

The Blumenfeld Education Letter

"My People Are Destroyed For Lack Of Knowledge" HOSEA 4:6

Vol. 11, No. 5 (Letter # 116)

EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld

May 1996

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

Will Republicans Betray America By Voting For Marc Tucker's Human Resources Development System: H.R. 1617 and S. 143?

There is no doubt that H.R. 1617 (known as the "Consolidated and Reformed Education, Employment, and Rehabilitation Systems Act" or "CAREERS Act"), which passed the House in Sept. 1995 by a vote of 345 to 79, and S. 143 (the Workforce Development Act of 1995), which passed the Senate in October by 95 to 2, will do more to lead America into socialist-fascist totalitarianism than any other pieces of legislation before the present Republican-dominated Congress.

Both bills, when reconciled in conference committee, will enact into law Marc Tucker's infamous Human Resources Development System, outlined in Tucker's exuberant letter of Nov. 11, 1992 to Hillary Clinton, a member of the board of trustees of Tucker's National Center on Education and the Economy. He wrote:

I still cannot believe you won. But utter delight that you did pervades all the circles in which I move. I met last Wednesday in David Rockefeller's office with him, John Sculley, Dave Barram and David Haselkorn. It was a great celebration. Both John and David R. were more expansive than I have ever seen them — literally radiating happiness. . . .

The subject we were discussing was what you and Bill should do now about education, training and labor market policy. Following that meeting, I chaired another in Washington on the same topic. . . .

Our purpose in these meetings was to propose concrete actions that the Clinton administration could take — between now and the inauguration, in the first 100 days and beyond. The result, from where I sit, was really exciting. We took a very large leap forward in terms of how to advance the agenda on which you and we have all been working — a practical plan for putting all the major components of the system in place within four years, by the time Bill has to run again.

That Hillary Clinton had been working with Tucker and associates to develop this fascist education system is confirmed by the fact that Tucker paid Hillary \$102,000 in 1991 for her work as a consultant to the NCEE. Obviously, the letter of Nov. '92 was meant to help prepare the Clintons to get the Tucker plan passed into law and implemented by the fifty states. In it Tucker outlined his "vision" of a human resources development system. He wrote:

What is essential is that we create a seamless web of opportunities to develop one's skills that

The Blumenfeld Education Letter is published monthly. Original material is copyrighted by The Blumenfeld Education Letter. Permission to quote is granted provided proper credit is given. Readers are encouraged to order and distribute additional copies of those newsletters they believe should be sent to legislators, columnists, talk shows, pastors, etc. Subscription Rate: 1 year \$36.00. Address: Box 45161, Boise, Idaho 83711. (208) 322-4440. WWW address: <http://www.cyberhighway.net/~phil/blumenfd.html>

literally extends from cradle to grave and is the same system for everyone — young and old, poor and rich, worker and full-time student. It needs to be a system driven by client needs (not agency regulations or the needs of the organizations providing the services), guided by clear standards that define the stages of the system for the people who progress through it, and regulated on the basis of outcomes that providers produce for their clients, not inputs into the system.

One should be aware that Tucker's plan to restructure American education goes back to his 1986 report on teaching, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, produced when he was executive director of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. In 1987, New York Gov. Cuomo and the leaders of Rochester, N.Y., invited Tucker to set up his National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) in that city. The idea was that the Center, with the help of an initial subsidy of \$1 million from Gov. Cuomo, would help Rochester implement Tucker's basic restructuring ideas in that city's school system.

Goals 2000

In 1989 the NCEE issued its first report, *To Secure Our Future: The Federal Role in Education*, which became the basis for Goals 2000. The report basically framed the issues and shaped the agreements that were made at President Bush's famous Education Summit at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, in the fall of 1989. After the summit, in which Gov. Clinton of Arkansas was an active participant, the National Governors' Association asked the NCEE to assist in the development of national goals for education. These goals were subsequently promoted by President Bush in his 1990 State of the Union address. Apparently, a Republican president was willing to accept the education reform plan of the ultra-liberal NCEE rather than call upon a conservative think

tank to come up with a conservative reform plan.

