

**PUBLIC
EDUCATION**

PUBLIC EDUCATION

THE "FINAL SOLUTION" IN THE CONQUEST OF AMERICA'S IDEALS

JEFFREY WICK



© 2011 by Jeffrey Wick. All rights reserved.

Published by Redemption Press, PO Box 427, Enumclaw, WA 98022.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any way by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—without the prior permission of the copyright holder, except as provided by USA copyright law.

Unless otherwise noted, all Scriptures are taken from the *New King James Version*[®]. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

ISBN-13: 978-1-63232-111-4

ISBN-10: 1-63232-111-4

ISBN-13: 978-1-63232-112-1 (ePub)

ISBN-10: 1-63232-112-2 (ePub)

ISBN-13: 978-1-63232-113-8 (mobi)

ISBN-10: 1-63232-113-0 (mobi)

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2011921212

This book is dedicated to our nation's founders, chosen by God to do His service, and to those thereafter who have continued to fight and sacrifice their lives to preserve our freedom.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Three American Cornerstones Besieged	1
2. Attack of the Public School System.	27
3. Education and Socialism	55
4. Propagating Religion in the Education System	77
5. Spawning Socialism: From Strength to Weakness	113
6. Spawning Socialism: Commandeering the Education System	149
7. The 235 Years' War: The Campaign against Democracy, Freedom, and Christianity	185
8. A Personal Story	215
9. America on the Brink of Judgment	223
Endnotes	257
Bibliography	269

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MANY PEOPLE DESERVE thanks for helping me complete this work:

Cathy Burke, an esteemed colleague and outstanding teacher—with whom I spent many hours debating and discussing education, faith, politics, and American culture—read my rough draft and provided helpful feedback.

Col. Robert “F” Pyner, a tremendous educator who offers motivation and encouragement, steady admiration for our awesome nation, and confidence in conservative ideals, provided feedback while reading the rough draft.

Pastor Kevin James of Salem Baptist Church, who provides guidance by being a strong example of living the Christian life, took time out of his busy schedule to read and respond to my rough draft.

Dr. Tony Dapena, an invaluable friend and consummate man of faith, spent the most time supporting my efforts in writing this book by proofreading, assisting with editing, and being an earpiece and source of guidance. Also special thanks for his instrumental role in my growing in the Christian faith, studying the Bible, and building my relationship with God and Christ.

I also thank Kory, Cricket, and Dwain Smith, Mike and Dorislyn Palmer, Mike Raynes, Karri Zellerino, David “Hooter” and Jennifer Burruss, Jessica Wick, Bobby Plaskett, Rob Mercer, and Glenda Rinaldi for their unwavering friendship and encouragement.

My parents, John and Barbara Wick, deserve immeasurable credit for their upbringing, support, encouragement, moral guidance, work ethic, sacrifice, and love they have shown throughout my life. Thanks to my brother, Jason, for demonstrating the will never to give up or quit in the pursuit of becoming a champion; and to my sister, Janine, for exhibiting the ability—and providing the inspiration—to overcome any obstacle one may confront.

Finally, I wish to thank our Father, the Creator, for His generous mercy, kindness, counsel, and patience; as well as the ability, family, and country with which He has blessed me; and His Son and our Savior Jesus Christ, for His free gift of salvation He offered by sacrificing His life for the world.

INTRODUCTION

A CONCERTED ATTACK on three cornerstones of American greatness has damaged the foundation of American culture and society. This attack began during the 1920s with the philosophy affecting the development of the modern public school system (led by John Dewey, known as the “Architect of Modern Education”), during the 1930s with Mr. Franklin Roosevelt’s socialist New Deal program, and since the hippie revolution spawned during the 1960s. The goal of this assault is to annihilate these cornerstones and fundamentally transform our society. These attacks have been well planned, coordinated, aggressive, and effectively executed. Though the offensives have negatively impacted our awesome nation, they have thus far fallen short of completely destroying this triad and fully changing our culture.

Nevertheless, incessant attacks continue. The perpetrators obsessively strive toward their goal of morphing the United States into a socialist, dependency-based, religiously benign country controlled by a dictatorial, oppressive ruling party. Part of their objective is to promote an international governmental authority over U.S. sovereignty. Achieving this goal would be an important step

toward allowing world leaders to create a one-world government that works cohesively to regulate people throughout the world.

The public education system is the mechanism through which socialist-leaning liberals can topple America's democracy and erect in its place a tyrannical government that controls its dependent populace, which is carefully trained to rely on government through this education system. Once America is conquered, the conditions are ideal for the aforementioned one-world government to control all people. Because the United States serves as the primary sower of freedom and democracy throughout the world, the dissolution of our form of government would be the first domino to fall and cause all other free nations to collapse.

Let us consider U.S. interests. When we review statements Supreme Court justices have made, we cannot help but be alarmed by those who encourage the United States to follow the lead of international legislative bodies instead of administering its own authority. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, for example, complained that the United States Supreme Court fails to reference international law in its decisions frequently enough.¹ In 2003 Justice Anthony Kennedy promoted the European Court on Human Rights' protection of the rights of homosexuals—rights that counter our traditional Christian heritage and morals.²

In 2002 Justice Sandra Day O'Connor said the United States Supreme Court needs to learn from other jurisdictions (meaning other nations), look at decisions of foreign constitutional courts, and reference international law in executing its duties. "The international community should at times constitute pervasive authority in American courts," she said.³ The word *pervasive* means spreading throughout every part; therefore, Justice O'Connor advocates the penetration of international law into every aspect of our culture. Liberals outside the judicial branch—from college professors to journalists, from politicians to presidents of the United States—cherish this attitude.

