



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 21, NO. 2, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

SEPTEMBER, 1987

Will We Let the Soviets Teach Our Schoolchildren?

Unknown to most Americans, the United States has agreed to let the Soviets work with us in the development of curricula and teaching materials for elementary and secondary schoolchildren. The purpose of this agreement is to restructure the education of American children.

Chapter I of this on-going saga took place in Moscow on October 24-29, 1985 when the Carnegie Corporation, with the prior approval of the U.S. Department of State and National Security advisers, entered into negotiations to work with the Soviets in the development of curricula and teaching materials for elementary and secondary schoolchildren.

Impossible? Far-fetched? Way out? No, that's exactly what has happened. It's a scandal that is crying out to be investigated.

According to a statement issued by the Acting Deputy Director for Public Affairs of the U.S. Department of Education on February 27, 1986, the State Department "apparently determined that it would be more appropriate for a non-federal organization, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, to represent the United States in the exchange."

Carnegie was represented by Dr. David A. Hamburg, a psychiatrist and president of the Carnegie Corporation, who in an interview in the *Los Angeles Times* of June 12, 1987 stressed "the special position of privately endowed foundations that can operate in areas government may prefer to avoid." The Soviets were represented by Yevgeny P. Velikhov, a vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and a frequent adviser to Soviet boss Gorbachev.

Discussions resulted in an agreement two weeks later that was signed by the Carnegie Corporation with the Soviet Institute of Informatics. The agreement calls for the Soviets and the Americans jointly to develop and test computer software for use in U.S. elementary schools, and to restructure the curriculum and teaching methods of our early elementary grades through the use of computers.

This agreement is ambitious and wide reaching. It also covers bringing Soviet experts here to observe our use of computers in schools and universities, evaluating the training of teachers in the use of computers, and conducting Soviet-American joint experiments.

Chapter II of the saga took place at the Geneva Conference on November 21, 1985 when Secretary of State

George Shultz signed a 41-page General Agreement with the Soviet Government covering a broad range of exchanges and cooperative projects in the education, scientific and cultural fields. The *Washington Post* of November 26, 1985 quoted the agreement as calling for "cooperation in the development of educational exchanges and software for elementary and secondary school instruction."

The activities covered under the U.S./Soviet educational exchange section of the General Agreement, signed at Geneva, are "funded and facilitated by the United States Information Agency (U.S.I.A.)" — using U.S. taxpayer funds — according to Stephen Rhinesmith, Coordinator of the President's U.S./Soviet Exchange Initiative.

The Carnegie Corporation, a longtime and notorious advocate of disarmament and "world interdependence," is using its tax-exempt status to cover the costs of its separate, but related educational exchange agreement with the Soviet Union.

Although sensational in content and effect, the meager publicity surrounding these two agreements suggests that secrecy may have been the intent of those involved. Most of the documentation on the Carnegie agreement is found in one lone *New York Times* article by Fred M. Hechinger dated December 10, 1985 (published two weeks after the Geneva conference). Mr. Hechinger's credibility cannot be disputed since he is the chief education reporter for the *New York Times*, a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation, and served as a delegate to the Moscow meeting.

Controlling Curricula Through Tests

As soon as the ink was dry on these agreements, Carnegie began promoting a plan for the national certification of teachers. Certification has heretofore always been the responsibility of state and local officials. The *New York Times* article did not mention this new Carnegie plan, but the relationship between Carnegie's agreement with the Soviets to restructure American education, and Carnegie's role in the national certification of the teachers who will participate in the "restructured" education system is obvious.

The nationally certified teachers will be required to teach to a much-enlarged national test prepared by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) which, interestingly enough, got off the ground in 1964 with the help of a

large grant from the same Carnegie Corporation. NAEP, a federally- and foundation-funded project has for the past 20 years tested a nationally representative sample of schoolchildren in academic and values/attitudes areas.

NAEP is presently seeking an expansion of its budget from \$4 million to \$26 million a year (more-than-sixfold) in order to vastly increase not only the numbers of children tested but also the number of subject areas tested.