In 1989, Tucker's group created the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce which compiled a report entitled *America's Choice: high skills or low wages!* The report, issued in June 1990, is the basic blueprint for Tucker's Human Resources Development System which moves American education from its traditional emphasis on academics and knowledge to a Soviet-style workforce training and certification program.

Both H.R. 1617 and S. 143 represent the culmination of Tucker's efforts to get Congress to impose his system on America. That Republicans should be in the forefront of promoting these bills makes one wonder if the Republican Party is becoming the new fascist party of America. In the Tucker system, the government will plan your life for you, track you from birth to death on its mammoth data-gathering computer, regulate employment, and eventually the entire economy.

Henry Hyde Opposes

The only Republican congressman to openly oppose this legislation is Rep. Henry Hyde of Illinois who addressed a letter to his colleagues in March of this year stating why he opposes the Tucker plan and the legislation that makes it law. He wrote:

Dear Colleague:

President Clinton's plan for a national workforce of skilled laborers is being achieved through the Goals 2000 Educate America Act (HR 1804), School to Work Opportunities Act (SWO), (HR 2884), and Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), (HR 6), all of which were passed and signed into law by President Clinton in 1994.

I'll tell you why it is so important to repeal these laws. The plan for Goals 2000 was developed by Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Ira Magaziner, and Marc Tucker, President of the National Center on Educa-

tion and the Economy (funded by the Carnegie Foundation), prior to Clinton's election. It is a concept for dumbing-down our schools and changing the character of the nation through behavior modification (a vital part of this plan). It moves away from an academically intensive curriculum to one that is integrated with vocational training, producing skilled manpower for the labor market. The economy will be controlled by the federal government by controlling our workforce and our schools. I'm enclosing an 18 page letter to Hillary Clinton from Marc Tucker which includes the framework for Goals 2000. . . .

Two other bills, still pending, are designed to advance the School to Work phase of Goals 2000. The Careers Act (HR 1617) and the Workforce Development Act (S 143) will support a nationwide work force development system, state by state. Funding is provided for "one stop career" employment agencies under the supervision of the federal government. Please, let's not let these bills become law.

At an education summit in 1989, then Governor Bill Clinton chaired a Governors meeting to establish national performance goals to make America internationally competitive. The governors adopted six of the National Education Goals which are now included in the 8 goals in Goals 2000. The other two came from goals adopted at a World Conference sponsored by the United Nations and the World Bank in March, 1990. . . .

Behavior modification is a significant part of restructuring our schools. School children will be trained to be "politically correct", to be unbiased, to understand diversity, to accept alternative family lifestyles, to contribute to the community through mandatory community service, to respect and protect the environment, to become a collaborative contributor and a quality producer. In Marc Tucker's letter to Mrs. Clinton, laying out the plan for Goals 2000 he states, "Radical changes in attitudes, values and beliefs are required to move any combination of these agendas."

Dumbing-down education is a prime component in creating a willing workforce. Higher education is not conducive to accepting skilled labor training for a career that fits into the federal government's planned labor force. Goals 2000 abandons the American competitive tracking system. It is replaced by new national achievement standards which assess students' behavior and attitude. . . .

A computer tracking system will track teachers' training and performance, school performance and students from pre-kindergarten through technical training and into the workforce. All information will be made available to interested government officials and prospective employers.

Pre-school, health clinics, daily meals, and parental assistance (they have the gall to instruct parents on how to rear their children, including how students' free time should be spent), are in this all-inclusive "cradle to grave" plan to control our children's minds and careers. . . .

This concept has been around since at least the 1960s and perhaps as far back as the 1930s. It has been tried in many schools over the past 20-30 years, to the detriment of our children. In the '70s, it was called "Mastery Learning" under the supervision of Professor Benjamin Bloom and now is known as Outcome Based Education (OBE). State school superintendents have learned to call OBE by other names because of its bad reputation which precedes it but the concepts are all the same.