The greatness of the United States comes not from the failed, perverse principles of foreign nations, from which the millions who immigrated to America fled, but from the foundational principles established by the Founding Fathers and colonists who settled this awesome nation. Certain people throughout the world would like nothing better than for America to put asunder its principles of freedom based on Christianity and return to an aristocratic, restrictive, oppressive, dependent way of life.

Throughout this book I use several terms to describe participants in this bout against our American way of life, including relativist, secularist, statist, elitist, radical environmentalist, socialist-leaning liberal, socialist, and liberal. All these interchangeable terms describe those who are sickened by the principles that made America great, including, but not limited to, freedom, faith in Providence, rugged individualism (succeeding without governmental intervention; self-reliance), sacrifice, and the God-given unalienable rights of “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.” Due to their abhorrence of these precepts, they have declared and engaged in a war against them, and they will not rest until they have won. This victory will occur when America is transformed into a socialist nation with a small, powerful government that lords over its dependent subjects. Again, the public school system encourages this dependency, and in the following chapters we will discuss its contribution in detail.

CHAPTER 1

THREE AMERICAN CORNERSTONES BESIEGED

CHRISTIAN FAITH

ONE OF THE three cornerstones against which this concurrent offensive is being waged is religious faith in general and the Christian faith in particular. To establish a sense of dependency on government, one must first discredit religion and God's authority over others—in the process revising our nation's Christian foundation. Patrick Henry eloquently stated, "It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians, not on religions, but on the Gospel of Jesus Christ!"¹ Citizens can serve only one master. If they are communing with God, attending church, reading the Bible, and engaging in religious activities to receive counsel, encouragement, and strength, they are not leaning on government for aid or guidance. Since liberals do not believe in moral absolutes, a topic we will discuss later in this book, they must reject an authoritarian, righteous God who expects people to behave in a certain and proper way.

In the mind of statist (those who believe in the supremacy of the state over the individual), only they can provide for the needs

of the pathetic, helpless commoner. This is their perception of the common citizen—he is weak, poor, helpless, and stupid. Thus citizens cannot survive without the assistance, generosity, direction, and wisdom the messianic statist provide. Since relativists worship themselves and the environment—Mother Earth—in which they live, they see themselves as omnipotent and omniscient; they are your saviors. They just need to convince you of this truth so you will only open your eyes and see them in such a light. Therefore, they must attack your faith, criticize it, disparage God as a figment of your imagination, parody your faith, and portray it as foolishness. Once the statist succeed in this endeavor, they, as gods, slip into the resultant void left behind.

God and faith have always been questioned in all generations and cultures. This is nothing new, nor do many consider such questioning inappropriate. Yet it is one thing to question faith; it is quite another to intentionally seek to invalidate faith and extricate it from society.

America's Christian Foundation

When we focus on America, we notice that it was founded on Christian principles from its birth, and many examples illustrate this truth. When Jamestown was founded in 1607, one of the colony's goals was to propagate Christianity in the New World.² In 1620 the Pilgrims established Plymouth after signing the Mayflower Compact. Part of this agreement stipulated the Pilgrims' service to God the Almighty by doing His will. The Compact begins with, "In the name of God, Amen." It continues, "Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith." The Founding Fathers mentioned our unalienable, God-given rights and referred to Providence in the Declaration of Independence and other writings.

Numerous references to faith in “God,” “Almighty God,” “Providence,” “Divine Providence,” “Sovereign Ruler of the Universe,” “Great Legislator of the Universe,” “Jesus Christ,” “the Creator,” and other Christian references appear in numerous state and federal documents dating back to the establishment of the colonies and the United States of America. The Declaration of Independence includes four references: “God,” “Creator,” “Supreme Judge,” and “Divine Providence.” The U.S. Constitution mentions “the Lord” once in reference to its ratification by the states³ and, in honoring the Sabbath, refers to not counting Sundays in the ten-day limit for the president to veto a bill after he receives it from Congress.⁴ Moreover, all fifty state constitutions mention their dedication to God, Providence, or the Lord. The God to which they refer is the God of the Bible, the Christian God. Most newspapers in the colonial era were explicitly Christian, and 75 percent maintained that status in 1830, according to one poll.⁵

Furthermore, many immigrants migrated to this country for religious liberty, which meant the freedom to choose their religion without government compulsion. For a large majority of these people, the choice in their native countries was between a form of Protestantism and Catholicism—Christian religions.

For more about the endless examples of documents that indicate the nation’s founding upon Christian precepts, please read *Original Intent* by David Barton, *America’s Providential History* by Mark Beliles and Stephen McDowell, and primary sources such as the Virginia Charters (1606, 1609, 1612), the Mayflower Compact (1620), the First Thanksgiving Proclamation (1676), the Declaration of Independence (1776), and so forth.