The Nation's Report Card, a lengthy report on NAEP, prepared by a Study Group chaired by former Governor of Tennessee Lamar Alexander, recognized that "there has long been a concern that any sort of nationwide assessment program would somehow generate a single national curriculum for all schools and all schoolchildren—something that many Americans would find objectionable." But, the Study Group gratuitously (and falsely) concluded, "many of these concerns are less important now than they were previously."

Translated from education jargon, that means that the education bureaucracy hopes that the well-publicized news about declining test scores and our millions of functional illiterates has convinced the American people of the necessity for the Federal Government to play the central role in American education. This implies federal control of technology not only to teach students what the government decides are essential subjects and values, but to use technology to "manage" education through the massive collection of data not only on academic achievement, but also on students', parents', and teachers' personal habits, traits, and values.

Such privacy-invading data collection will aid in the continuing redesign of education programs to accomplish predetermined government goals in academic and value/attitude areas. No longer are the educationists and behavioral psychologists content to survey and report on the objective achievements (or failures) of our public school system; those data are too depressing.

The Lamar Alexander Study Group strongly urged that NAEP "make the evaluation of higher-order thinking a central concern of future assessments," and that "NAEP channel additional resources into developing ways to identify and measure the higher processes of thinking and learning." The Study Group report states that "the development of skilled and flexible thinking does not need to wait upon the mastery of more 'basic' or 'fundamental' skills grounded in rote memorization."

That statement proves that NAEP's goal is to teach "flexible thinking" and value-free decision-making even when the child lacks basic skills such as reading and fundamental knowledge about objective facts. The Study Group report urges NAEP to measure "complex thinking skills" that involve "value judgments of some subtlety." The Study Group report also urges NAEP to survey background information about the pupils and their family and home life, all of which is none of the Federal Government's business.

Such a blatant admission of what NAEP plans to do in the area of higher-order thinking is understandable when one considers Professor Benjamin Bloom's definition of the purpose of education and of good teaching. Bloom, a highly influential figure in U.S. education, says: "The purpose of education is to change the thoughts, feelings and actions of students," and defines good teaching as "challenging the

students' fixed beliefs."

NAEP's planned assessment of higher-order thinking or "influential comprehension" will require written informed parental consent under the federal statute called the Pupil Protection Amendment. Parents should request their local school boards and principals to make a public announcement prior to the administration of any state or national assessment.

The expanded NAEP process is skillfully structured to provide a basis for education-policy and curriculum control at the federal level. Local schools will be compelled to conform their curricula to this new national testing, a process that will make local control a thing of the past and dictate a national curriculum in all public schools in America's 15,500 school districts. Speedy passage of legislation to increase funding for NAEP will put the control system in place before the public finds out what the education bureaucracy is up to.

Meanwhile, Carnegie's national teacher certification plan will assure that only teachers willing and able to teach to the expanded NAEP test will be rewarded by certification and merit pay increases.

Good Advice About the Soviets

In our efforts to be realistic rather than starry-eyed about the Soviets, let's examine the words of a man who had first-hand experience with them, a former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, a career foreign service diplomat who has always been known to be "moderate" in dealing with the Soviets.

Malcolm Toon fits that description; he was even Jimmy Carter's Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. Publicly, Toon is partisanly critical of Ronald Reagan's anti-Communist rhetoric; but among his old classmates he sings a different tune.

In the fall of 1985, Malcolm Toon made a remarkable speech to the 50th class reunion of Hotchkiss School, a prestigious eastern prep school. Fortunately, Toon's candid remarks were reported in the *Hotchkiss Alumni Magazine*.

"We must recognize the Soviet Union for what it is," Ambassador Toon told the *Hotchkiss Alumni*, "a ruthless and brutal power." Its leadership is "conspiratorial in nature," and its foreign policy is "inherently aggressive." The Soviets will extend and consolidate their power wherever they think they can do so with impunity, he added.

Toon obviously doesn't believe in the popular academic myth of "moral equivalence" between the two superpowers. Our share of the blame for Soviet relations is "infinitesimal," Toon said, listing incidents of Soviet "misbehavior" as a massive arms buildup, the invasion of Afghanistan, the treatment of Poland and Solidarity, the use of biological warfare, and the shoot-down of the Korean airliner.

