2015-16, illustrating three key shifts:

Consortium strength continues to wane.

- Twenty states and the District of Columbia are giving PARCC or Smarter Balanced tests. Six states and the District of Columbia will administer PARCC; 14 will use Smarter Balanced.
- Twenty-seven states are using tests they created or bought off the shelf.
- Three states are blending consortium questions with home-grown questions, or offering districts a choice of which test to give. Most Massachusetts districts can choose, for a second year, whether to give PARCC or the state's legacy test, the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, or MCAS (although 10th grade students still must pass the MCAS to graduate). Tests given in Michigan this year will combine Smarter Balanced and state-designed questions; Louisiana's tests will blend PARCC and state-designed questions.

Last year, consortium tests were more dominant, though the two groups had declined from their peak membership. *Education Week's* survey of states' 2014-15 testing plans showed 28 states and the District of Columbia using PARCC or Smarter Balanced, and 22 states using other tests or offering districts a choice of which test to use.

Consortium participation is particularly weak in high school.

- Nine states will use consortium tests, or questions, only in grades 9 and lower, and chose some other assessment—in many

cases, the ACT or the SAT—to measure high school achievement as required by federal law. Colorado, for instance, will measure achievement in grades 3-9 with PARCC, and in grade 10 with the PSAT. It will also administer the ACT to all juniors to gauge their readiness for college.

- Fifteen states will use PARCC or Smarter Balanced in the full range of grades required for federal accountability.

[Read full story here...](#)



Education Researchers Shred Common Core Standards, Call For Ban On High-Stakes Tests

TN Note: Common Core Education Standards should be banned everywhere, and control over education passed 100 percent back to the states. The co-founder of Technocracy, Inc. in 1934 was M. King Hubbard. His view of education is very descriptive of Common Core today. As he stated in the *Technocracy Study Course (1934)*,

“A continental system of human conditioning will have to be installed to replace the existing insufficient educational methods and

institutions. This continental system of general education will have to be organized as to provide the fullest possible conditioning and physical training... It must educate and train the student public so as to obtain the highest possible percentage of proficient functional capacity. “

Thus, conditioning to prepare students for entering the Technocracy work brigades was the primary goal. Critical thinking skills were anathema, unless it was possessed by the elitist Technocrats like Hubbard.

More than 100 education researchers in California have joined in a call for an end to high-stakes testing, saying that there is no “compelling” evidence to support the idea that the Common Core State Standards will improve the quality of education for children or close the achievement gap, and that Common Core assessments lack “validity, reliability and fairness.”

The California Alliance of Researchers for Equity in Education, a statewide collaborative of university-based education researchers, recently released a research brief (see in full below below) describing concerns with the Common Core standards and the assessments being given to millions of students in California and other states around the country this spring.

The researchers, from public and private universities in California — including Stanford University, UCLA, and the University of California Berkeley — say that the Common Core standards themselves do not accomplish what supporters said they would and that linking them to high-stakes tests actually harms students. The brief says:

Although proponents argue that the CCSS promotes critical thinking skills and student-centered learning (instead of rote learning), research demonstrates that imposed standards, when linked with high-stakes testing, not only deprofessionalizes teaching and narrows the curriculum, but in so doing, also reduces the quality of education and student learning, engagement, and success. The impact is also on student psychological well-being: Without an understanding that the

scores have not been proven to be valid or fair for determining proficiency or college readiness, students and their parents are likely to internalize failing labels with corresponding beliefs about academic potential.

More specific to California: a recent study on the effects of high-stakes testing, in particular of the CA High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE), found no positive effects on student achievement and large negative effects on graduation rates. The authors estimated that graduation rates declined by 3.6 to 4.5 percentage points as a result of the state exit-exam policy, and also found that these negative effects were “concentrated among low-achieving students, minority students, and female students.”

The Common Core State Standards initiative has become a political issue, with Republican presidential candidates, including front-runner Donald Trump, repeatedly saying that if they become president, they will get rid of the Core. In fact, no president can do that with executive power. While the Obama administration supported the development of the Core and dangled federal dollars in front of states to “persuade” state legislatures to adopt the standards, 45 states and the District of Columbia each separately went ahead and approved the math and English standards (though some later decided to repeal or replace the standards). The administration provided two multi-state consortia with some \$360 million in federal funds to develop new Core-aligned standards tests, which states could choose to join. The federal government can’t directly dictate to a state what standards and curriculum it must use.