I ask you to please investigate Goals 2000 yourself. I think you will come to the same conclusion. Goals 2000 must be rejected, and the sooner the better — for our children's sake.

What has been the response to Rep. Hyde's very strong letter? So far, the only response we know of is a 4-page letter dated March 28 from William Goodling, Republican from Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Lifelong Learning. Goodling, serving his 10th term in Congress, was a school superintendent before becoming a Congressman. McKeon, a Republican from California, is a first-term freshman who seems neither to understand the significance of the bill he is promoting nor the subcommittee he heads. Attached to their letter was a six-page compendium of explanations "developed to respond to similar concerns and misunderstandings that have been expressed over the CAREERS bill in recent months." Goodling and McKeon write:

We recently received a "dear colleague" from you entitled "Clinton's National Workforce and Education Plan," in which you express concerns over H.R. 1617, the House-passed CAREERS Act. . . .

In your letter you describe the CAREERS legis-

lation, and the Senate's Workforce Development Act as "designed to advance the School to Work phase of Goals 2000," tying the roots of this legislation to the work of the Clinton Administration, Ira Magaziner, and Marc Tucker. In fact, CAREERS is the product of efforts by Republicans going back to the Reagan and Bush Administrations, and incorporates suggestions by a bipartisan coalition of reform-minded colleagues, including many leading Republican Governors.

At last, two honest Republicans admitting that it is the Republicans who are creating the educational foundations for a totalitarian system in America! Who are these fascist Republicans? Chester Finn, Dennis Doyle, Bill Bennett, Terrel Bell? It was Bell who in 1984 awarded Bill Spady the grant to continue work on implementing Outcome-Based Education in all of the schools in America. Concerning Chester Finn, Bell writes in his memoir, *The Thirteenth Man*:

David Stockman, director of the Office of Management and Budget, suggested that the very competent Chester Finn be appointed deputy undersecretary for planning and budget in ED. Finn had served in the Nixon White House. I had known him from my Nixon-Ford years, and I knew that I could work with him. Given Stockman's support, I was hopeful that he would be the first one to break the logjam. But despite this endorsement, Finn was promptly rejected by White House Personnel because he was currently serving on the staff of Democratic Senator Pat Moynihan. (Stockman and Finn had both been close to Moynihan during their Harvard days.)

Now we know why Chester Finn can't be trusted! In his book, Bell bemoans the fact that President Reagan did not want the federal government to assume a role of leadership in education. In fact, Reagan wanted to abolish the Education Department but was unable to get the support needed in Congress. Nevertheless, in the bowels of the educational bureaucracy plans were well underway by the National Center for Education Statistics to create its massive computerized data-collection system. It seems as if the government works on two tiers: there is the

visible tier of politicians in the White House and Congress which the public is very much aware of; and there is the invisible tier made up of bureaucrats, laboratories, and various foundation-supported commissions that quietly advance the liberal-socialist agenda no matter who occupies the White House or controls Congress. Funding for the invisible tier is always forthcoming in the Budget, even though the politicians may not have the foggiest idea what the money is being spent on.

Iserbyt Blows the Whistle

It was Charlotte Iserbyt, former senior staff member at the Education Department, who saw what was going on among the socialist-fascist planners in the invisible tier and decided to let the public know. Her little book, *Back to Basics Reform Or . . . Skinnerian International Curriculum?*, published in 1985, revealed what the invisible tier was doing to prepare America for a socialist one-world government scheduled for the early years of the twenty-first century. She wrote:

This book deals with the social engineers' continuing efforts, paid for with international, federal, state, and tax-exempt foundation funding, to manipulate and control Americans from birth to death using the educational system as the primary vehicle for bringing about planned social, political, and economic change. (The major change in our economic system will be the determination by industry and government of who will be selected to perform the necessary tasks in our society — quotas for engineers, doctors, service workers, etc. to bring about the socialist concept of full employment.)