In his first inaugural address on April 30, 1789, President George Washington summed up the importance of the Christian faith to the survival of democracy. “It would be peculiarly improper to omit, in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe. . . . The propitious smiles of Heaven can

never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained.”⁶

1960s Rebellion

Along with the hippie rebellion against authority, tradition, and morals in the 1960s came the more aggressive assault on faith. No authority figure, including parents, teachers, pastors, priests, and police, was exempt from the hippies' disaffection. In a nutshell, they dismissed standards, restrictions, and boundaries on behavior in exchange for free love, drug use, and the elimination of inhibitions. The consequences of this trade in values continue to plague our society today. We can see them in the acceptance of behavior once considered deviant, the actions of teenagers, promiscuity, sexually transmitted diseases, the number of children born out of wedlock, and the crude content of popular entertainment.

The hippies especially targeted the Christian faith and church due to what they perceived as “oppressive” regulations against human nature that prevented others from feeling good and enjoying life. They perceived those commandments as old-fashioned restrictions that had outlived their usefulness; they were the previous generations' way of doing things. Now times were changing, and the rules of personal conduct had to change with them; those decrees stifled creativity, self-expression, self-actualization (reaching self-fulfillment or full potential), personal enjoyment, instant gratification, and true freedom.

Notice that these terms all focus on self. People are perceived as their own individual, god, and center of their unique universe; therefore, they worship themselves as they strive to attain peace, happiness, and success. These three goals, the means to arriving there, and the definition of right and wrong are open to individual interpretation and definition; thus moral relativism supplants absolute right and wrong as a person's guide in his journey

through life. Their value system is individualistic, subjective, and ever changing. The convenience of this philosophy is that one can change his mind and morals at any time. No circumstance or consequence is problematic because people can alter their values to suit themselves regardless of the effect their actions have on others.

This leads us to another side effect of the hippie revolution: the belief that the consequences of one's actions are neither the person's fault nor his responsibility to bear. For example, let's say someone contracts a sexually transmitted disease. It would become the government's responsibility—and thus the taxpayers' burden—to fund research to find a cure or provide medication so the individual could be healed or comfortably live with the disease. Then the person continues to negligently engage in the behavior that caused the problem. In addition, schools and other agencies should provide contraceptives to save these rebels from their own recklessness and lack of self-control. Notice that this last term, self-control, is absent from the previous list of words that focus on self, as are the terms self-discipline, self-reliance, self-sacrifice, and selflessness. This is not an oversight by the proponents of the rebellion. After all, they would say we are all humans with natural instincts no one can expect us to control.

The state of culture has declined to the point that cities provide clean needles to drug users in an attempt to prevent them from contracting HIV or hepatitis through the sharing of contaminated needles. Somehow this service is supposed to help people, but one cannot extinguish immoral behavior by providing tools that promote it. Is it possible that those who institute such programs do not consider the behavior undesirable? After all, an addict is often in a state of dependence.

The incidence of HIV or any other disease will not decline because clean needles are provided to drug users. This brand of charity encourages others to engage in such behavior; at some point clean needles will not be available, and the addict will seek his fix

regardless of the risk. Has offering condoms in schools reduced the teen pregnancy rate? Has the right to an abortion lowered the number of women who unintentionally become pregnant? Does inventing medications that suppress the effects of an STD discourage people from participating in risky behavior or decrease the number contracting such disease? These questions are rhetorical, for the answer to them is obvious.

Government Grows

What we see here is the moral confusion that results from rejecting Christian principles and replacing them with relativism and self-worship. We also see how the government gains increased control and influence over its populace. If people cannot discipline themselves and regulate their own behavior, the government will finance their needs or provide for them through products, research, or services. At some point, what the government offers becomes restrictive, such as services through a government-run health care system. The government's cost becomes overwhelming, so the government must enact repressive laws or regulations to try to control the people it is allegedly assisting. Such restrictions lead to rationed health care, which will occur under Obamacare.

We live in a licentious society; eventually the government will be forced to pass stringent legislation to restrict behavior and manage its citizens. This is happening already. For example, the government forces us to wear seatbelts, has reduced the DUI level from .10 to .08, has proposed regulations to require green standards in home construction, and has required consumers to install certain light bulbs in homes.

Automaker Audi's commercial with the "green police" is more creepy than funny. In this ad, the "green police" confront people about excessive hot water temperature settings and the use of incandescent light bulbs, plastic bags, batteries, and foam cups,

among other things. The ad reminds us of those who disguise their true opinions through “humor.” Some of these initiatives sound altruistic on the surface, but the federal government’s role is not to care for people or supervise them in an oppressive fashion. Eventually others expect this behavior from government; they become more dependent on it, and in small increments the government assumes greater power over time.

Statists have promoted and capitalized on this rebellion against God and church authority since at least the 1960s. Through the public and higher education systems, they have excluded, criticized, and satirized faith while encouraging moral relativism. Once God has been excluded from the equation, someone or something else must take His place. The Supreme Court banned prayer in public schools in *Engel v. Vitale* (1962) though Bible study and Christian education had been part of the system since the nation’s founding.

