

# The Patriots' Truth

## Flint Hills Party News

---

**Next meeting September 12 — 9:30am, Manhattan City Library, have your concerns ready.** The Working Group meetings at McAlister's, 5:30-10pm, Wed. evenings are come and go, at your convenience. Bring your concerns for discussion. **Your concerns are important.** In this publication what is in green is me, other colors are just for getting attention. Changes in font are for letting readers know it is a change of subject or person speaking. I would like to include your opinion/concerns. With the help of the **LORD** we will prevail!! Let us PRAY!

---

This issue of The Patriots' Truth is dedicated to the Schools of Kansas/America. We have had so much "up and down" in our schools in the last few years. The Public became very aware of what was happening when "No Child Left Behind" turned out to be a huge failure. Then the Federal Government came up with "Common Core" — we know how that has been about "dumbing down" our kids rather the Liberals want to admit it or not.

---

**From: American Thinker August 23, 2015**

**Back to School ---- REALLY?**

**By Deana Chadwell**

It's that time again -- back-to-school ads fill the TV screen. Football teams sweat through summer practice. Teachers return to their classrooms, hoping against hope to get totally prepared for the year to come. And yet we all know that something is rotten in America's schools.

America was once a well-educated country -- de Tocqueville mentioned that on his tour of the fledgling nation in the early 19th century. He was astounded at how well informed the average man-on-the-street was. He would be horrified today.

The man-on-the-street videos are not only embarrassing and scary, but test scores and graduation rates back up the videos with dismal scores, and many of those who do graduate can't read or write, can't compute, can't speak without using the F-word. Competent, inspiring teachers are vacating the profession at an alarming rate -- one can only take the frustration and disrespect for so long.

And it's not going to get any better if we keep doing what we've been doing: dusting off the same old band-aid programs, dressing them up with new names, and hoping against all rationality that this time it will work. It won't. There are some fundamental reasons for this dead end.

Mainly, education is caught up in a landslide caused by the weakness of its very foundations and hastened by the frantic efforts of a movement so off base, so deeply, fundamentally flawed that it must implode.

Education, from time immemorial has been rooted in religious belief. The most knowledgeable people in any tribe were the priests, the shamans. From the scribes of Israel, the Wise Men of the Gospels, the monks of the Middle Ages, the scientists of the Renaissance, the Ivy League schools at their inception, education and religion were joined at the hip. Up until John Dewey and his "progressive" anti-religion attitudes, educators recognized that connection and nurtured it.

Why does this learning-believing pairing work? Why is it so hard to teach without it? The short answer is that learning is hard work and requires a substantive motivation to accomplish. When human beings acknowledge their Creator, curiosity ensues — Who is this God who made me? Why did He make me? What is my purpose? What is the purpose of the universe? What are the properties of this universe? What is the nature of man and how can we connect with God? What will happen in the future? The important questions, the wondering questions all start with God.

Secular humanism, the main philosophy behind public education since Dewey, teaches that we are each the master of our own fate and that everything is about us, for us, through us. It teaches moral neutrality, so nothing is shocking, nothing is reprehensible, nothing is important, and nothing is interesting. Our school librarian -- a lovely lady -- used to say that most things weren't worth learning since everything was going to change anyway. The librarian! It teaches that science knows everything, and only those with the power of science can know anything. And yet, science is always changing its collective mind, and often at the whim of a grant bribe. God, on the other hand, doesn't change. What we learn about Him will never be useless.

Progressivism, however, promotes the idea that the state is the Supreme Being; its priests are the bureaucrats and politicians, its disciples the men in white coats. None of this promotes curiosity; none of it provides purpose or direction. And it relegates education to nothing but job training.

For decades after Dewey the schools limped along still able to pull their students into at least a semblance of learning. The family still stood behind the schools and the family taught its children about God. Those kids could find purpose and interest in that divine knowledge.

But much has changed. The family is crumbling like a stepped-on potato chip. And much of that can be laid at the feet of the leftist, progressive ideology and the government policies that resulted. Prior to Johnson's Great Society only 7% of black families were missing their fathers; now, 73% of African American families are fatherless. A single mother is hard-pressed to feed her children let alone take them to church and watch over their schooling. The family, as a bulwark against ignorance, feels, especially to teachers, like a lost cause.

So we have a gigantic, expensive, paradoxical institution hanging around the necks of our children. It teaches them that nothing is true, that we mustn't make any moral judgments, that respecting authority is an antique idea, and that their own self-esteem should be their greatest concern and then we expect the kids to learn. When they don't, the government, which is now synonymous with the schools, gives them harder tests, which undermine self-esteem and do nothing at all to ramp up curiosity.

The secularist attitude has ruined our schools. But, but, but, sputters the progressive, but we have to have separation of church and state! We have to keep our schools neutral! Really? If you send a kid through 16 years of schooling in which God is never mentioned, except in a derogatory way, you end up with a person who doesn't see any evidence for, or information about, or guidance from the Creator of us all. That's not neutral.

But, but, but, says the humanist, we're a secular society. Really? And how's that working for you? Any teacher will tell you that the best students, the successful students are, more often than not, from religious families. The troublesome students, either the arrogant pseudo-intellectual kids, or the dropout wannabes, usually are not.