[Read full story here...](#)



Exposed: Anti-American Agenda in Common Core State Standards

TN Note: This is a must read article. Common Core is further uncovered as a ruse on Americans and their precious children. In 1934, Technocracy called education “a system of human conditioning”, and that is exactly what they have accomplished with Common Core. If you love America’s kids, then these globalist destroyers need to be called out, shamed and stopped before we lose this entire generation to the global hive-mind.

A former marketing executive for textbook publishing giant Pearson Education reveals the anti-American agenda behind Common Core and the Advanced Placement U.S. History framework in the third video of a series produced by Project Veritas and focused on the corporate cronyism behind the education reform known as Common Core.

Kim Koerber, a former Pearson executive who now works as a sales consultant for National Geographic - another Gates Foundation-funded Common Core publisher - tells the Project Veritas undercover journalist that “conservative voters are afraid of everything,” and proceeds to say

why Common Core is important in her view.

She explains that those behind Common Core and the new AP U.S. History framework have attempted to minimize the Constitution and remove Christianity from the core concepts, while they also stress the importance of teaching about Islam:

“The dead white guys did not create this country,” Koerber says. “They [presumably conservatives] want to talk about those dead white guys.”

Koerber continues that Common Core is necessary because “it needs to be come cohesion between the states.” She expresses frustration, however, that “Texas keeps screwing it up over and over again.”

“People who say they want to teach the Constitution, only want to teach the part of the Constitution that they like,” she tells the journalist, who then asks her about the Second Amendment.

“But yet they don’t want to teach all of it,” she replies. “Damn the Second Amendment.”

[The discussion follows, click here...](#)



Executives Admit Common Core Education Standards Are All About Selling Books

TN Note: Common Core is a disaster in terms of delivering quality and meaningful education; in fact, it is the system designed for Sustainable Development and Technocracy. However, bookmakers and publishers are raking in money hand-over-fist as they replace virtually every book in the U.S. school system with the new curricula. When Common Core is fully rejected, the same publishers will sell another round of books to put things back where they were.

The guerrilla video crew that exposed Obamaphone cheaters and shut down the left-wing advocacy group ACORN is at it again, this time hammering the 'Common Core' education standards as a scheme for publishers to sell more textbooks.

The West Coast sales manager from one of the nation's biggest school book sellers, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, [told an undercover muckraker](#)

[with Project Veritas](#) that 'I hate kids.'

'I'm in it to sell books,' Dianne Barrow said of her advocacy for Common Core. 'Don't even kid yourself for a heartbeat.'

She added that 'it's all about the money. What are you, crazy? It's all about the money.'

'You don't think that the educational publishing companies are in it for education, do you? No, they're in it for the money.'

Bianca Olson, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's senior vice president, confirmed Tuesday morning that Barrow 'has been terminated.' That followed a phone call in which DailyMail.com read Barrow's statements to her verbatim.

Harsh words from educators also won't help the K-12 Common Core system's advocates.

'It's a joke,' a Brooklyn, New York teacher Project Veritas identified as Jodi Cohen said on the group's hidden camera.

'It's bulls**t and the thing is, what they do is they create some new f**king system, that f**king sucks to sell more books and then we have to learn something new with the students.'

Cohen, like Barrow, believes that the Common Core system is a marketing bonanza for textbook publishers.

'Oh my god, it's all a money game. It's all a money game,' the cynical educator said.

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt's CEO, Linda Zecher, told DailyMail.com on Tuesday morning that her company 'is as appalled by these comments as we expect readers will be.'

'These statements in no way reflect the views of HMH and the commitment of our over 4,000 employees who dedicate their lives to serving teachers and students every day.'

'The individual who made these comments is a former employee who

was with HMH for less than a year,' she added, referring to Barrow's firing on Tuesday.

Cohen couldn't be reached for comment.

The new video threatens to blow open the national debate about the national standards, which have simmered on the back-burner of Republican debates but haven't taken hold as much as immigration or foreign policy.

Former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush has advocated in favor of Common Core, arguing that participating states aren't restricted from setting their own standards.

[Read full story here...](#)



Global Schooling: The Hijacking of American Education

Hijack: To seize control of (a moving vehicle) by use of force, especially in order to reach an alternate destination.