Though some individuals worship themselves as deities, they are incapable of caring for themselves in all circumstances. Recall the above discussion about the treatment of STDs. The statist government ultimately steps in and fills the void created by the abandonment of religious faith; it is the all-powerful government that becomes society’s savior. With God eliminated from culture, the government inefficiently and incapably attempts to become god for its citizens, vainly and tirelessly trying to provide for their every circumstance. Schools become “little brother” in the government’s scheme, providing every possible service to keep the populace depending on it. But the relativistic statists actually believe they have the skills, abilities, and wisdom to accomplish this goal. Hippies should add two additional terms to those regarding self from the 1960s revolution: conceited and self-deluded.

Unfortunately, liberals who have assumed government positions have been seduced into believing that they are God (but they are really god) and that they can provide for the needs of their citizens. It is sad for them and the populace that they believe this delusion.

Since they embrace this belief, they continue to indoctrinate citizens aggressively and without shame, beginning in elementary school, continuing in high school, and finishing in institutions of higher learning. The media are their strong ally in spreading their messianic message while discrediting the Christian faith and religion. With the passing of each successive generation, the statist's worldview gains a stronger foothold in society at the expense of America's Christian foundation.

FAMILY

The second cornerstone the liberal statist has pilloried is the family. The Puritans correctly believed that the family is the instrumental ingredient to a stable society.⁷ If the family is stable, it bequeaths its strength to the community, the state, and the nation. The socialist also recognizes the importance of strong families in a country. The problem is, loyalty to the family means less dependence on the government and its influence. Does it then make sense that statist want weak families? Probably not, unless one is obsessed with the accumulation of power and influence.

How do weak families benefit socialist-leaning liberals? The answer is simple: if people lack parents or family members in whom they can rely, the government has more emptiness to fill. Gangs or other criminal groups sometimes fill this space, but the void also provides an opportunity for the government to increase power, which is manifested in the public school system. Moreover, if families teach values to children, they can pass on a value system counter to that of secularists.

Promiscuity

Another negative consequence of the 1960s hippie revolution is the family's breakdown. As many grew in their desire to experience free love, unplanned pregnancies multiplied and led to an increase

in single-parent families. Furthermore, the value of marriage began to decline. Divorce and remarriage occur more frequently today than ever before. In 1890 one out of every seventeen marriages (6 percent) ended in divorce;⁸ by 1990 the divorce rate had risen to 50 percent, where it has remained according to 2008 preliminary data.⁹

One negative result of the high divorce ratio is the raising of children in single-parent households or in homes with a stepparent. Though not all of these situations are bad, they certainly are not ideal. Many children are raised successfully by a single parent, stepparent, or grandparent; however, this isn't always the case. Many single parents struggle to raise their children. Many grandparents rear their grandchildren due to the parents' negligence. In many circumstances, a single mother raises several children, sometimes from different fathers.

Also, when a teenager bears a daughter out of wedlock, her child regularly repeats the cycle of teen parenthood. Boys suffer most when they lack a positive male role model at home and often become the next generation of absentee fathers, sometimes fathering multiple children to different mothers. This is the proud legacy of the free love movement. My purpose is not necessarily to denigrate those in this situation but to explain the consequences of the free love mentality.

Stating that premarital sex and unwanted pregnancies occurred before the 1960s shouldn't be necessary here, but if I do not, liberals across the fruited plain will accuse me of making that insinuation. The point is, since the free love of the sixties, this problem has only increased. When I graduated from high school in 1985, a few girls from my school became teenage mothers. Before the explosion of promiscuity in the 1960s, such an occurrence was rare. Between 1962 and 2001, births to unmarried teenagers increased from 15.7 to 78.9 percent.¹⁰ In addition, the percent of all births to unmarried women rose from 5.9 percent (1962) to 33.5 percent (2001), and births per one thousand unmarried women between the ages of

fifteen and forty-four increased from 21.9 to 45 during the same years.¹¹ Is it coincidental that this explosion occurred after the 1962 *Engel* decision that banned prayer in public schools (not to overlook *Roe v. Wade* in 1973)?

Unless we are liberals, we know that single-parent families are not the best environments for raising children. We also know that unwed teens becoming parents is far from ideal. Of course, a number of single parents, largely mothers, do an outstanding job in this endeavor. But both mothers and fathers have unique roles to fill in the multiple facets of their children's development; children acquire positive traits from both their mother and father. The fact that fathers and mothers bestow important characteristics the other parent is incapable of passing along cannot be understated. For example, it is beneficial for girls to see their fathers model how to treat a woman; it is also important for boys to learn how to be strong from their father.

Sure, some parents are abusive, controlling, or neglectful, but this problem does not justify the disparaging of the family. One should not project exceptions on a population to generalize experiences, yet this is the "reality" liberals often create to advance their agenda; they dwell in what I dub the "valley of exceptions." Overall, a man and woman who fulfill their proper roles allow children to develop emotionally, intellectually, physically, and morally. The connection between broken families and crime, drug use, alcohol consumption, promiscuity, gang activity, and the high school dropout rate is well documented.