By forcing our schools into this anti-God stance we have destroyed them. If the government (and the bigger the government the worse this is) runs the schools, God (according to 21st century attitudes) must be excluded. If we exclude God from education, we also exclude the impetus for that education, and we remove much of the philosophical, moral, virtuous, character-building material goes with Him -- literature, music, art, history, science -- all these disciplines must be heavily censored, rewritten, dumbed down. If we do this, then we are training robots, not enlightening human beings.

If God is excluded from schools then so is any authority to demand good behavior. If several generations receive their education from Godless schools, then fewer and fewer of the population know anything at all about Him or about absolute values, like truth. If couples who don't know God raise children, they won't know God, and the family will be unlikely to develop consistent values, let alone values that lead to confident, well-behaved, motivated students.

So, how do we break this chain when the separation-of-church-and-state meme seems carved in stone? We educate our children in the way they should be educated; at home. We set up vouchers to be use at the school of the parents' choice. We support specialized charter schools and open up school registration so that parents can choose where their kids go to school. If parents can send their kids to a school that teaches what they believe, then the church/state hammer no longer has any weight and some schools will go back to allowing for the reality of God.

Many options are sitting there in the classroom, enthusiastically waving their hands, just waiting to be called on. Enough data already exists to prove that these options work. So, as the kids and their new backpacks march off to school this fall, let's keep our eyes open, do some research and make a move. It's up to each of us to fix this.

Deana Chadwell blogs at [www.ASingleWindow.com](http://www.ASingleWindow.com). She taught high school English for 30 years and currently teaches writing and speech at Pacific Bible College in Medford, Oregon.

Read more: [http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2015/08/back\\_to\\_school\\_really\\_.html#ixzz3jkM67CfU](http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2015/08/back_to_school_really_.html#ixzz3jkM67CfU)

Follow us: [@AmericanThinker on Twitter](#) | [AmericanThinker on Facebook](#)

**WOW!!! I have never heard/understood this point of view. It makes perfect sense. GOD has always been in our family, so looking at any area of our lives, without Christianity was NOT a part of my thinking/reasoning. This is just one more reason to keep GOD in the foundation of our Country, States, Communities & Schools**

**. Understanding and living by this concept is way beyond the Federal Government, therefore, GETTING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OUT OF OUR SCHOOL SYSTEMS IS AMOUNTING TO AN EMERGENCY!! Can we do it by just refusing Federal monies? If every State did this it would be a beginning – it is up to each state, each school district to refuse Federal monies for our school systems. Is money more important than morals?**

**Professors threaten bad grades for saying 'illegal alien,' 'male,' 'female'**

By Peter Hasson on /29/15

**Washington State students risk a failing grade in one course if they use any common descriptors**

professor considers “oppressive and hateful language.” In another class, students will lose one point every time they use the words “illegal alien” or “illegals” rather than the preferred terms of “‘undocumented’ migrants/immigrants/persons.” migrants/immigrants/persons.” “Students will come to recognize how white privilege functions in everyday social structures and institutions.”

Multiple professors at Washington State University have explicitly told students their grades will suffer if they use terms such as “illegal alien,” “male,” and “female,” or if they fail to “defer” to non-white students.

According to the syllabus for Selena Lester Breikss’ “Women & Popular Culture” class, students risk a failing grade if they use any common descriptors that Breikss considers “oppressive and hateful language.”

The punishment for repeatedly using the banned words, Breikss warns, includes “but [is] not limited to removal from the class without attendance or participation points, failure of the assignment, and—in extreme cases— failure for the semester.”

Breikss is not the only WSU faculty member implementing such policies.

Much like in Selena Breikss’s classroom, students taking Professor Rebecca Fowler’s “Introduction to Comparative Ethnic Studies” course will see their grades suffer if they use the term “illegal alien” in their assigned writing.

According to her syllabus, students will lose one point every time they use the words “illegal alien” or “illegals” rather than the preferred terms of “‘undocumented’ migrants/immigrants/persons.” Throughout the course, Fowler says, students will “come to recognize how white privilege functions in everyday social structures and institutions.”

In an email to *Campus Reform*, Fowler complained that “the term ‘illegal alien’ has permeated dominant discourses that circulate in the news to the extent that our society has come to associate ALL unauthorized border crossings with those immigrants originating from countries south of our border (and not with Asian immigrants, for example, many of whom are also in the country without legal documents and make up a considerable portion of undocumented immigrants living in the country).”

“The socio-legal production of migrant illegality works to systematically dehumanize and exploit these brown bodies for their labor,” Fowler continued.

White students in Professor John Streamas’s “Introduction to Multicultural Literature” class, are expected to “defer” to non-white students, among other community guidelines, if they want “to do well in this class.”

In the guidelines in his syllabus, Streamas elaborates that he requires students to “reflect” on their grasp of history and social relations “by respecting shy and quiet classmates and by deferring to the experiences of people of color.”

Streamas—who previously generated controversy by calling a student a “white shitbag” and declared that WSU should stand for “White Supremacist University”—also demands that students “understand and consider the rage of people who are victims of systematic injustice.”

Later in the syllabus, Streamas goes even further and accuses Glenn Beck of being an “insensitive white.”

Several other WSU professors require their students to “acknowledge that racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, and other institutionalized forms of oppression exist” or that “we do not live in a post-racial world.”

Ari Cohn, a lawyer with the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, told *Campus Reform* he considers such requirements to be contradictory, even given the sensitive nature of the courses.

