

The Curriculum Creators – Part 5

More about John Dewey, the Marxist, who was given our education system to mold for questionable purposes.

From Charlotte Iserbyt's *The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America*, in which she quotes Samuel Blumenfeld in his book, *The Whole Language/OBE Fraud* to further examine Dewey's perspective:

What kind of curriculum would fit the school that was a mini-cooperative society? Dewey's recommendation was indeed radical: build the curriculum not around academic subjects but around occupational activities which provided maximum opportunities for peer interaction and socialization. Since the beginning of Western civilization, the school curriculum was centered around the development of academic skills, the intellectual faculties, and high literacy.

Dewey wanted to change all of that. Why? Because high literacy produced that abominable form of independent intelligence which was basically, as Dewey believed, anti-social. Thus, from Dewey's point of view, the school's primary commitment to literacy was indeed the key to the whole problem.

In 1898, Dewey wrote an essay, "The Primary-Education Fetish," in which he explained exactly what he meant:

There is . . . a false education god whose idolators are legion, and whose cult influences the entire educational system. This is language study—the study not of foreign language, but of English; not in higher, but in primary education. It is almost an unquestioned assumption, of educational theory and practice both, that the first three years of a child's school life shall be mainly taken up with learning to read and write his own language. If we add to this the learning of a certain amount of numerical combinations, we have the pivot about which primary education swings.... It does not follow, however, that conditions—social, industrial and intellectual—have undergone such a radical change, that the time has come for a thoroughgoing examination of the emphasis put upon linguistic work in elementary instruction.... The plea for the predominance of learning to read in early school life because of the great importance attaching to literature seems to me a perversion.

For a nation that had been able to point with pride to extraordinary advances in all areas of endeavor carried out by individuals, with no assistance whatsoever from the government, the early years of the twentieth century surely reflected a "Turning of the Tides." An alien collectivist (socialist) philosophy, much of which came from Europe, crashed onto the shores of our nation, bringing with it radical changes in economics, politics, and education, funded—surprisingly enough—by several wealthy American families and their tax-exempt foundations.

The goal of these wealthy families and their foundations—a seamless non-competitive global system for commerce and trade—when stripped of flowery expressions of concern for minorities, the less fortunate, etc., represented the initial stage of what this author now refers to as the deliberate dumbing down of America.

Seventy years later, the carefully laid plans to change America from a sovereign, constitutional republic with a free enterprise economic base to just one of many nations in an international socialist (collectivist) system (New World Order) are apparent. Only a dumbed down population, with no memory of America's roots as a prideful nation, could be expected to willingly succumb to the global workforce training planned by the Carnegie Corporation and the

John D. Rockefellers, I and II, in the early twentieth century which is being implemented by the United States Congress in the year 1999.

Dewey also had some interesting views beyond education.

Iserbyt continues: Humanist Manifesto I was originally published in 1933 in the “New Humanist,” (vol. vi., issue 3, 1933), the main publication of the American Humanist Association.

Co-author John Dewey, the noted philosopher and educator, called for a synthesizing of all religions and a “socialized and cooperative economic order.”

The following are excerpts taken from *Secular Humanism and the Schools: The Issue Whose Time Has Come* by Onalee McGraw, Ph.D.:

The basis of humanist belief is that there is no Almighty God, the Creator and Sustainer of life. Humanists believe that man is his own god. They believe that moral values are relative, devised according to the needs of particular people, and that ethics are likewise situational.

Humanists reject Judeo-Christian moral and ethical laws, such as those contained in the Ten Commandments, calling them “dogmatic,” “outmoded,” “authoritarian,” and a hindrance to human progress.

In humanism, self-fulfillment, happiness, love, and justice are found by each man individually, without reference to any divine source. In the Judeo-Christian ethic, there is and can be no real self-fulfillment, happiness, love, or justice on earth that can be found which does not ultimately issue from Almighty God, the Creator and Sustainer.

Several main differences between the humanist ethic and the Judeo-Christian ethic become clear upon reading the Humanist Manifestos I and II (1933 and 1973) and comparing them to the tenets of the Judeo-Christian ethic contained in the Old and New Testaments

At issue is the basic concept concerning the nature of man and the “rules” by which men govern themselves individually, in society, and in government. In the Judeo-Christian ethic, man’s ultimate deliverance and salvation—his finding a means of living together on this planet, in peace, harmony, justice, and love—is through God’s given “rules.”

For the humanist, man’s greatness, his coming of age, his total fulfillment is found when he no longer needs the idea of God. Man gets rid of God, not just to do what he wills but to regain possession of human greatness.

Is Humanistic Education unconstitutional? Inasmuch as humanistic curriculum programs and “values clarification” and “moral education” teaching strategies are based upon materialistic values found only in man’s nature itself, they reject the spiritual and moral tradition of theistic faith and religion. Thus, many parents who subscribe to Judeo-Christian belief oppose humanistic education in the tax-supported schools on grounds that such programs promote and advocate the religion of secular humanism in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The U.S. Supreme Court cited Secular Humanism as a religion in the 1961 case of Torcaso v. Watkins (367 U.S. 488).

Roy Torcaso, the appellant, a practicing Humanist in Maryland, had refused to declare his belief in Almighty God, as then required by State law in order for him to be commissioned as a notary public. The Court held that the requirement for such an oath “invades appellant’s freedom of belief and religion.”

The Court declared in Torcaso that the “no establishment” clause of the First Amendment reached far more than churches of theistic faiths, that it is not the business of

government or its agents to probe beliefs, and that therefore its inquiry is concluded by the fact of the profession of belief.

The Court stated: "We repeat and again reaffirm that neither a State nor the Federal Government can constitutionally force a person to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. Neither can constitutionally pass laws or impose requirements which aid all religions as against non-believers, and neither can aid those religions based on a belief in the existence of God as against those religions founded on different beliefs."

The Court has also stated "Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others."

The Torcaso and Abington cases defined secular humanism as a religion and prohibited the government from establishing a religion of secularism by affirmatively opposing hostility to theistic religion, values, and beliefs.