This issue demonstrates the virtual takeover, or hijacking, of American education by the same global elite who have already been noted in other issues of The August Review. The time period for this hijacking is roughly the same as the economic plundering of America detailed in For Sale: The United States of America — it started roughly in 1973, and is still in progress today.

The success of globalism rides on the back of manipulating the minds of students to reflect patterns of global dogma. These students may be academically inferior to their 1970 counterparts, but scholarship was easily traded for the globalist-friendly character traits of a global citizen — traits that will not question the globalist agenda, but that will indeed welcome it as an inevitable evolution of civilization.

It will be shown that the hijacking...

- had careful forethought and planning
- anticipated a specific timetable for implementation
- was actually implemented according to the stated timetable
- included plans to remove resistance and obstacles
- was steeped in deception and double-talk

The common thread through all of this will be seen most clearly in the common patterns of financing that repeatedly surfaces: Foundations like Carnegie Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, and others, who backed those working toward globalist ends.

The result is the total subversion of American education into the hands of a relatively small band of global elitists. There was no public or

political mandate for their policies or actions. By and large they operated behind the scenes by blurring the distinctions between public and private policies, and by making sure no one connected the dots to accurately display the “big picture.”

The mission of The August Review has been “Follow the money, follow the power”. In this case, we are following the money. The big picture will reveal to the reader a startling scene that few have experienced before.

Background: Policy and Planning

In his contribution to the 1979 book, *Schooling for a Global Age*, Robert Leestma of the U.S. Office of Education wrote:

“National security today involves more than military preparation. Global education is one of the essential new dimensions.

“The globalization of the human condition is interweaving the destinies of all nations and peoples at an accelerating rate and affecting many aspects of life. Global education involves multidisciplinary perspectives about the extended human family, the existing condition of mankind and the planet, and foreseeable consequences of present trends and alternative choices.”

The back side of the dust cover noted the financial backers of the studies:

The Danforth Foundation
The John D. Rockefeller III Fund
Martha Holden Jennings Foundation
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
The Needmor Fund
The Rockefeller Foundation
The Spencer Foundation
U.S. Office of Education
National Institute of Education²

Emphasis is added to note two things: first, the Rockefeller and

Kettering foundations originally funded the Trilateral Commission. Second, public funds were intermixed with private funds to facilitate and implement a non-public supported or authorized endeavor.

Schooling for a Global Age was an excellent example of global education strategy because of its authority of scholarship, financial backing and subsequent impact. Although it was not an “official” US government publication, government officials were quoted and substantial government funds were provided so the study could be undertaken.

In short, this book typified the then-current thinking of the National Education Association (NEA), the Department of Education, the various foundations listed and most importantly, the thinking of David Rockefeller et al.

A Philosophy of Education for World Citizenship

Keeping in mind The August Review’s treatment of Humanism in Global Religion for Global Governance, the following “purpose statement” from Schooling for a Global Age exemplifies and magnifies the Humanist philosophy on global education:

“To develop student understanding of themselves as individuals.

“To develop student understanding of themselves as members of the human species.

“To develop student understanding of themselves as inhabitants and dependents of planet Earth.

“To develop student understanding of themselves as participants in global society.

“To develop within students the competencies required to live intelligently and responsibly as individuals, human beings, earthlings, and members of global society. 3

“...We endeavor to create in world-centered schools the kind of social order, the organizational climate, the physical environment, and the formal curriculum that support and further the purposes of global education.”

*“Identities, loyalties, and competencies as well as rights, duties, obligations, and privileges are associated with each of these goals. For example, students might explore the issues involved and discuss the rights one has by virtue of being a member of the human species. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Humanist Manifesto, and UNICEF and the Rights of the Child are among many documents and other materials which can be used in considering this question.”*⁴

According to another contributor, Irving H. Buche, the student “...will be capable of sustaining many allegiances, without contradiction, on both a national and international scale, and be closer to being, especially through the concept of global perspectives, a world citizen.”⁵

The Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies was in total agreement and support of this. In its white paper, *American Education and Global Interdependence*, it stated:

“The educational enterprise has a vital role to play in preparing present and future generations of Americans to cope with interdependence. Universities contain intellectual skills needed to develop the knowledge base about global interdependence; developing a more secure knowledge base should facilitate greatly the building of political consensus on what we should do about global interdependence.

“The mass media by their very nature are event-centered, imposing on schools and colleges an obligation to provide students with the continuity and depth of understanding demanded by complex long-term interdependence issues.