“It is notable that one of the syllabus provisions warns: ‘The subject material of this class is sensitive and controversial. Strive to keep an open mind.’ How are students supposed to approach these sensitive and controversial materials at all, let alone to keep an open mind, if they have to fear that a misconstrued statement, or one that unreasonably offends a classmate will lead to a grade reduction or even removal from class?”

Neither Breikss nor Streamas replied to *Campus Reform*’s request for comment.

## THE FOLLOWING IS RELATED:

### Missouri State Nixes Free Speech Restrictions

by Peter Fr ce on -27-15

- Prior to Wednesday, MSU’s “Expressive Activity Policy” confined external groups to select areas of campus.
- Missouri Gov. Jay Nixon (D) signed the “Campus Free Expression Act” (CAFE Act) in July, invalidating the school’s policy.
- The school will now consider all outdoor areas legitimate forums for free speech.

Missouri State University has revised a policy that limited where outside groups could hold events on campus, and will now consider all outdoor areas legitimate forums for free speech.

The policy change was formally approved Wednesday afternoon during a meeting of the MSU Board of Governors’ executive committee, and has been in the works since at least July, when the school’s existing policy came into conflict with a newly-passed state law.

Prior to Wednesday, MSU’s “Expressive Activity Policy” explicitly differentiated between the free speech of internal and external (non-affiliated) groups, confining the latter to a few pre-approved areas of campus, sometimes referred to facetiously as “free speech zones.”

The policy stated that all members of the MSU community “are encouraged to exercise the right of assembly, free speech, and expression throughout the campus, when doing so does not disrupt the academic mission or daily University functions,” but also stipulated that individuals and groups that are not affiliated with the university could only conduct expressive activities either on city sidewalks near campus or at one of three designated “[public forums](#).”

In July, however, Missouri Gov. Jay Nixon signed the “[Campus Free Expression Act](#)” (CAFE Act) into law, invalidating the school’s two-tiered approach to free expression and forcing it to extend free speech protections to those outside the MSU community.

The new law designates all outdoor areas of campuses of public institutions of higher learning as “traditional public forums,” meaning expression can only be restricted “in service of a significant institutional interest [and] only when such restrictions employ clear, published, content- and viewpoint-neutral criteria, and provide for ample alternative means of expression.” The designation applies not only to students and faculty, but also to “any person who wishes to engage in noncommercial expressive activity,” provided the person’s conduct “is not unlawful and does not materially disrupt the functioning of the institution.”

To [bring its policy into compliance with the law](#), MSU eliminated all references to external groups and individuals, and now extends the same speech protections to all individuals that it once confined to members of the MSU community.

In addition, the new policy does away with all requirements confining expressive activity to the three public forums, describing them instead as being the “most appropriate” locations on campus for forums, rallies, demonstrations, and other similar activities.

According to the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), which [assisted legislators in drafting the CAFE Act](#), roughly one in six American public colleges have policies restricting expression to designated “free speech zones,” and Missouri is only the second state (along with Virginia) to pass a law prohibiting the practice.

“Missouri is in many respects leading the way in this now,” FIRE legislative and policy director Joe Cohn told Campus Reform. “It’s a little too early to say how each of the institutions will respond to the legal obligation, but if they all act in good faith, then FIRE will be delighted about that.”

Since the CAFE Act was passed, FIRE has maintained a standing offer to assist schools with their efforts to comply with the law, though Cohn claimed that, “we didn’t work directly with MSU on their revisions.”

Nonetheless, he said, “We think it’s good to see MSU taking their obligations under the CAFE Act seriously. I haven’t had a chance to review the policies, but from what I have read it seems like they’re on the right track.”

Follow the author of this article on Twitter: [@FrickePete](#)

## **Catholic Schools Are Back, and There’s Hope for Their Future**

By Andy Smarick — September 22, 2015

During his time in the United States, Pope Francis will make a quiet stop at East Harlem’s Our Lady Queen of Angels. His visit to this humble, 120-year-old elementary school, which to this day educates an overwhelmingly low-income and minority student body, underscores the Catholic Church’s centuries-long commitment to the disadvantaged. But it will also shine light on an unreported good-news story in urban education: the budding renaissance of Catholic schools.

For 50 years, inner-city Catholic schools have been [shuttering](#), victims of shifting city demographics, changes in the workforce, the advent of charter schooling, and much more. Impoverished families have too few accessible school options to begin with, but this phenomenon has been especially painful. A [substantial body of evidence](#) shows that Catholic schools have an unusual ability to help underserved kids succeed. [Newer research](#) suggests that longstanding urban Catholic schools foster social capital outside their walls, helping decrease crime and other societal ills.

In the early 1970s, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, at the time a White House adviser, saw the crisis looming and warned President Nixon about the [tragic consequences](#) if these schools disappeared. Little was done, and, so as a White House aide 35 years later, I was part of an effort to re-sound the alarm, organizing a [White House summit](#) and [authoring a report](#) on the threat to urban faith-based schools.

The prognosis then was gloomy. It looked as if divine intervention would be required. But less than a decade later, it appears that America’s miracle-worker, civil society, is coming to the rescue. Thanks largely to the energy of social entrepreneurs, the generosity of donors, and — counterintuitively — the lessons of charter schooling, urban Catholic education may be on the rebound.

In hindsight, it’s becoming clear that Catholic education’s foundational virtue, steady adherence to venerable principles and practices, was also holding it back. Yes, it was right to steadfastly serve the underserved, stubbornly believe in every child, set the highest standards, and teach character. But many of its approaches to staffing, leading, organizing, governing, and funding its schools had become anachronistic. A refresh was desperately needed.

