

The Seamless Web: Minnesota's New Education System

12 The Ideology of Revolution

People often ask: why is this happening? Why would anyone force this kind of monstrous education system on all our schools? We will be unable to answer that question if we have an unrealistic view of human nature—if, for example, we mistakenly believe that people are inherently good.

On this critical issue, philosopher and talk show host, Dennis Prager, said:

To believe that human nature is basically good—after Auschwitz, the Gulag, Rwanda, Armenia, and Tibet, just to mention some of the the horrors of the twentieth century alone—is a statement of faith, as nonempirical as the most wishful religious belief. Whenever I meet people who persist in the believing in the essential goodness of human nature, I know I have met people for whom evidence is irrelevant.⁸⁷

As mentioned previously, the revolution in education is the natural result of the progressive education movement, a movement which includes the faulty assumption that people are inherently good, a movement which also denies the existence of natural law. The education policies which follow from this vantage point, again as described by Prager, take the following form:

Those who believe that evil comes from outside people work on changing outside forces rather than on changing the evildoer's values. It is the dominant view among academics, policy makers, social workers, and psychotherapists that society must focus on the environment that produces rapists and murderers, not on their values and character development. For example, when irresponsible young men impregnate irresponsible young women, it is not better values that they need, but more sex education and better access to condoms.⁸⁸

Prager is correct in these statements. It is also quite obvious that the new system of education is a direct result of the world-view of its architects. What is this world-view? It can be found throughout the documents of the new system. For example, an important segment of this philosophy is recorded in the SCANS report. The report said:

About 150 years ago a French visitor named Alexis de Tocqueville described the United States as a "land of wonders" in which "what is not done is only what [they have] not yet attempted to do." Through the generations the people of the United States have proudly lived up to that description. American ingenuity and creativity expanded the frontiers of technology. Our science and engineering took men and women into space. And American know-how gave the United States pride of place in the world economy. Ingenuity, creativity, hard work and know-how made the American dream come true for millions of our citizens. Much of the rest of the world is now trying to live it.⁸⁹

This statement of philosophy by SCANS is typical of the many similar statements made by backers of the revolution. It may look good at first glance, but consider carefully what it says. It identifies four factors which it claims explain America's greatness:

1. ingenuity
2. creativity
3. hard work
4. know-how.

Are these really the factors which made America great? Compare United States citizens on these criteria to citizens of other countries. Is it true, for example, that Americans have more ingenuity than people in Communist China? Is it true that we are more creative than the population of Venice? Is it true that we have worked harder than the oppressed peoples in the former Soviet Union? To identify these four factors as supposedly explaining America's greatness is almost too absurd for serious comment. Yet this is what the writers of the document apparently believe.

Why did America become great? **Our nation became great because it has been free! We are the only superpower in the world today because we have been free!** Nowhere in the new system of education can we find anything approaching an adequate recognition of this critical fact.

And what is it that the education revolutionaries would throw in the trash can of history? It is our freedom. Remember, for example, how the Minnesota performance packages are controlled by non-elected bureaucrats. Remember how STW creates new governing boards which are non-elected. Remember how these boards allocate money and are put in the position of deciding what types of workers our schools must now produce. Remember how teachers find themselves under audits by department bureaucrats who will tell them what to teach and how to teach it. Remember how schools are given no choice about the Profile of Learning, or about performance packages, or about Goals 2000. Remember how STW intends to enroll every business and every person from cradle to grave. Remember how SCANS utilizes a central planning attempt to dictate the "necessary skills" for most lines of employment. Remember how data privacy is nonexistent under the new centralized computer system of record keeping.

Connect the dots. What do we lose in all this? We lose our freedom. We lose the one central principle that has made America great. The education revolutionaries have created a system to control people, not to liberate them.

Why? Why are the proponents of the revolution—people such as Marc Tucker, Ira Magaziner, Robert Reich, Hillary Clinton and others—doing this to our schools? The reason, as they have said many, many times, is because they want to "reinvent education." Their dream is not to improve education, but to reinvent it. Why do they want to reinvent education? The reason is because they want to reinvent the world. The revolution in education is a necessary means to their much bigger end.

It is not the citizens who are calling for this reinvention. It is not the teachers, not the parents and not the school board members who are calling for the reinvention. It is the revolutionaries at the top. They are true believers in the vision of creating a brave new world.⁹⁰ They will be the architects, they will be the builders, they are intoxicated with their utopian vision—and they know that their dream cannot come true among a people that is free.

Notes:

87. Dennis Prager, *Think a Second Time*, (New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 1995) p. 4.

88. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

89. SCANS Report, p. 3.

90. The chair of the Minnesota Senate's Children, Families and Learning Committee, Larry Pogemiller, said, "We will back off the Grad Standards over my dead body." (MREA newsletter, January 4, 1999.) Such people are true believers. One only wishes that Pogemiller was willing to give his life for freedom, not tyranny.