We cannot overlook the prevalence of divorce in this equation. The rate of divorce at 50 percent has contributed significantly to single-parent or unstable families. Though children may visit the parent (usually the father) with whom they do not reside, the ideal family life is broken. Ask any parents who see their child on weekends if they believe the separation has a detrimental effect on their child and their ability to parent; most likely the answer will

be yes. Even if the child lives in a two-parent household with a parent and stepparent, valid concerns arise about divergent values being taught or about parents playing children against each other. Again, in some arrangements, dilemmas like this are absent, but in many cases, the problem affects children psychologically. Moreover, stepparents or live-in partners often impact a child's psyche and development. This scenario regularly leads to the child's future promiscuity and begins the process of the child repeating a broken home later in his life.

Even when an intact, two-parent marriage is in place, parents regularly rely on day care, babysitters, or nannies to nurture their children while they work or pursue recreational activities. As a result, parental influence on children lessens, and children form their values, morals, philosophy of life, and so on from a hodgepodge of sources, including pop culture, friends, maybe gangs, and even the curriculum learned in the education system.

Public School Role

Probably one of the biggest influences on the breakdown of the family is the public school system. From ages five to seventeen, most students spend the bulk of their time at school, with many beginning school in prekindergarten or day care. The average school day is seven hours long, excluding after-school activities such as tutoring, sports, and clubs. Students spend a minimum of thirty-five hours a week at school. If they play a sport like basketball, for example, they easily spend fifty-four hours a week at school when we factor in three nights a week for practice and two nights for games. Practice averages two hours per night, while games can constitute up to seven hours of time when we factor in junior varsity and varsity games each night, with games beginning at six o'clock and ending at nine. If a game is somewhere other than the child's school, more time must be added for travel.

At the least, then, students attend school thirty-five hours per week for thirteen of the most formative years of their lives (excluding preschool). During that time, students often receive instruction with a liberal emphasis on topics that sharply contrast with what their parents believe. These topics can include environmentalism, sex education (including promiscuity, homosexuality, and abortion), diversity, revisionist history, and secularism (atheism, relativism, and evolution). American ideals are also attacked, such as prayer in school, the right to bear arms, and patriotism.

Of course, when teachers present the theory of evolution, they omit alternate and prohibited viewpoints such as creationism or intelligent design. But this practice is true with all topics. Case in point: when they teach about climate change, they present only the alarmist, man-made global warming indoctrination. If they mention the opposing viewpoint, they do so only in a critical manner. When they teach liberalism in general, they often present current events only from the liberal point of view; this presentation includes the use of liberal political cartoons to illustrate a point. These cartoons either promote the liberal opinion or criticize the conservative one. In addition, teachers use curriculum written from the liberal stance, so these activities simply support the curriculum.

Real Example of Indoctrination

Another example from environmentalism highlights this propensity. When indoctrinating students in the environmentalist agenda, teachers say that too many trees have been cut down and that few are left. As a result, we must recycle, constrict the lumber industry, and halt deforestation. In 2000 *Forest Voice*, an extremely liberal, earth-worshipping periodical that promotes the radical environmentalist agenda, was distributed to several teachers, including me. This particular issue included maps that purportedly indicated the number of trees in America during certain periods of

our history. Shading on the maps allegedly showed the number of trees in the United States in 1620, 1850, and 1999.

As you can guess, the shading decreased as the dates progressed. According to the 1999 map, no trees existed in over 95 percent of the Appalachian Mountains. States such as Virginia and Pennsylvania contained very few or no trees. Furthermore, the 1620 map indicated that up to that time no trees had been cleared in the eastern half of the United States.¹² Of course, the information conveniently omitted the fact that Plymouth had been built on cleared land, which may have been the site of an Indian village years earlier.¹³ And we know that hundreds of tribes and villages existed in America during colonization, as is often emphasized in public school and university classrooms across the fruited plain.

Anyone observing the local environment in which he lives should easily dismiss the *Forest Voice* and the assertion that it makes; unfortunately, many teachers subscribe to such foolishness and teach it to their students. As a matter of fact, many citizens ingest whatever information they are given without questioning it to any degree.

Since I was a sensible, intelligent teacher, I guided my students through the analysis of these maps. I asked them what the maps showed, and they stated the number of trees in America. I then asked them to think about what the 1999 map was showing and to compare it to the community in which they lived. At this point in the discussion, they were a little slow, so I asked if any of them lived near A. P. Hill, a military base in the county. A couple of pupils said yes. I asked them if trees were there. They said yes. I asked by a show of hands how many were hunters and asked if they hunted in their county; they said yes.

Then the lightbulbs illuminated, and they shined brilliantly. The students noticed that the map showed no trees in Virginia; they noticed that though A. P. Hill military base comprises about 25 percent of the county, mostly woods, no trees appeared on the

map. They recognized that the 1999 map showed few trees in the Shenandoah Valley, even though voluminous acres of forests exist there. They noticed the same discrepancy when they examined the Rockies and other places in the United States with which they were familiar. After that discussion, I showed pictures of forests in Pennsylvania that had been farmland forty years before. I explained that the forests had retaken the fields and pastures. I showed them pictures of trees lining both sides of Interstates 80 and 76 in Pennsylvania for miles; none of these trees had appeared on the *Forest Voice's* map.