That's a virtual description of Marc Tucker's Human Resources Development system. Charlotte was fired for her patriotism. But the cat was out of the bag, and now a small group of conservative activists were able to track the doings of the invisibles. In her book Charlotte was able to document

Terrel Bell's complicity with Bill Spady in the development of Outcome-Based Education. She also sounded the alarm on Skinnerian mastery learning, the technique to be used in the schools to change the values, beliefs and behavior of American children.

But to many of us, it was Marc Tucker's letter to Hillary Clinton that proved to be the great eyeopener. What was so shocking was the clear totalitarian nature of what was being planned by these American social engineers. And for Republicans in Congress to even contemplate using any component of this plan as a means of reforming American education is to reveal the utter bankruptcy of the Republican party when it comes to education. For Goodling to promote any components of this plan is to betray fundamental Republican principles in defense of freedom. But perhaps the Republicans no longer adhere to these principles and have indeed become the new American fascists. In his letter to Rep. Hyde, Goodling writes:

In exchange for billions of dollars in federal funding for job training and employment assistance, the CAREERS bill does ask States and local communities to establish what we call integrated career center systems, where there are easily accessible, single points of entry into local employment and training programs, for people in need of employment assistance or job training, and for employers in need of workers. The actual design for such systems is left entirely to the State and local community. Co-located Career centers (some call them one-stops) are encouraged, not required. And they are locally-designed, appointed and managed — not federally run or controlled.

Apparently, Goodling is unaware that federal control is not needed to put the Tucker plan in place in every state. The only thing that is needed is federal money. Tucker's change agents will design the local systems so that they conform with the overall national — not federal — plan. The social engineers desperately need the federal money to implement this totalitarian plan,

and Goodling is willing to give it to them.

As for the Senate bill, S. 143, it is much more in line with just about everything Marc Tucker wants. And the prime promoter of that bill is Sen. Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas who should be designated as Republican traitor number one. It is hard to believe that a so-called Republican can be so blind to the totalitarian nature of the Workforce Development Act of 1995. A Report from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, summarizes S. 143 as follows:

TITLE I

State Systems—Statewide work force development systems are established through a single allotment of funds to each State. A minimum of 25 percent of the funds are for work force employment activities, such as creating one-stop career centers or providing job training. Work force employment activities are to be planned and administered under the authority of the Governor. A minimum of 25 percent of the funds are for work force education activities, including vocational and adult education. Work force education activities are to be planned and administered under the authority of the State Educational Agency.

The remaining 50 percent of the funds are to be used for any work force employment or education activities as a State decides. . . . The decision to allocate funds from this "flex account" is made through a collaborative process involving, among others, the Governor, the State educational agency, and the private sector. . . .

State goals and benchmarks are established in the plan, as well as how the State will use its funds to meet those goals and benchmarks.

In addition, the plan includes how the State will establish systems for one-stop career centers, labor market information, and accountability for job placement, as described in the bill. . . .

The Governor must enter into agreements with local communities for the delivery of work force employment, school-to-work, or economic development activities, where appropriate. . . .

TITLE II

Job Corps remains as a residential program for at-risk youth, but is integrated with the statewide work force development system. Primary responsibility for the operation of Job Corps centers is transferred to the States, and each center must be linked into the one-stop career center system and other local training and education efforts.

TITLE III

A Federal partnership is established to administer all Federal responsibilities, including approval, of the State plans, negotiation of benchmarks with each State, and dissemination of best practices.

A governing board, composed of 13 members, will manage the partnership. The board is composed of a majority of representatives from business and industry, and representatives of labor, education and Governors. . . .

Final authority for the approval of State plans and disbursement of funds, however, remains with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Labor.

Other national activities include national assessments of vocational education, a national labor market information system, and establishment of a national center for research in education and work force development. . . .

The Workforce Development Act of 1995 promotes the development of a new and coherent system in which all segments of the work force can obtain the skills necessary to earn wages sufficient to maintain a high quality of living and in which a skilled work force can meet the labor market needs of the businesses of each State.