*“Schools, furthermore, have the golden opportunity, if they will but use it, of shaping the world views of future generations of Americans along lines more compatible with the realities of global interdependence before these views become hardened through maturation along other less compatible lines.”*⁶

Global education required the transformation of existing local educational systems — primarily those at the elementary and secondary

school levels - to produce students who saw themselves not so much as Americans but as citizens of a world society.

Why? Because “nationalism” and “individualism” are lumped in with the “other less compatible lines,” and stand in the way of globalist progress.

Society must be planned, they said, in overt and covert ways; individual ethnic, cultural and intellectual differences were to be subordinated to some predetermined set of characteristics set forth by the elitist group preparing us for global interdependence.

An Action Plan Was Launched

The Aspen Institute study noted, “The task of bringing about the kind of transformation which will make education a better instrument for coping with interdependence is formidable.”⁷ To achieve their plan, global educators proposed to identify and concentrate action upon what they called “critical leverage points” in the educational system.

The plan was to subvert and change these critical points into a program to achieve global goals. When analyzed, Aspen’s six point plan of action was nothing less than cultural genocide:

“Point 1: Revise curricula, the content of teacher training and community education toward global education. It is proposed to use the U.S. Department of Education as well as independent foundations and local school systems for this purpose.

“Point 2: To obtain support from political and educational leaders at both national and local levels, particularly from boards of trustees and professional organizations, to mold public support for global education.

“Point 3: To use universities and research institutions to develop a “knowledge base” on interdependence in order to help build the political consensus necessary for global policies.

“Point 4: To shape existing world outlooks within American popular culture.

“Point 5: To reach outward to the world through educational institutes, particularly through the United Nations.

“Point 6: To influence mass media to these ends, particularly through the use of internships that are part of professional training in mass communications.”⁸

(Editor’s note: by this time, there were many college-age students who had been raised in prototype “global schools” who thought in global terms. They were “interned” in strategic places within the media.)

Lastly, Aspen made it clear that this was an activist plan: “Achieving the educational transformation, which the future demands will require all of the spirit of conquest and aspiration which we possess.⁹

Centralized, Government-Controlled Education Required

Globalists recognized that American education was essentially decentralized and that public education had historically played a role in the teaching of American history and government. Thus, one objective was to heavily reduce the amount of time devoted to the study of these subjects that were required in the curricula of most states. These America-oriented curricula were to be replaced with ones concentrating on world history and politics.

They described the current educational system as a “constitutional incongruity.” Certain constitutional conflicts existed that could not be overcome as long as education remained in the hands of local and state governments. A major answer to this was the creation of the Department of Education, which was heavily lobbied by the global-minded National Education Association (NEA).

The Aspen study also cited Roger Ulrich’s *The Control of Human Behavior*. According to Ulrich, conditioning is supposed to start at the age of two years.¹⁰ It is recognized within the global education community that the critical years for the establishment of values and ideas is around seven to twelve. Consequently, it was planned to subject

students to a curricula which employed behavioral techniques involving so-called “values clarification” and situational ethics.

This whole plan was to manipulate students into an artificial belief structure. Who picked the values they were to be taught? Which set of ethics were used? The obvious answer is theirs and not yours!

The Timetable: Executing the Plan

Many made the mistake of underestimating the forces behind global schooling. This was not some passive, “pie-in-the-sky” ideological exercise of academia - it was highly organized, completely funded and well staffed. It swept the country.

The following “timetable” is quoted exactly from pages 240-241 of *Schooling for a Global Age*.

“PHASE 1, PREPARATORY PERIOD - BY 1980:

Every state education department and most school systems and teacher education programs would have a collection of some basic references on global education and would have provided opportunities for selected staff members to become aware of the global education concept, some relevant research, successful programs elsewhere, and local possibilities.

In-service education programs would be available in every region of the country to begin to acquaint teachers and others with the global education concept.

A survey of the role of the world in the community, region, or state and vice versa would have been conducted, planned, or under consideration in a majority of states.

“PHASE 2 - BY THE MID-1980s:

Study groups would be at work in a sizeable proportion of state education departments, local school systems, and teacher education institutions to analyze and enrich existing curricula, requirements, and materials from a global perspective.

In-service education opportunities would be available in the

majority of states, including through teacher centers.

Pre-service education programs would be offering some orientation to global education, at least as an option.