My students learned the lesson that you cannot trust a printed source just because it says something. They learned that they must closely examine any information given to them and compare what they are told with what they experience and observe on a daily basis. They learned that they cannot trust education because the goal of some educators is to intentionally mislead them. They learned to think analytically and rationally. Regrettably, educators rarely teach these lessons and skills in the education system as they indoctrinate students in liberalism. Let me remind you that such “education” is not confined to the public school system. It is probably more rampant in institutes of higher education—or should I say “higher indoctrination”?

Let me repeat. As the family is depreciated, the school system (“little brother”) steps in to fill that role. In the process it transmits its values, including the religion of environmentalism, to children.

Scores of other resources, including textbooks, advance the radical, environmentalist, and liberal agenda but usually in a more subtle fashion. It is unfortunate that most teachers have succumbed to this philosophy, lack the ability to think through issues critically, and thus impart these beliefs onto children. The sadder fact is that many of these children grow up and go on to college, where the indoctrination continues more aggressively and with less restraint. In public schools, parents can be involved, can be heard, and can

have some influence. In higher education, however, children are separated from their parents. It is an accepted fact that parents are not involved in their child's higher education other than giving them money and advising them to go to class, study, and get good grades. The saddest fact is that these effectively indoctrinated graduates enter the workforce, many as teachers, and believe, pass on, and promote this brainwashing.

Government Grows

Therefore, the cycle continues, the impact in the following generation deepens, and secularists more easily advance their agenda. Once the old guard of teachers retires—those not exposed to such miseducation and pressure to accept a certain agenda—a well-trained, loyal corps of indoctrinated, liberal, environmentalist cadets replaces it. Fortunately, not all students are gullible and thus consumed by this indoctrination; however, they are an ever-shrinking minority.

As the years pass by, statisticians call to extend the school day and school year as well as to lower the school age. Just after I started writing this book, President Obama announced his plans to do just that. If any of these changes occur—the lower school age is already common though not mandated—they will translate into more time children spend away from their parents (and their value systems) and in the liberal school system, “educated” according to its precepts.

The school system supplants parents and the family. The liberal asserts that because programs such as Head Start benefit children, all children should start school early. The statistician says that American students need more time in school so they can compete with their international counterparts. To rationalize school day extensions, the socialist presents data showing our academic inferiority compared to students from other nations. Also, as time goes by, students are

brainwashed into believing the supremacy of the state over God and family. They believe government should determine the solution to all problems, struggles, or hardships. They learn that reliance on the statist ruling class is good. They exchange God-given freedoms, upon which our nation was founded, with self-gratifying freedoms that erode personal responsibility and increase dependence on the state, thus leading to tyranny.

The unstated goal is to decrease the time children spend with their parents so the state can indoctrinate them and make them dependent on it through “little brother.” This is not the ambition of teachers; rather, they are steered by the whims of those who determine the philosophy of education. Education leaders often say that the school is the most important thing in a child’s life. That’s strange because I was raised to believe that God and family were the most valuable things in life. These so-called leaders may deny that they want to train a state-dependent populace, but if you pay close attention to what they say and do, their words and actions betray them.

Citizens have made choices that have allowed liberals to advance this agenda and thus increase our problems. Many parents have chosen to work two jobs for material gain at the expense of their children’s upbringing and welfare. They have relegated the rearing of their children to strangers so they can have multiple cars, electronic devices, vacations, country club memberships, oversized houses, and so on. I must say that owning possessions is okay as long as people are spending within their means and not sacrificing their children in the process.

This is not to say that parents should withdraw their children from public schools. As long as a parent is home when a child returns from school, mothers and fathers monitor what their child is learning, families eat dinner together, parents stay involved in their child’s life through college, and parents impart their morals and values to their children, then the family will be fine. As a public

school educator, I have seen a number of parents take those steps and raise morally strong children, whom “little brother” has not decapitated. But keeping the school system at bay is a battle that requires a concerted effort, high parental involvement, and a strong spirit of discernment.

The outcry in opposition to vouchers or school choice has nothing to do with what is best for students. Instead, the challengers wish to maintain power and control over the education of students. The teachers’ unions, public school officials, developers of teacher education programs in colleges and universities, and statisticians in government know that many families would prefer school choice as an alternate route to the public schools. But this choice would undermine the liberal’s goal of indoctrination by offering undesirable competition in the education of students. The only way to influence a whole society is to force it into your modality of education. Though they abhor the situation, relativists can tolerate those currently educated at home or in non-statist private schools, but they would not survive the mass exodus that could occur under a voucher or school choice program.

One educational leader expressed his disagreement with charter schools. He once said that a politician supporting the measure had control of the money and that more charter schools or school choice would give him and his supporters additional money, control, and power. This leader was unable to grasp that his reason for opposing school choice was the same as his reason for preserving the current public school system—money. The current public school system holds the money and thus maintains control and power it has held for a long time.

In summary, liberals have weakened the family through the free love movement of the 1960s and the ever-expanding, influential education system. The phenomenon of the sixties helped increase the number of single-parent families and divorces, leading to an unforeseen acceptance of the belief that the importance of the

two-parent family is exaggerated. At the same time, the breakdown of the family opened a portal for the government to become more influential through the public school system. This expansion of power is justified to “help” and “benefit” children. Moreover, the public school system and institutes of higher learning attack the importance of family.