Like the European Renaissance, this rebirth blends the old and the new. There are new networks of Catholic schools modeled after successful charter management organizations (think Catholic versions of the Knowledge Is Power Program). There are [Notre Dame’s ACE program](#), often called the “Catholic Teach for America,” and other new pipelines of teachers and

leaders. There are new [tech-driven school models](#) using virtual and “blended” strategies for instruction. There are innovative approaches to financing, including the [Drexel Fund](#) (the first-ever venture philanthropy fund for Catholic and other private schools) and [Cristo Rey’s](#) work-study program, which sends high-schoolers into offices one day a week.

Though many of these innovations put some distance between schools and the old parish- and diocesan-based systems that used to control them, they are dedicated to preserving the authenticity of Catholic education.

So on Friday, Pope Francis won’t simply be touring a high-performing high-poverty school that’s been part of Harlem’s social fabric for a century. Our Lady Queen of Angels is also part of [Partnership Schools](#), one of the nation’s new independent Catholic-school networks. The [Partnership’s superintendent](#) isn’t just a former Catholic-school student and teacher; she was also an executive of one of the nation’s best charter-school organizations. The [network’s board](#) includes representatives from the New York archdiocese as well as business and philanthropic leaders.

There’s more reason for optimism about the future of Catholic education than at any time in the last half century. Those hoping to learn more might find worthwhile my guidebook for Catholic-school donors to be published soon by The Philanthropy Roundtable (excerpted [here](#)).

But for those interested in K–12 education more broadly, there’s also an important lesson to be learned. The revitalization of this sector of schools is modern-day barn-raising. It’s a quiet triumph of civil society — collective action with public benefits but absent centralized government direction.

Through the loosely coordinated collaboration of parents, educators, faith leaders, social entrepreneurs, colleges, and philanthropists, an organic movement has developed. It’s growing sturdier while evolving to meet an array of needs in a variety of locations.

This is precisely how education reform was described ten years ago. But because of the field’s growing technocratic tendency — the view that brainy central administrators know best — it’s increasingly seen by many as top-down. Indeed, Washington has inserted itself into accountability, standards, tests, teacher evaluations, and more. The backlash is building.

It is highly instructive that a famously hierarchical organization, the Catholic Church, has made substantial progress of late with its schools by protecting its principles but devolving power to civil society. The next administration should take note.

— *Andy Smarick is a partner at Bellwether Education Partners and coauthor of the forthcoming [Catholic School Renaissance](#). He served at the White House and U.S. Department of Education under President George W. Bush. He is a member of the Maryland State Board of Education.*

**In a remarkable admission, the former director of the Race to the Top (RttT) competitive grant program and chief of staff to U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan says the federal government “forced” full support for adoption of the Common Core standards from each state by requiring its governor, chief state school officer, and head of the state board of education to sign off on the grant application.**

Joanne Weiss, who is now an “independent education consultant,” writes at the [Stanford Social Innovation Review](#) that the RttT grant program, funded through President Obama’s 2009 stimulus bill in the name of helping low-income, poor-performing schools, “offers lessons in high-impact grantmaking that are applicable not only in education but also in other fields.”

She states:

The Department of Education runs about 150 competitions every year. But among those programs, Race to the Top stands out. It had more than \$4 billion to allocate to competition winners, and it attracted the participation of nearly every state in the union. It arguably drove more change in education at the state, district, and school levels than any federal competition had previously been able to achieve.

Weiss, who led RttT from its start, explains the federal government took advantage of the fact that states were strapped for cash due to the recession.

“[S]o the large pot of funding that we had to offer was a significant inducement for states to compete,” she writes, adding the surprise number of 46 states willing to sign onto the Common Core standards initiative was due to “our decision to leverage the spirit of competition.”

Though Weiss apparently believes she and the U.S. Department of Education (USED) fostered “competition,” her essay essentially admits to remarkable amounts of manipulation of states, as well as non-transparency, at the hands of a puppeteer federal government:

To help each state bring all parties to the reform table, we deployed four tools.

First, we forced alignment among the top three education leaders in each participating state—the governor, the chief state school officer, and the president of the state board of education—by requiring each of them to sign their state’s Race to the Top application. In doing so, they attested that their office fully supported the state’s reform proposal.

Second, we requested (but did not require) the inclusion of signatures by three district officials—the

superintendent, the school board president, and the leader of the relevant teachers' union or teachers' association—on each district-level MOU. This approach, among other benefits, gave unions standing in the application process without giving them veto power over it.

Third, we created tangible incentives for states to gain a wide base of community support for their plans. Securing buy-in from multiple stakeholders—business groups, parents' groups, community organizations, and foundations, for example—earned points for a state's application. Having the support of a state's teachers' union earned additional points.

Fourth, as part of the judging process, we required officials from each state that reached the finalist stage to meet in-person with reviewers to present their proposals and answer reviewers' questions. At this meeting, a team that often included the state's governor—as well as union leaders, district officials, and the state's education chief—made its case to reviewers. We imposed this requirement largely to verify that those in charge of implementing their state's plan were knowledgeable about the plan and fully committed to it. (This was particularly critical in cases where states had used consultants to help draft their application.)