Note how this plan ignores state legislatures or local school boards. The governor runs everything. This is, for all intents and purposes, a coup d'etat that overthrows the representative form of government and local school boards that are supposed to govern education.

Research Galore

Also, the call for the establishment of a national center for research in education and work force development is based on the already existing National Center for Research in Vocational Education at the University of California at Berkeley. A new center will be established by the Governing Board. Its areas of focus are to include:

(1) combining academic and vocational education; (2) connecting classroom instruction with work-based learning; (3) creating a continuum of educational programs which provide multiple exit points for employment; (4) establishing high-quality sup-

port services for students; (5) developing new models for remediation of basic academic skills; (6) identifying ways to establish links among educational and job training programs at State and local levels; (7) creating new models for career guidance, counseling, and information; (8) evaluating economic and labor market changes that will affect work force needs; (9) preparing teachers and professionals; (10) obtaining information on practices in other countries that may be adapted for use in the United States; (11) providing assistance to States and local entities in developing and using systems of performance measures and standards; and (12) maintaining a clearinghouse to provide information about the conditions of systems and programs funded under this act.

Obviously, this national center will provide a lot of good jobs at good wages for a lot of liberal university graduates. They will need directors, assistant directors, researchers, statisticians, consultants, secretaries and staffers producing an endless number of reports to be distributed to every member of Congress, every Governor, every school administrator. Think of all the trees that will have to be cut down to make paper for all of the reports, and think of all the computers, modems, word processors, copy machines, phones and faxes that will have to be bought. Who knows, the national center may balloon to the size of the Pentagon if it is to service the nation's entire workforce development system.

For Republicans who believe in *less* government, the word *less* now apparently means *more!*

Governing Board

And according to this Kassebaum-Tucker plan all power over American education will reside in the Governing Board. The committee report says:

The Work Force Development Partnership will be headed by a Governing Board composed of 13 members, including 7 representatives of business and industry, 2 representatives of labor and workers, 1

representative of adult education providers, 1 representative of vocational education providers, and 2 Governors, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Governing Board shall be appointed not later than September 30, 1996.

The duties of the Governing Board include: (1) Overseeing the development of a national labor market information system and job placement accountability system. (2) Establishing model benchmarks, taking into account existing work force development benchmark efforts at the State level. (3) Negotiating benchmarks with the States. (4) Reviewing and approving State plans. (5) Reviewing reports on the States' progress toward their benchmarks. (6) Preparing and submitting an annual report to Congress on the absolute and relative performance of States progress toward their benchmarks. (7) Awarding incentive grants. (8) Issuing sanctions. (9) Disseminating information on best practices. (10) Performing the duties relating to the Job Corps. (11) Reviewing other federally funded work force development programs. (12) Reviewing and approving the transition work plan submitted to the Secretaries of Labor and Education. (13) Overseeing all activities of the Federal partnership.

Benchmarks Equal Outcomes

What are "benchmarks," about which the Governing Board will be so concerned? Benchmark is the new word for outcome. Since the lawmakers are concerned that the American people might find out that the Tucker plan is simply another version of Outcome-Based Education, they've decided to eliminate any terminology which might produce widespread parental and conservative opposition. Here's how the lawmakers define benchmarks:

This act will require States to measure and report annually on benchmarks—measurable indicators of the progress the State has set out to achieve in meeting broad work force development goals related to employment, education, and earning gains.

Benchmarks related to employment and earning gains include, at a minimum, placement and retention in unsubsidized employment for one year, and increased earnings for participants. Benchmarks related to education include, at a minimum, student mastery of certain skills, including: academic knowl-

edge and work readiness skills; occupational and industry-recognized skills according to skill proficiencies for students in career preparation programs; placement in, retention in, and completion of secondary education; placement and retention in military service; and increased literacy skills. It is expected that States will develop additional benchmarks.