Initial research agendas would be established and studies and surveys begun.

A national baseline survey of the knowledge and attitudes of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community leaders on global education concerns would be completed.

Every state education department and a sizeable proportion of school districts would become involved in an international educational exchange program for students and/ or staff

State and local school board policy statements would be giving explicit support to global education.

National public awareness and local community support would be growing, in part, because of increased attention to global problems and issues in the mass media, particularly television, and in the schools.

“PHASE 3 - BY 1990:

Teachers in every state would have access to in-service education programs for global education, at least at the awareness level.

Good case-study material on the initiation or improvement of global education programs in a variety of school and community situations would be becoming widely available.

All school districts, state education departments, and pre-service teacher-education programs would have access to information clearinghouses and resource centers on global perspectives in education.

Teacher certification requirements in a sizeable number of states would begin to reflect global education concerns.

State curriculum requirements in a sizeable number of states would begin to reflect global education objectives.

School accreditation requirements would begin to reflect attention to global education.

Local, state, and national assessments of educational progress would include attention to global educational concerns.

Textbooks and other educational materials would increasingly provide more adequate treatment of global issues and perspectives. “11

PARENTS NEEDED TO BE EDUCATED ALSO

John I. Goodlad wrote in *Schooling for a Global Age*:

*“Parents and the general public must be reached also. Otherwise, children and youth enrolled in globally oriented programs may find themselves in conflict with values assumed in the home. And then the educational institution frequently comes under scrutiny and must pull back.”*12

The question boiled down to this: Were your values good enough for your children, or not?

This thinking was expanded by Carl Rogers:

*“Parents should understand that developing independent individuals is not a goal of government education, and this becomes apparent only with an understanding of the educator’s view of an individual: ‘The emerging modern individual places his confidence not in society’s norms, not religion’s rules, nor parents’ dictates, but in his own changing experience. He is, in a very deep sense, his own highest authority. He chooses his own way.’”*13

The greatest obstacle to the implementing of global schooling was not lack of funding, trained teachers or global textbooks – it was the parent who was skeptical about the federal government (with its blurred distinctions between private and public institutions) being better qualified to say how their child should be raised and educated.

“Rebel” parents who chose to educate their children at home have become “examples” to globalists who drag the parents into court on civil and criminal charges of negligence.

Private schools across the country have continuously fought an onslaught of legislation that would destroy them, if passed. Whenever a student is transferred to a private school, the public school he or she

attended loses state and federal budget funds for the following year. In many cases, the formula for determining funding was disproportionate to the total number of students in attendance; thus, if 40% of the students withdrew to private schools, those public schools could lose 70 or 80% of their funding. This was intolerable to public educators, and pressure was put on the parent to re-enroll the student in public school.

One of the key activist groups that dealt with parent as well as student problems was the National Education Association (NEA); it was the most powerful special interest group in operation at the time: The NEA sent more delegates to the Democratic National Convention in 1980 than any other interest group, including trade unions.

The NEA worked closely with the Trilaterally oriented Carter administration in setting up the long sought after Federal Department of Education that was needed to centralize US education.

The NEA was also successful at blocking legislation that would have allowed tuition tax credits for parents of students enrolled in private schools. If passed, it would have dealt a fatal blow to global educators because it would have encouraged parents to seek better, private education for their children; in turn, public schools would have their funding automatically chopped.

Early Financing of Global Education

We noted in *Global Religion for Global Governance* that the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies was funded primarily by Atlantic Richfield, Rockefeller, Kettering, Weyerhaeuser, Ford and the Markle Foundations. In addition, we saw that almost 40% of Aspen's funding came from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

NEH granted a whopping total of \$185.3 million in 1979 to many different Humanistic and globalist endeavors, including Aspen Institute. While the US taxpayer contributed about 80% of NEH's annual funding, the remaining 20% came from Lilly Endowment, the Ford Foundation and the Andrew W. Mellon and Alfred P. Sloan Foundations.

Watchers of the Public Broadcasting System saw many global-oriented

shows sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

We noted earlier that Kettering was a supporter of *Schooling for a Global Age*. That book also states, “Sub-study on the teaching of global education in schools [is] supported by an additional grant from the Charles F. Kettering Foundation.”¹⁴

Among the Kettering directorship, we found two notable Humanists: George Gallup and Norman Cousins. Cousins was a director of National Educational Television and the U.N. Association of the U.S. Gallup surveys, which were always pitched as being so “unbiased,” were frequently called upon when globalists needed to “prove” their case to the public by doing a public opinion survey.