Writing at [The Pulse 2016](#), attorney Jane Robbins, a senior fellow with American Principles in Action, says that Weiss' admission shows that USED “was actively coercing states, in blatant violation of constitutional principles of federalism, from the earliest days of Common Core.”

Robbins tells Breitbart News Weiss' admission “blows the lid off” any presidential candidate's claim that Common Core was a “state-led” process that was simply hijacked by the federal government.

“The former director of the Race to the Top program has admitted a remarkable level of coercion in ‘persuading’ states to adopt federally preferred education policies — Common Core standards, aligned assessments, accountability systems, and personnel policies,” Robbins said. “Not only did the states have to toe the line in all these areas to have a shot at the much-coveted federal money, but they had to alter their own decision-making structures to comply with federal dictates.”

“Given that the Constitution gives the federal government exactly no role in education, the scope of the federal mandates in this situation is quite remarkable,” Robbins writes. “But it wasn't a hijacking — it was planned from the start. Presidential candidates should retire the misleading talking points.”

In a comment to Weiss' article, Cheri Kiesecker writes:

THIS confession is astounding...How disturbing that the federal government would “promote approaches to education reform that would be coherent, systemic, and statewide” when there are laws prohibiting the US Dept of Ed from directing local education.

RTTT, taxpayer money, could have, SHOULD have been used to help struggling schools in a time of “profound budgetary challenge for state governments;” instead you chose this as an opportunity.

“A perfect storm for reform,” with no teacher or parent approval necessary or invited involvement. Many of those on your “panel of independent education experts” refused to sign off on this rushed RTTT “induced” experiment.

You have used our children as your guinea pigs, testing out common standards, and data driven instruction. You have changed laws to allow the taking and sharing of children's personal data and have been backed by billions of edtech dollars, because they stand to make even more money from our children's data and from the business that is now education...

Similarly, Victoria M. Young writes:

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act dollars being used on a poorly designed experiment was a horrible waste of tax dollars at a time when schools – ACROSS THE COUNTRY – needed real help.

Let me try to explain because clearly you people don't get it.

First, you set the rules. Then you say winners were picked that “had outstanding ideas for improving educational outcomes.” You forgot the part about how they had to be in lock step with what you leaders already decided. Then, you all thought it was a good idea to pick winners that “were also in a strong position to implement those ideas.” That is where all logical thinking about real reform (improving those schools that aren't “strong”) is dead in the water. Do you wonder why historically we never succeed in “scaling-up” ideas that “work” in states that already have good outcomes? Think about it.

Competitive grants? What a horrible way to do the business of educating all children!

Christopher Chase, Ph.D., a professor of English Language Studies at Seinan Gakuin University, a Christian university in Japan, comments as well:

Wow.

There is so much deception and spin in this article I don't know where to begin. I'm a Stanford School of Education graduate who worked with real education reform in the 1990s, the Accelerated Schools Project started by former Stanford Prof. Hank Levin...

You wrote:

“The competition required applicants to address four key areas: standards and assessments, teachers and leaders, data, and turning around low-performing schools.”

Concerning “standards and assessments” – In reality, what happened is that your Common Core standards and assessments were put together in secrecy by people associated with testing (not learning), with a pedagogy out of the Cold War era (New Criticism) and little input from real teachers and education reform experts. You ignored research on child development, focused on high-stakes testing and rigid standards, which all the research has shown diminishes student motivation and learning...

Your “reform” approach was set up to take over, manipulate and sabotage American education...

---

“A primary object... should be the education of our youth in the science of government. In a Republic, what species of knowledge can be equally important? And what duty more pressing... than communicating it to those who are to be the future guardians of the liberties of the country?”

...George Washington

---

### **Another Study Indicates that Universal Preschool is Essentially Useless by Christine Rousselle 10/27/15**

A new [study](#) out of Tennessee is indicating that the universal preschool program in the state may be a complete waste of money that doesn't actually benefit the children enrolled and may actually harm them. This study has [similar](#) conclusions as one in Quebec that examined low-cost daycare programs, as well as studies that [suggest](#) that Head Start has little to no academic benefits for the children who enroll in the program.

From [Vox](#):

At the end of pre-K, the results look pretty much as you would expect: Teachers rates the children who went through pre-K as "being better prepared for kindergarten work, as having better behaviors related to learning in the classroom and as having more positive peer relations."

The problem is those results dissipate by the end of kindergarten — by then, the group that attended pre-K is no better off than the group that didn't — and then begin to reverse by the end of first grade. By the end of second grade, the children who attended the pre-K program are scoring lower on both behavioral and academic measures than the children who didn't.

Curious.

This is a very compelling argument against universal pre-k/preschool. There's no real way to ensure/pay for a pre-k classroom has high standards (see: what happened in Quebec), and in many cases, putting a child into a low-standards pre-k classroom led to a worse outcome than a child who didn't receive any care.

Children are unique, and (shockingly) one-size-fits-all educational programs don't work for all children. A more holistic approach (or, alternatively, letting parents decide what's best for their child) would likely have a better outcome than shuffling them into yet another program designed to "help" them.

---

### **American Thinker**

**By Thomas Lifson**

**October 20, 2015**

SF school principal suspends student council election outcome because results not 'diverse' enough.

The children attending Everett Middle School in San Francisco's Mission District just got an object lesson in liberal fascism. Eugene Volokh, writing in the [Washington Post](#), cites a report by KTVU television:

There's a bit of controversy surrounding student elections at a San Francisco middle school after the results were immediately withheld by the principal because they weren't diverse enough.