The weakening of the family and the supplanting of family values, many of which were Christian, with relativistic ones have allowed the statist via the education system to gradually replace parents as the guiding force and authority figure in the lives of children. I have dedicated more space to the education system later in this book.

PATRIOTISM

The final cornerstone to be attacked and destroyed is patriotism or pride in the United States of America. Many list nationalism, a synonym for patriotism, along with European rivalries, militarism, and alliances, as one of the causes of the world wars. Simply, nationalism is devotion to national interests, unity, and independence, especially of one nation above all others. In other words, nationalism is pride in one’s country and culture. Liberals generally frown on patriotism because being proud of America and promoting our interests create dissension and hurt feelings, which cause conflict and lead to war. How dare we say we are better than any other nation? How dare a liberal assert that his philosophy is superior to that of a conservative? Ah, the hypocrisy evident in all things liberal.

Textbooks began teaching nationalism with a negative connotation, at some point attacking American patriotism. Unlike their assault against the previous two cornerstones, socialist-leaning liberals often masquerade as American patriots when they talk about America’s prestige or about returning America to her

greatness. Their goal, however, is to destroy traditional America and transform it into a socialist, secular, relativistic nation. The actions of statist reveal their intentions despite their dialogue to the contrary. Statists continue to trample on the Constitution and the founding principles of our nation, of which our Founding Fathers so eloquently wrote and conveyed. Liberals continue to harp about a “living Constitution,” legislate from the Supreme Court instead of through the legislative branch, disregard votes on referendums, and increase federal government power in defiance of the principles of federalism. Federalism is defined as the division of power between the states and federal government.

Examples of the Supreme Court legislating from the bench include the following:

- Allowing Congress to regulate intrastate commerce (a state right), which is “closely related” to interstate commerce (*NLRB v. Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation, 1937*; *Wickard v. Filburn, 1942*; and *Maryland v. Wirtz, 1968*)¹⁴
- Applying the First Amendment to state and local governments and invoking the manufactured “wall of separation” phrase (*Everson v. Board of Education, 1947*)¹⁵
- Creating the allegedly constitutional “right to privacy” in cases involving contraceptives for married couples (Connecticut, *Griswold v. Connecticut, 1965*)¹⁶ and unmarried individuals (Massachusetts, *Eisenstadt v. Baird, 1972*)¹⁷
- Legalizing abortion (*Roe v. Wade, 1973*)¹⁸
- Overturning state laws that prohibit partial-birth murder (*Stenberg v. Carhart, 2000*)¹⁹
- Granting to foreign enemies of the United States what is supposed to be a citizen’s right to a fair trial (*Rasul v. Bush, 2004*).²⁰

Some may agree with an adult's right to use contraception, but the federal government's duty is not to grant such a right or to fabricate one in the Constitution, where it does not exist. Issues such as these are local or state concerns, which the local or state government should appropriately handle. If you would like to read more about the Supreme Court's seizure of power, I highly recommend Mark Levin's *Men in Black*. Also, to read about the statist's continuous grab for power in contravention to our Constitution's precepts, I strongly recommend *Liberty and Tyranny*, also by Mr. Levin.

Why Criticize Patriotism?

Why the attack on American patriotism? I have identified three reasons for this assault. First, as mentioned, statist believe patriotism is evil because love of country promotes too much self-centered pride in one's own nation. This pride then creates conflict with other countries and causes wars.

Second, relativists are really anti-American. Socialists at heart, they believe they have been ordained with wisdom and knowledge their subjects are unable to attain or comprehend. The American ideals of democracy and government by the people threaten their beliefs in aristocracy, dictatorship, and even monarchy. In their minds the American people are too stupid to govern themselves and will not survive unless supreme leaders save them from their own idiocy. If socialist-leaning liberals made public statements to this effect, a large part of the electorate would reject them—with the exception of those who either support socialism or do not understand the breadth of its ideology.

How much responsibility does the education system bear for those who lack the ability to think analytically? The liberal-leaning education system has misinformed and poorly educated many. In addition to schools, the media have falsely reported on a variety

of issues, and numerous citizens are too lazy or disinterested to seek the truth.

Third, statistis undertake this strategy to destroy the United States of America, the only nation that can protect, preserve, and advance democracy and liberty. Once they have achieved their objective, they will reestablish the old order of aristocracy throughout the globe under a one-world government. Here, a small group of “wise” rulers will care for the incompetent “serfs” of the world; if you doubt this, observe the actions of the United Nations. Therefore, socialists are duplicitous elitists. They make deceptive statements to the general public about loving America while simultaneously cringing at such sentiments as they gradually, intentionally, and methodically dismantle our founding precepts.

America’s Principles Despised

From the moment the Founding Fathers presented the Declaration of Independence to King George III of England, the battle against democracy and liberty was born. This battle ensued due to the Declaration’s bold statements about the social compact between citizens and their rulers as well as the law (or laws) of nature. The social compact (sometimes referred to as the “social contract”) states that “men...unite into a community for... peaceable living...in a secure enjoyment of their properties.”²¹ The Declaration of Independence states, “Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” The social compact also endorses revolution as a last resort to change corrupt government. Again I quote the Declaration: “That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it.”