Side Show: Mass Media and the Markle Foundation

In *Global Religion for Global Governance*, The Markle Foundation was identified as a prime contributor to the Aspen Institute, with its ties to the Morgan banking establishment.

Markle’s statement of purpose reads: “The goal of the current program is to strengthen educational uses of the mass media and communications technology.”¹⁵

This foundation deserves extra coverage as a prime purveyor of global education. The president of Markle Foundation was Lloyd N. Morrisett. Over ten years before, when Morrisett was a vice-president of Carnegie Corporation, he and Joan Cooney (wife of Trilateralist Peter G. Peterson) originated the idea for Sesame Street . He subsequently served as chairman of the board of trustees of the Children’s Television Workshop, which produced Sesame Street.

According to the 1978 Annual Report of the Markle Foundation:

“In its first operating year, 1969-1970, the Workshop had 36 employees and a budget of \$6.8 million. Almost all this money came from three sources: The Office of Education, the Carnegie Corporation of New York , and the Ford Foundation. The Workshop

itself was able to provide only \$119,000 from its own income. “16

The report further stated that:

“CTW has established its status as a public charity under the Tax Reform Act of 1969. The value of the public charity classification to an organization such as CTW is that it allows the receipt of individual or corporate contributions on a fully tax deductible basis for the donor. It also facilitates philanthropic donations by foundations. “17

This paved the way for globalist ventures like Sesame Street to be persistently bailed out financially, year after year, because they could not make their own way. In addition, major supplemental funding came from your taxes.

Into High Gear: The Center on Education Policy

In 1995, the Center on Education Policy (CEP) was founded and financed by globalist foundation money, and staffed by operators who would carry out elite wishes. Its innocuous-sounding Statement of Purpose that CEP is an “independent advocate for public education and for more effective public schools” is shattered by its own admission of who is providing the primary funding:

The Atlantic Philanthropies
The George Gund Foundation
The Joyce Foundation
The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation
The Carnegie Corporation
The Hewlett Foundation
The Gates Foundation
The Ford Foundation
The Spencer Foundation
The William T. Grant Foundation
Phi Delta Kappa International¹⁸

Its Statement of Purpose has the audacity to proclaim “We do not

represent any special interests.” “Instead”, they say, “we try to help citizens make sense of the conflicting opinions and perceptions about public education and create the conditions that will lead to better public schools.”

“Conflicting opinions and perceptions”, indeed! Citizens and parents everywhere are still scratching their head as to what has happened to our educational system. Johnny can’t read, write or do math, but he’s been thoroughly indoctrinated with globalist pap. If parents and citizens had understood this chicanery in the early years, they would have collectively run the globalists out of town on a proverbial rail.

CEP is not the only globalist education activist organization financed by the likes of Carnegie and Ford Foundations, but it is clearly representative that the original global agenda is not only alive and well, but gathering momentum with every passing year.

One might anticipate that the CEP has been carefully tracking President George W. Bush’s “No Child Left Behind Act” since its passage in 2002.

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

On the surface of it, the rhetoric of NCLB (nick-named as “nickle-bee” by educators) seems to address turning the education system around. “Leaving no child behind” is as sensible as the old marketing line, “because a mind is a terrible thing to waste.” Certainly all Americans would like to see every child have a good education, thus allowing each one to rise to their maximum potential.

Prior to NCLB, federal aid for education was focused mostly on certain groups of students (immigrants, minorities, handicapped, etc.) rather than students across the board. This changes with NCLB. It was the capstone of an effort started in the 1980’s to federalize education for all students. Previous efforts by Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton failed to achieve this end.

NCLB achieved two major goals for global education operatives: First, and for the first time in the history of the U.S., it centralizes control of all education standards under the umbrella of the federal government.

Second, it creates a mechanism for mandatory national testing and data collection for children in public schools.

Both of these goals are worthy of discussion.

Standards-based reform looks to normalize various local, district, state and federal standard into a consistent body of standards that all schools will look to for guidance in creating curriculum and even individual lesson plans. Ostensibly, a math student in New York will learn algebra in the same way as a student in Oregon.

Federalized standards-based reform is reinforced by mandatory national testing. If students in an individual school don't score "up to par" with the national targets, that school will be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including closing the school.