The incident happened at Everett Middle School in San Francisco's Mission District. The voting was held Oct. 10, but the principal sent an email to parents on Oct. 14 saying the results would not be released because the candidates that were elected as a whole do not represent the diversity that exists at the school....

According to Principal Lena Van Haren, Everett Middle School has a diverse student body. She said 80 percent of students are students of color and 20 percent are white, but the election results did not represent the entire study body.

“That is concerning to me because as principal I want to make sure all voices are heard from all backgrounds,” Van Haren said....

“We're not nullifying the election, we're not cancelling the election and we're not saying this didn't count,” Van Haren said.

She said the school may possibly add positions in an effort to be more equal.

It is positively Orwellian to claim “[w]e're not nullifying the election, we're not cancelling the election and we're not saying this didn't count” while acting to do exactly that by means of adding hand-selected (by the principal, obviously) representatives to change the membership of the body.

Professor Volokh comments:

Well, the children's voices were heard. They just seemed to be less obsessed with race than some administrators are. And exactly what “learning experience” would the children get this way, whether about racial tolerance or democracy?

The principal's outrageous actions caused a bit of controversy, even in San Francisco, and as a result, she backtracked, somewhat, with this statement:

Everett Middle School is honoring the results of the Associated Student Body (ASB) elections. This is our first student council at Everett Middle School in recent history and we started up a student council because we want our students to have several ways to develop their leadership skills and be a part of shaping our school. We want a student leadership body that includes the range of perspectives and experiences of our students and we believe a representative body is an important part of democracy.

When we reviewed the results of our Associated Student Body (ASB) elections on Friday, October 9th, we saw that it was not fully representative of our school population. I made the decision to pause on sharing the results with the students in order to capitalize on a teachable moment. I wanted to have a conversation with all of the candidates and ask for their ideas to make sure that all voices and groups are represented in our ASB. In retrospect, I understand how this decision to pause created concerns. Today I visited classrooms to announce the winners of the elections.

There are many challenges and opportunities that this situation surfaces. Especially now, at a time when our school and community's population is undergoing demographic change, I believe that we have a responsibility to take these conversations seriously, appreciating both their complexity and their urgency. There are no easy answers, so I am looking forward to talking as a community about how we can grow and get better at this for the rest of the year and into next year.

That is 264 words' worth of pabulum that manages to obscure more than it reveals. I think it means that she is backing off her overruling of democracy, but then again, she avers that "we have a responsibility to take these conversations seriously, appreciating both their complexity and their urgency." So what does that mean?

For the record, the Mission District, formerly a heavily Irish and Jewish neighborhood, transitioned to heavily Hispanic and is now rapidly gentrifying as many highly paid tech people move in. The principal seems to imply that "students of color" are proliferating, but even taking account of the low incidence of childrearing among the youngish tech crowd, it would seem to me that in fact, the proportion of Hispanic students would be declining as the gentrification continues. Incidentally, while there were no political protests when Hispanics displaced Irish and Jews several decades ago, the current transition of the Mission District has sparked outrage and even violent protest, as so-called Google Buses that transport employees to Silicon Valley jobs have been attacked.

If you want to find the hottest restaurants and bars in San Francisco, you go to the Mission. It is the happening place. But Principal Van Haren seems to be locked in a time warp, where omniscient and wise educrats dictate an ideal racial and ethnic outcome for elections and neighborhoods.

America's public schools, the most expensive in the world outside Switzerland and Luxembourg, are failing our children, as the results of international comparisons of standardized tests reveals. How could it be otherwise with people like Principal Van Haren leading them?

" WASHINGTON " — From John D'Aloia

In what can be viewed as a late homage to departing House Speaker John Boehner, the lower chamber has adopted anew a federally funded school voucher program for students in Washington, D.C., but the proposal is likely to run into a roadblock – the White House has made its opposition known.

In a 240-191 vote, with eight Republicans voting against it and two Democrats offering support, the House sent to the Senate legislation to extend the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act at an estimated cost of \$60 million annually, allowing D.C. students from eligible low-income families in kindergarten through grade 12 to attend private schools at taxpayer expense through 2021.

The measure adds a provision to the current program – those attending private institutions will be required to take the same standardized tests administered to students who remain in the district's public schools. The new rule will enable officials to compare varying results in the educational systems."

## Cardinal Burke Urges Genuine Catholic Education to Renew Culture

by Patrick J. Reilly

10-29-15 at 10:14AM

Cardinal Raymond Burke last week gave us yet another trove of wisdom to contemplate, just as the Synod on the Family came to a close. This time, it was about Catholic education, and it came with a stern warning.

In [prepared remarks](#) last week given to representatives of [Voice of the Family](#), Cardinal Raymond Burke, patron of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, warned parents about the threats to their children from wayward Catholic schools while arguing that faithful Catholic education at home and in schools is needed to transform the culture.

"Today, parents must be especially vigilant, for sadly, in some places, schools have become the tools of a secular agenda inimical to the Christian life," he said. Corrupted Catholic institutions can lead young people "to their slavery to sin ... profound unhappiness, and to the destruction of culture."

Cardinal Burke has received a lot of attention for his courageous opposition to those who sought to hijack the Synod in support of Communion for remarried, divorced Catholics. So it may seem odd that he chose to focus

on Catholic education during the Synod's last week. The topic of education got surprisingly little attention at the Synod, even after scholars Theresa Farnan and Mary Hasson [publicly urged](#) the Synod fathers to devote more time to it.