When Toon fielded questions after his speech, a student asked whether Toon had anything positive to say about the Soviet Union. Toon paused and then answered, "About the Soviet Union? They have good ballet."

In Afghanistan, the Soviets have loaded toys with explosives so that many Afghan children have had their hands blown off when they picked up the "toys." *That's* how the Soviet Union uses children to serve their goals.

Do we want to cooperate with these "ruthless and brutal" people in developing teaching materials for American schoolchildren?

Portions of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Agreement Dealing with Elementary and Secondary Schools

The General Agreement

Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Contacts, Exchanges and Cooperation in Scientific, Technical, Educational, Cultural and Other Fields

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ... Have agreed as follows: ...

Article II

... 3. The Parties will encourage the conclusion, when it is considered mutually beneficial, of agreements on cooperation in the field of science and technology, and also additional agreements in other specific fields, including the **humanities and social sciences**, within the framework of this Agreement. ...

Article IV

1. The Parties will encourage and facilitate, as appropriate, contacts, exchanges and **cooperation** between organizations of the two countries **in various fields of education**. These activities may include:

a. The exchange of students, graduate students, researchers and faculty members for study and research; the exchange of professors and teachers to lecture, **offer instruction**, and conduct research; the exchange of specialists and delegations in various fields of education; and, as possible, the organization of lectures, seminars and symposia for such specialists;

b. The exchange of more young researchers preparing dissertations, as well as of young teachers, taking into account the desirability of proper representation of the **social sciences, the humanities**, and the natural and applied sciences in these exchanges; ...

d. The facilitation of the exchange, by appropriate organizations, of **educational and teaching materials (including textbooks, syllabi and curricula)**, materials on methodology, samples of teaching instruments and audiovisual aids. ...

Article VI

1. The Parties will encourage the film industries of both countries, as appropriate, to consider means of further expanding the purchase and distribution on a commercial basis of films produced in each country; the joint production of feature, documentary, popular-science, and **educational films**; and the rendering, upon request, of production and creative assistance by each side for films produced by the other.

2. The Parties will encourage, as appropriate, the exchange and exhibition of **documentary films** dealing with science, technology, culture, **education** and other fields. ...

Article XIX

1. In implementation of various provisions of this Agreement, the Parties have established a Program of Cooperation and Exchanges for 1986-88, which is attached and is an integral part of this Agreement. The terms of that Program shall be in force from January 1, 1986, to December 31, 1988, and thereafter, unless and until amended by agreement of the Parties, will provide the basic guidelines for

the Program of Cooperation and Exchanges for 1989-1991.

2. The Parties agree that their representatives will meet prior to the end of 1988 to develop the Program of Cooperation and Exchanges for the succeeding three years. ...

Done at Geneva, this 21st day of November 1985, in duplicate, in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government
of the United States
of America:

George P. Shultz

For the Government
of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics:

Eduard Shevardnadze

Program of Cooperation and Exchanges Between The United States of America and The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for 1986-1988

In implementation of various provisions of the General Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Contacts, Exchanges and Cooperation in Scientific, Technical, **Educational, Cultural**, and Other Fields signed at Geneva on November 21, 1985, the Parties have agreed on the following Program of Cooperation and Exchanges. ...

Article II

Primary and Secondary Education
and the Pedagogical Sciences

... 2. The Parties will exchange one delegation annually of specialists in **primary and secondary education** of up to five persons from each side for a period of two to three weeks each, including a seminar of normally two to three days with specialists of the other country. The subjects of the seminars, their duration and itineraries of the visits will be agreed upon subsequently.

3. The Parties will encourage the exchange of **primary and secondary school textbooks and other teaching materials**, and, as is deemed appropriate, the conducting of joint studies on textbooks, between appropriate organizations in the U.S.A. and the Ministry of Education of the U.S.S.R. ...

Article VII

... 4. This Program is valid from January 1, 1986 through December 31, 1988.

Done at Geneva, this 21st day of November 1985, in duplicate, in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government
of the United States
of America:

George P. Shultz

For the Government
of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics:

Eduard Shevardnadze

Emphasis added.

Cancel Education Agreements

Both agreements (the U.S.-Soviet agreement signed at Geneva, and the Carnegie-Soviet agreement authorized by the U.S. Department of State and signed in Moscow) must be cancelled for the following reasons:

1. Their constitutionality is questionable since education is not mentioned in the U.S. Constitution and thus remains the responsibility of state and local elected officials.