If whole schools and teacher jobs are on the line, they will quickly learn to "teach to the test" and they will accept any and all guidelines from above to make sure their school does well.

Test results are not merely aggregated however. NCLB requires additional student data to be attached to each test, such as racial, religious, socio-economic, etc. This allows research scientists to slice and dice the data in order to draw all sorts of inferences about the state of mind of each little segment of society. It also allows them to determine psychological condition of groups of students, such as their preparedness for global citizenship.

The real danger of NCLB, however, is not with the academic mechanics of the three "R's" of education: readin', writin', 'rithmetic. Rather, the real danger is in specifying the textbooks used in carrying out these lesson plans. For the first time in history, such "recommended" reading lists will come from one centrally controlled location.

Any parent in America who has raised school-age children in the last 15 years has experienced curriculum battles with local schools. When objectionable material is "slipped in" to the classroom, parents have fought passionately with teachers, administrators, school board members to have the material replaced. In many cases, stunned

(because there was resistance) educators have given way to these angry parents by dropping the contested material.

This will not be a problem in the future. With the embedding of NCLB, parents will simply be greeted with a shrug: "It's a federal standard, Mrs. Jones, and we're really sorry, but it's out of our control". Thus, take your curriculum wars to the federal government. Good luck.

Prior to its passage in 2002, NCLB was passionately showcased as President Bush's permanent legacy to the field of education. Even though this was very close on the heels of 9/11, a very big deal was made in the press about how it would finally turn our failing school system around. Well, it's turning it around all right, but in the opposite direction from what you were led to believe!

It must be noted, however, that there is a growing grass-roots resistance against NCLB from all quarters, from the NEA to states, schools, teachers and parents. Their reasons have little to do with what is written here, but it is resistance nonetheless.

Mission ACLU: Anticipate and Neutralize the Opposition

As you are already aware, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has used and abused the U.S. legal system in order to completely axe the trappings and practices (Ten Commandments and prayer) of Judeo-Christian heritage from the public school system in America.

The ACLU's seemingly irrational hatred and rhetoric against anything Christian in public schools continues to rise. Not satisfied with purely legal harassments, they are now resorting to what they would be first to call "hate speech" if spoken against any other religious group in the country.

Consider this recent example. Joe Cook, executive director of the Louisiana chapter of the ACLU, on August 16, 2005 publicly lambasted a school board who sought to exercise its rights of free speech regarding prayer on school campuses. Cook stated,

“They [the school board] believe that they answer to a higher power, in my opinion. Which is the kind of thinking that you had with the people who flew the airplanes into the buildings in the country, and the people who did the kind of things in London.”¹⁹

Such attacks are not coincidental.

As we will show, the American Civil Liberties Union is an integral part of the elitist plan that has been funded by the same globalist foundations that are funding global education.

While the mere mention of the letters “ACLU” is a cause for heartburn for tens of millions of Americans, few understand the history and purpose of this trojan-horse organization. The ACLU has never been an independent organization to promote civil rights; rather, it has been the legal lapdog of the global elite since its founding in 1920. It’s first director, Roger Nash Baldwin, was fanatically pro-communist, except that he was also a pacifist. This branch of pacifistic Marxism was originally promoted by the Fabian Society in England starting in 1857.

Fabian Socialists and Marxist revolutionists were identical in basic ideology, but disagreed only in the means to the end: The Bolshevik revolution used military force to implement Marxism while the Fabian Society promoted quiet subversion. Fabian Society thinking was proven right when the USSR failed under its own weight, and that same Fabian thinking is now gaining more and more traction with every passing year.

The director of the ACLU from 1932 to 1954 was civil rights activist and Humanist/Marxist author Corliss Lamont, the son of Thomas W. Lamont..

To properly understand the Lamont family, we must go back to the First World War.

Thomas W. Lamont (1870-1948) was one of the original organizers of the Round Table group cited by Quigley in *Tragedy and Hope*.

Thomas Lamont’s autobiography was appropriately entitled *Across World Frontiers*. He was not only a senior partner in J.P. Morgan & Co., but was also a director of Guaranty Trust Company, International

Harvester Co. and the law firm of Lamont Corliss & Co. Thomas Lamont was a key figure in the Morgan financial group. (For further information and extensive documentation on the links between J.P. Morgan and the development of the early Soviet Union, see Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution by Antony Sutton.)