But education and the good of the Catholic family are essentially linked, and Catholic education is a key solution to the challenge of secularism. In a [lecture](#) last week at the Franciscan University of Steubenville, Ohio — which is a model of faithful education — I expressed my concern that we not limit the New Evangelization to strategies that excite young people about the Faith, but also focus more attention to the renewal of Catholic education. It is in Catholic education that young people experience the deeper formation that prepares them for sainthood in a difficult and often hostile culture.

The timing of Cardinal Burke's comments also are relevant to today's 50th anniversary of the Vatican II declaration on Christian education, [Gravissimum Educationis](#). Next month, the Vatican will celebrate the documents while addressing the "crisis of education" in the modern world, meaning the modern failures to truly bring young people to know, love and serve Jesus Christ. The result is a deep despair and aimlessness in today's societies — what Cardinal Burke calls a "profound unhappiness."

And ultimately, happiness in God is the promise of a genuine Catholic formation.

It is important that "children know happiness both during the days of their earthly pilgrimage and eternally at the goal of their pilgrimage which is Heaven," said Cardinal Burke. And it is no contradiction that such happiness means preparing for the Cross.

"Education, if it is to be sound, that is, for the good of the individual and society, must be especially attentive to arm itself against the errors of secularism and relativism," Cardinal Burke stated, "lest it fail to communicate to the succeeding generations the truth, beauty and goodness of our life and of our world, as they are expressed in the unchanging teaching of the faith."

He addressed particularly the modern confusion in sexuality, including the "so-called 'gender education' in some schools, which is a direct attack on marriage at its foundation and, therefore, on the family."

"Good parents and good citizens," said Cardinal Burke, "must be attentive to the curriculum which schools are following and to the life in the schools, in order to assure that our children are being formed in the human and Christian virtues and are not being deformed by indoctrination ... Today, for example, we sadly find the need to speak about 'traditional marriage,' as if there were another kind of marriage."

He referred to *Gravissimum Educationis* in support of parent-directed education: "As it is the parents who have given life to their children, on them lies the gravest obligation of educating their family. They must therefore be recognized as being primarily and principally responsible for their education."

And most profoundly, he reminded his audience of the encyclical by Pope Pius XI, [Divini Illius Magistri](#), and the task of Catholic education to form "the supernatural man who thinks, judges and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished man of character."

In light of the confusion surrounding the Synod and the greater confusion in the world about marriage, family and even the value of human life, we are in great need of Catholics with this sort of formation. Renewing Catholic education should be among our highest priorities.

This article was originally published by [National Catholic Register](#) and is reprinted with permission.

[Catholic Education Daily](#) is an online publication of The Cardinal Newman Society. [Click here](#) for email updates and free online membership with The Cardinal Newman Society.

Sent to me by: JDA

**AMERICAN THINKER      10-17/15      BY BRUCE WALKER**

The left plans to pitch to middle-class families and young adults who want a college degree to make college free. Conservatives have a great chance to counterpunch on this issue. Academia, like all other institutions under the totalitarian thumb of the left, is ridiculously expensive and filled with all sorts of pet bureaucracies. The approach of the left is not to cut the costs of college and to make it as easy and cheap as possible, but rather to subsidize whatever academicians' bray that they need without any serious questioning.

Higher education is, of course, heavily dependent upon government appropriation, government grants, federal student loans, tax-deductible contributions by alumni, and so on. Conservatives ought to use these levers to compel any institution of higher learning to limit its expenses in order to qualify for any sort of government help, direct or indirect. Here are some ideas about

what to propose as reforms within academia.

Limit the annual compensation for any professor or administrator to \$150,000 per year, or the top five percent of income in America. Index the maximum compensation to inflation so that it rises gradually over time, but not faster than inflation. This would force the left to defend paying sky-high salaries, a cost today paid by students' and parents' hard-earned dollars and by government support. These professors are the "rich," and ordinary people will have a tough time grasping the left's whine that no one can live on a measly \$150,000 per year.

Also require that professors actually teach in the classroom for twenty hours each week of school. This will reduce the need for graduate assistance and other flunkies doing most of the real work while professors lounge.

Another abuse that needs to be corrected is the high cost of textbooks, particularly textbooks that just happen to be written by professors teaching classes in which the textbooks are required. Prohibit colleges to require in any subject the books written by professors at the college. These textbooks cost a lot of money, and that money goes back into the professors' pockets.

End involuntary student activity fees. These levies on tuition add to the cost of college for every semester hour. Students should, of course, be allowed to contribute money voluntarily to various extracurricular activities, but they should not be forced to support things they do not wish to participate in.

Require that every college have online courses for every classroom course, and provide that students test out of any subject with the tuition per hour set at one quarter of the normal classroom subjects. Students who take online classes exclusively for their degree also reduce the costs of student housing.

Set a basic maximum tuition per credit hour, which universities may charge for students who attend schools funded by tax dollars and prohibit any student loans for tuition costs above that low level. This would compel universities to be efficient, something that these institutions simply are not required to do now. It would also keep student loan debt low, a major cost of higher education for those who are paying for college.

These changes would not be mandatory for any university that does not receive federal funding or support, like Hillsdale College. The changes would simply require that any university that wishes to have taxpayer support take serious measures to contain costs and, indeed, to slash them.