2. The General Education Provisions Act, which covers all U.S. Department of Education activities, prohibits the Federal Government from exercising any "direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration or personnel of any educational institution, school or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system..."

However, the U.S. Department of State, which is responsible for *both* agreements, may not be covered by this provision since State's purpose is to conduct foreign affairs, *not* to involve itself in education. Congress should specifically include the State Department under the prohibitions of the General Education Provisions Act in order to protect Americans from federal and international control of education.

3. The agreements clearly violate the fundamental principle of local control over schools. Unfortunately, local control over school materials and teaching methods has already been significantly reduced due to state-mandated curricula, federally-funded goals and objectives developed at the national level, curricula developed with federal grant monies, and state teacher certification policies, not to mention the proposed Carnegie national teacher certification policy.

4. If it is wrong to privatize foreign policy about aid to the Contras, isn't it just as wrong to privatize education policy which determines what is taught in our public schools? In referring to the Iran-Contra affair, the Committee Chairman, Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-IN), said: "The use of private parties to carry out the high purposes of government makes us the subject of puzzlement and ridicule."

But, Iran-Contra involves only a few million dollars (only a fraction of one percent of the foreign handouts we dole out legally to foreign governments every year), while the U.S.-Soviet and Carnegie-Soviet agreements involve what 40 million American children are taught in our \$170 billion public school system.

The actions of U.S. government employees in encouraging private individuals and foreign officials to send a few million dollars to the Contras in Nicaragua is inconsequential compared to this deal in which State Department personnel authorized the private Carnegie Corporation to negotiate with Soviet officials to develop curricula for American schoolchildren.

How do our elected officials, who have sworn to uphold the U.S. Constitution and who vehemently objected to the use of private parties to support the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters, feel about Carnegie's agreement with the Soviet Union to develop educational materials and to restructure American education? Have these same Congressmen asked themselves *which* Constitution — the American, the Soviet, or a mixture of both — will be the foundation for curriculum development in the areas of citizenship, moral-related and

social science education and in the restructuring of American education?

Some U.S. educators are working openly for an international curriculum. *Education Week* reported in 1986 that Gordon Cawelti, executive director of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, urged representatives of ten western nations and Japan to press for the development of a "world core curriculum."

The opposition of many lawyers to a similar agreement signed by the American Bar Association with the Association of Soviet Lawyers should put us on alert. The Soviet lawyers' association is a KGB-dominated, anti-Semitic Kremlin agency. Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz called it "the most reprehensible professional organization on the face of the earth." Federal Judge Frank Kaufman called it "similar to or maybe even worse than the Goebbels propaganda ministry" of Hitler's Third Reich. Jewish leader and lawyer Morris Abram stated, "These are not lawyers."

Surely, if lawyers reject negotiations by a private American association with a Soviet government association because of the Soviets' contempt for truth and the law, Americans, who *all* have a stake in the quality of education, should reject the education agreements for the very same reasons plus the outrageous way that the Soviets trample on intellectual freedom and use education for Marxist-Leninist indoctrination.

If ABA lawyers can be taken in by a Soviet agreement and allow themselves to be used by the clever propaganda that ensues, then how in the world are schoolchildren going to protect themselves from curricula and methods developed as a result of these education agreements?

Both agreements call out for an immediate, fully-televised Congressional investigation — with possibly a special prosecutor — to ascertain exactly who is responsible for their planning and implementation.

What You Can Do

1. Write to President Ronald Reagan, The White House, Washington, D.C. 20500, and ask him to cancel all portions of the U.S.-Soviet agreements of November 21, 1985, negotiated by the State Department, which pertain to the development of curricula for elementary and secondary schools. Cancellation raises no legal problems; President Carter cancelled similar cultural, scientific and educational agreements in 1979 when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. If Jimmy Carter can do it, Ronald Reagan can, too.

2. Write to your Senators at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, and your Congressmen at the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. Ask them to start a fullscale Congressional investigation of the U.S.-Soviet and the Carnegie-Soviet education agreements.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$15 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.