The law of nature or natural rights states, “The Law of Nature stands as an eternal rule to all men...Laws human must be made according to the general laws of Nature, and...Scripture.”²² The

Founding Fathers first mention the laws of nature in the Declaration of Independence by asserting that people can assume “the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and Nature’s God entitle them.” They then wrote that “all men...are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” So these are natural, God-given rights as opposed to ones stipulated by allegedly God-chosen kings or aristocrats.

Although the likes of John Locke, Sir William Blackstone, Richard Hooker, and Thomas Hobbes discussed these doctrines, many considered it outlandish that a bunch of insubordinate rabble rousers would not only issue such a proclamation but also deliver it to the greatest nation and king on earth at the time, genuinely believing they could establish a government without a monarch. Protesting taxation without representation, having a tea party, or engaging in a minor massacre was one thing, but creating a brand-new form of government was completely different. It was intolerable and unimaginable.

As we know, the colonists won the War of Independence and thus founded the United States of America with thirteen original states. Of course, none of the world powers at the time—England, France, Spain, Denmark, the Netherlands, or Russia—believed this experiment in self-government would succeed. Those nations lacked the wisdom to recognize that God was on America’s side as He helped it defeat the strongest army in the world—but that is a different story to be dissected later.

After the Revolutionary War, Europe patiently waited for this experiment in representative government to fail. Several glimpses of hope came with the Whiskey Rebellion (1794), the election of 1800, the second engagement with Britain in the War of 1812, the Mexican War (1846–48), and the Civil War (1861–65). But the young country held its own, and the European hope of dividing the nascent American nation after its anticipated self-destruction

never materialized. (I will examine these events in greater detail in a later chapter.)

America has endured for over 235 years since its founding, but the threats against liberty persist. Especially since President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his New Deal program of the 1930s, the federal government has been expanding its power not only in defiance of our Constitution's precepts but also to the detriment of American citizens. Today, the more people statisticians can convince that America is evil, greedy, imperialistic, and selfish, the more quickly they can create their dominant, oppressive, controlling central government. Once they have annihilated American democratic principles, they can restore aristocratic ideals. Attacking patriotism since at least the 1960s in schools and later in the media and popular culture has allowed elitists to erode American pride as they bolster their power and influence. Or has it?

Patriotism Thrives

Despite innumerable efforts over forty years to thwart Americans' pride in their country and delegitimize faith in God through anti-American and anti-Christian propaganda, socialist-leaning, secular statisticians have failed to change the hearts of the majority of Americans in these matters.

One must simply look at the reactions of U.S. citizens to the horrific terrorist acts of September 11, 2001. It would be impossible to estimate the number of expressions of patriotism and faith throughout the country after that day. American flags appeared everywhere and on everything imaginable (and still do)—yards, windows, cars, T-shirts, jackets, towels, bathing suits, lapel pins, team uniforms, hats, dresses, ties, magnets, and more. People sang the national anthem with an increased sense of pride, zeal, and fervor as giant American flags were unfurled at stadiums of college and professional teams. Phrases honoring the greatness of

the United States appeared on marquee of schools, businesses, and churches. Moreover, people prayed and referred to prayer, displayed “God Bless America” slogans, expressed their faith in God in a multitude of venues, and followed the national anthem with a rendition of “God Bless America” or “America the Beautiful” at sporting events and other functions.

Liberals had spent at least four decades forcing anti-American propaganda and revisionist history down people’s throats with little resistance or the provision of equal time to the opposing point of view. For more than forty years socialists had berated faith in God, especially Christianity, under the manufactured guise of separation of church and state. Statists had labored forty-plus years with near monopoly status in the media and education systems to indoctrinate our citizens and youth to hate America and abandon their “childish” Christian or religious beliefs. Despite their efforts, elitists witnessed after 9/11 that the fruits of their incessant labors were paltry, rotted, and rancid. Secularists observed that over four decades of constant, relentless, well-orchestrated indoctrination were a dismal failure. They realized that blatant dishonesty, revisionism, misreporting, miseducation, and criticism had not taken deep root in the American psyche. And they loathed it! So they amped up their offensives to a new level of intensity. Such disappointment may explain their desire to advance their agenda through the “people-less” judicial branch, as previously discussed.

After more than forty years of indoctrination to the contrary, bountiful expressions of patriotism and faith were unfathomable in their minds. Such sentiments were beyond the socialists’ comprehension. You could hear it in their voices, see it on their faces, and read it in their articles. A certain sarcasm, contempt, and cynicism were evident when they reported on acts of patriotism and expressions of faith. How could this be? They spent almost a half-century breaking down American pride and its Christian foundation just as a cult leader might break the spirit of his

followers until they exchange their values for his leadership. Yet how could this outpouring of patriotism and faith be the return on their investment?

Not unlike the Japanese military in World War II or Osama bin Laden on September 11, I believe they underestimated the traditions and principles upon which our great nation is constructed—freedom, family, Christianity, hard work, as well as “Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” Only statist, who detest these ideals, could miscalculate the importance of their influence and imprint on the American spirit. They continue to fight, and they are making headway, but they realized after that terrible day that they had miscalculated their degree of advancement.