The winners would be the student, his parents, and the taxpayer. Conservatives could calculate how much these changes would save the average student seeking a four-year degree and would expose just how absurdly high the costs of college are for students seeking a college degree.

How would the left react to these proposed reforms? Leftists could not say that this would deprive young adults from getting a college education, because the reforms would, in fact, do just the opposite. The left would be forced to defend student activities funded out of tuition that support ridiculous and often offensive activities. The left would also be compelled to defend huge administrative overhead and the many professors who teach only a couple of classes each semester.

Higher education is a bloated, selfish institution, which has for decades fleeced students, fleeced their parents, and fleeced the taxpayer. If the left wants to attack great wealth, then we ought pick the great wealth that is the education establishment. We would be defending the little guy, and the left would be defending the rich and powerful.

Read more: [http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2015/10/making\\_college\\_affordable.html#ixzz3rDfXHML](http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2015/10/making_college_affordable.html#ixzz3rDfXHML)

Follow us: [@AmericanThinker on Twitter](#) | [AmericanThinker on Facebook](#)

I worked in various departments at a Kansas institution of Higher Education. I saw many very high paid instructors who taught maybe one or two classes a semester. Graduate students, some who spoke very little English, teaching more classes than the Professors. It is a good way for the Graduate student to pay for their education, but very bad for the students taking the class, who could NOT understand the instructor. In the listing of the classes the Professors are listed as the Instructors, but often do NOT sit foot in the classroom all semester. Said Professors often are paid over \$100,000 a year – **PAID FOR WHAT??? RESEARCH WORK THAT IS NEVER FINISHED OR PUBLISHED!! FAILING THOSE PAYING FOR THE CLASS.**

From the office of the Kansas Governor:

Executive Order 15-07

Protecting Kansas From Terrorism

**WHEREAS, THE WELL-BEING OF THE STATE OF KANSAS AND ITS CITIZENS IS THREATENED BY THE SCOURGE OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM; AND WHEREAS, KANSAS LOCATIONS PREVIOUSLY HAVE BEEN TARGETED FOR TERRORIST ACTS OF VIOLENCE, AND THE PERPETRATORS HAVE BEEN APPREHENDED AND PROSECUTED; AND WHEREAS, THE RECENT TERROR ATTACKS IN PARIS HAVE HEIGHTENED CONCERNS ABOUT PROTECTING KANSAS AND ENSURING THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF OUR CITIZENS; AND**

**WHEREAS, THE TERRORIST PERPETRATORS OF THE PARIS ATTACKS APPEAR TO HAVE TIES TO THE SYRIAN REFUGEE POPULATION; AND  
WHEREAS, I HAVE CONCLUDED THAT THE ADMISSION OF SYRIAN REFUGEES TO THE STATE OF KANSAS, I HEREBY ORDER AND DIRECT AS FOLLOWS:**

**No department, commission, board, or agency of the governemtn of the State of Kansas shall aid, cooperate with, or assist in any way the relocation of refugees from Syria to the State of Kansas. This Order includes, but is not limited to, the Kansas Refugee Program, the Refugee Resettlement Program, and the Refugee Social Service Program administered within the Kansas Department for Children and Families, and the Kansas Refugee Social Service Program administered within the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. Furthermore, this Order also includes the funding or administration of any grant program under the authority of the State of Kansas.**

**This document shall be filed with the Secretary of State as Executive Order No. 15-07 and shall become effective immediately.**

**THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE**

**BY THE GOVERNOR \_\_\_\_\_**

**DATED \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary of State

\_\_\_\_\_  
Asst. Secretary of State

**FILED Nov. 6, 2015  
Kris W. Kobach  
Secretary of State**

**I want to THANK Governor Brownback for issuing Executive Order No. 15-07. I agree with him 100%; however, since other states are NOT doing the same we will still be swamped with these dangerous refugees. We have NO LAWS governing who, when, what and why persons pass from one state to another. What will stop these refugees from moving from one state to another? NOTHING!!! It makes you look GREAT, Governor Brownback, but how are you going to enforce it??? As I understand it the House of Representatives has passed a bill forbidding these refugees from entering the USA, but it is doubtful the Senate will even vote on it. McConnell is still taking orders from the President. Oh, to send him the way of Boehner!!!! As I see it – There is no way to enforce this bill anyway!!! Please, tell me I am wrong!! GOD be with us!!!**

---

If you would like to forward this Newsletter as is on to others – be my guest.  
If you would like to send comments (just a sentence or two) to the editor – be my guest.  
If you have an editorial to submit – be my guest.

---

Flint Hills TEA Party contact information: [www.flinthillsteaparty.com](http://www.flinthillsteaparty.com); [fhtp@flinthillsteaparty.com](mailto:fhtp@flinthillsteaparty.com) or facebook – Flint Hills TEA Party; Manhattan contact – Chuck Henderson, 785-236-1286; Sylva Nichols, editor, email: [sylda@gemsandwood.com](mailto:sylda@gemsandwood.com). Sylva sends the snail mail. Newsletter; Flint Hills TEA Party Snail Mail: Flint Hills TEA Party of KS, 1228 Westloop Place, PMB #326, Manhattan, KS 66502-2840. All donations for the Educational Fund (payable to “Educational Fund”) will also be accepted at this address and is tax deductible.

---

Reprinting of this Newsletter may be done in whole, however, copying any part requires permission given by the persons listed above☐