Mrs. Thomas Lamont was a member of several unusual organizations:

- Federal Union
- American-Russian Institute (on the Attorney General’s subversive list)
- National Council of American-Soviet Friendship
- American Committee for Friendship with the Soviet Union... and numerous others. (See above citation for full list.)

In short, the Lamont family epitomized the links between:

- Humanism
- Communism
- New York financial interests

So much for history of the ACLU- let’s look at the recent past.

Between 2000 and 2004, major financiers of the ACLU include:

Foundation	Donations (2000-2004)
Ford Foundation	\$9,120,000
Carnegie Corporation	\$300,000
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	\$500,000
David and Lucile Packard Foundation	\$2,650,000
MacArthur Foundation	\$1,250,000
Rockefeller Foundation	\$325,000
Open Society Institute (George Soros)	\$2,827,175

As the old saying goes, “Cash talks, B.S. walks.” In short, the ACLU has been completely intertwined with and financed by globalist/Marxist powers since its very inception. Indeed, hirelings do the bidding of those who sign their paychecks!

Having laid this short groundwork, you are asked to answer this question: What organization has single-handedly caused the strike-down of both a) prayer and b) display of the Ten Commandments anywhere in public schools? By “single-handedly”, this writer pointedly means that there have been no other public contesters against these issues except for the ACLU. Not one.

Why would global elitists want all vestiges of Judeo-Christian tradition removed from the classroom?

Because their global education agenda would not and could not work as long as students could compare their propaganda to the “inflexibility” and “intolerance” of the Judeo-Christian ethic.

In communist Russia, Lenin and Stalin’s solution to Christianity and Judaism was simple: kill the Christians and Jews. Of course, they killed capitalists and the intelligentsia also- totaling some 60,000,000 innocent people over several years. With Fabian socialism, where violence was eschewed as unnecessary, less-direct but equally potent means are used to neutralize its enemies: kill the intellectual and moral implements of Christians and Jews — the Ten Commandments and prayer. In short, wipe the Judeo-Christian ethic off the face of the country!

The ACLU has single-handedly killed both (prayer and the Ten Commandments), and they did it with money directly contributed by the same globalist elite who sought to control the educational system for their own nefarious purposes.

Conclusion

Every condition of a hijack is now met: The moving vehicle is the pre-existing system of education; the force used is generated by massive amounts of private and diverted public money; the alternate destination is socialistic globalism.

The data presented in this paper should not imply that education was not in the cross hairs of globalists prior to the early 1970's. In fact, there is a long history of elitist meddling and social engineering experiments dating well back into the 1800's. Rather, the significant fact about modern history (1973-present) is that globalist efforts and successes have shifted into high gear.

It is also not implied that there are no other organizations or areas of attack involved in the global assault on education. There are many. It was sufficient here to demonstrate one coherent set of data and evidence, even in skeleton form, to prove the basic point. If this paper only draws a stick-man, complete data and historical inquiry will certainly result in a more complete picture.

The reader is finally reminded again that the proof of this takeover is not seen by looking at direct evidence. Trying to pin down specifics is like picking up a slippery bar of soap. The pattern of things can be very clearly seen, however, by examining the people and organizations who have put their own money on the line to bring it about: after all, is there any stronger proof of involvement than committing your own money?

Endnotes

1. Robert Leestma, *Schooling for a Global Age*, ed. James M. Becker, p. 233.
2. *Ibid.*, Dust cover.
3. Lee and Charlotte Anderson, *Op. cit.*, pg. 8.
4. James Becker, *Op. cit.*, pg. 41.
5. Irving Buche, *Learning for Tomorrow*, ed. Alvin Toffler, p. 137.
6. *American Education and Global Interdependence*, Aspen Institute.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. Roger Ulrich, *Control of Human Behavior*.
11. Robert Leestma, *Op. cit.*, p. .240, 241.
12. John I. Goodlad, *Ibid.*, 17.
13. Carl Rogers, *Courses by Newspaper*.
14. James Becker, *Op. cit.*, p. vii.

15. Markle Foundation Annual Report (1977), p. 4.
16. Ibid., p. 8.
17. Ibid., p. 17.
18. <http://www.cep-dc.org/aboutcep.htm>
19. Prayer school board likened to terrorists, WorldNetDaily, 8/17/2005
20. The Foundation Directory Online, <http://www.fdncenter.org>.