If any further proof were needed to indict Nancy Kassebaum as the Republican party's leading socialist-fascist, one need not seek further than the May 20, 1996 issue of *Forbes* magazine in which Steve Forbes writes:

Advocates of nationalized health care are on the verge of a stunning achievement with the passage of the Senate's Kennedy-Kassebaum bill. This legislation is portrayed as a benign way of making it easier for people to keep health insurance when they change jobs or to buy insurance if they are in less-than-perfect health. Actually, if this becomes law, it will put us on a fast track to Hillary care. Yet few foes of her socialized monstrosity are fighting what one opponent has rightly called a "Trojan pony."

The First Lady must be beaming. The enforcement language is lifted almost directly from Clinton care. Ferocious penalties litter the House version of this legislation. For instance, doctors face heavy fines if they are deemed to have delivered "unnecessary" health care services. And who determines what is unnecessary? You guessed it—federal bureaucrats, not physicians. . . .

The Senate bill is written in a way that guarantees the eventual imposition of federal price controls. Right now, there are no caps on premiums—which will rise big-time because of the bill's mandates on who is eligible for insurance. Washington State, for example, has Kennedy-Kassebaum-like guarantees. Premiums for individual policy holders have skyrocketed. As prices go up, young, healthy people won't bother to buy insurance. The whole process will then create irresistible pressure for federal controls "to make insurance affordable." There are other flaws here. The bill blithely guarantees that mental health coverage will equal coverage for physical ailments; this is an open invitation for massive abuse. Rules, mandates and caps will proliferate.

The Senate version doesn't even contain a provision for Medical Savings Accounts, the only hope for restoring true freedom and consumerism to the health care field.

Is this what voters elected a Republican Congress for?

Thanks to Nancy Kassebaum and her fellow socialist-fascists in the Senate, this Republican Congress will do more to inch us toward totalitarianism than any previous Congress. Does Sen. Dole approve of what his fellow Kansan is doing?

Meanwhile, what should *we* do? We should do all we can to get the federal government out of the education and health care businesses. If Republicans really believe in downsizing government, the last thing they should be doing is voting for more government intrusion in education and health care.

Call, write, or fax your Representatives and Senators. Purchase a copy of the U.S. Congress Handbook, P.O. Box 566, McLean, VA 22101, 703-356-3572. This handbook contains all of the information you will need for access to your Washington lawmakers. They need to hear from you.

Miss. Schools to Put Student Records Online

The state of Mississippi is in the process of compiling a student-level computer database which it expects to have online in every school and district by the fall of 1998.

However, there is now a growing concern about the confidentiality of these records. State education officials haven't decided whether students will be identified by their Social Security number or assigned entirely different identifying numbers. If the Social Security number is used, transcripts and other data can be easily transferred out of state to other institutions. That's not as easily done if a Mississippi student ID number is created.

According to Nathan Slater, director of management information services in the Dept. of Education, it's possible to use a combination of both: Social Security num-

bers as first option, with a different number created for students whose parents object to use of Social Security numbers as ID numbers.

The student-level database and the computer network to transmit it will require spending about \$500,000 to purchase software called the "district accumulator." To be used at a district's central office, the software will pull together data from each school into one standardized format.

Local districts will have to buy their own hardware and individual school software, but a portion of the \$30 million in state technology money can be used for that.

To keep information private, the system will limit access only to school employees who need it. That will be done by allowing access only with correct coded passwords.

Data will also be reported more accurately because it would only be entered once and would not be recopied by someone else. "We'll maintain it at elementary, middle and high schools, send it to the district, then we'll send it directly to the state, so we do not in any form or fashion re-enter the data," said Rusty Scafidel, director of information services for Jackson schools. (*The Clarion-Ledger*, Jackson, MS, 4/26/96.)

Comment:

Obviously, the student record will eventually wind up in the central computer in Washington, available to the ATF, FBI, IRS, CIA and any other government agency that wants to keep track of the individual. And obviously, the student's Social Security number will be entered into the record somewhere, especially if a student loan or job training is involved. And obviously other states are also setting up their computerized data-gathering systems. Another indication of the trend toward total control of the American people by their unelected bureaucrats and social engineers.