

Words Have Exact Meanings

Jeannie Georges

"HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS ARE ESSENTIAL to the current reform movement popularly known as Outcome Based Education (OBE). Without this new thinking process, children will not be capable of using the correct political and psychological thinking necessary to meet the new outcome. " Don't let the terminology fool you -- they purposely use words whose meanings are likely to keep you from asking questions.

One superintendent (or other change agent) after another has introduced it into local school systems. They have been warned not to become overly anxious and implement it all at once -- so that the parents won't see the bits and pieces put together. Everything is to be done piecemeal to keep the goals as secret as possible. In this way, people will have plenty time to be conditioned to accept the unacceptable.

Experimental programs will be brought in from the federal education laboratories and from numerous other sources. Pilot schools will not keep appropriate records to document the results of their experimental programs. Legislators will not ask for research before granting money for more experimental schools. No accounting of tax money will be requested by representatives. And year by year -- little by little -- every aspect of the national agenda for restructuring education will be brought into each school.

Unless the parents, voters and office holders decide to find out what really is going on and stop it before all representation is taken away.

The teacher's manual for Higher Order Thinking, *Tactics for Thinking*, referenced a book, which made the following statement:

Comprehension may be regarded as relating what we attend to in the world around us... to what we already have in our heads...Anything I cannot relate to the theory of the world in my head will not make sense to me. I shall be bewildered.

It makes sense: if your understanding of the universe around you conflicts with some new information you're given, you're not likely to understand or accept it. Worse, when an authority figure demands that you accept the new confusing information, you reach a point of bewilderment -- until you either accept the authority and the new information, or reject the authority and retain your previous understanding (which is supported by the evidence of your senses).

It's a well-known fighting tactic: *bewilder your adversaries*, keep them confused. Opponents are easier to overwhelm when they don't know what's going on.

We hope to show you how our "educators" are using exactly those tactics, in exactly that manner -- against you, the enemy. The purpose of this paper is to show you why -- and how -- our educators are trying to be so bewildering: because the best way to control the population is to catch them while they're young, while they don't know any better -- and program them to behave the way you want them to. And thus we have behavioral psychologists receiving federal grants to restructure our educational curriculum.

Some of the things taking place in education these days are so amazing that they will not likely relate to what you think is going on in your school, county, state or nation. It will probably cause you to be bewildered (if they have their way).

It is the behavioral psychologists, and those who have been trained by them for the purpose of acting as change agents, who are out to bewilder everybody. They are hoping, if not certain, that most people will be confused by the change of our thought processes (which will lead to a change in our culture). But they don't think many will care enough to address the state of bewilderment, let alone act to clear up any confusion. They're counting on it. Since bewilderment typically leads to a sense of being overwhelmed, their radical reform is not endangered -- unless the populace pulls together to defeat the "overwhelmed" attitude.

Statements, such as the following by Richard Paul, a noted supporter of Critical Thinking, ARE overwhelming, and people do themselves no favor by ignoring them.

"(C)hildren become literally dependent, intellectually and emotionally, on them (parents)... In this way, children are condemned to closed-mindedness...Children come to adulthood today as intellectual; emotional, and moral cripples."

Paul is only one of many who have made this assessment. This elitist attitude is a driving force which is emphasizing your child's emotional and mental needs over academic needs in school.

What he means is children must have their parents' values removed from their thinking; they must change their attitudes and beliefs. This is fundamental to Outcome Based Education and it is an objective of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS). While there are many areas we could explore which deal with OBE, we need to address the thinking that is guiding the programs and philosophies we are seeing, but haven't understood.

What we usually see are programs which are symptomatic of strange bewildering philosophies. For example: Parents may object if children view a movie on masturbation. Or, it may be they prefer their child use an alert mind instead of meditating. They may get upset with "dirty" stories used in reading class. They may think sex education encourages sexual activity and drug education increases drug use. More bewildering, with the new assessments, if the child gets a letter grade the parent still doesn't know what the child is doing: is she good in math, or are her beliefs judged as politically correct? Still more bewildering, longer school days and longer school years are luring the children away from home. The teachers and principals are talking about strategic planning, school restructuring, site-based management, team teaching, interdisciplinary curriculum, and effective schools. The programs, the ideas, the consensus building and complaints are endless. Parents protest against one particular implementation, so it's modified or renamed -- and the parents walk away proud of having rescued their children from the clutches of the evil programmers. Meanwhile, several other programs are quietly expanded. Meanwhile, other programs are quietly introduced. Meanwhile, the steady flow of programs quietly gets bigger and more harsh. Maybe the one detected program was merely a decoy...

We could spend endless days defining and describing each of these programs. But it is not necessary if we understand the PROCESS of Higher Order Thinking.

Usually the programs will state they are being used to increase Higher Order Thinking Skills, critical thinking, problem solving and decisionmaking. Who could object to such lofty terms as these? They sound great, so why would anyone object? But that's exactly why those names were picked -- to tug at your emotions, to soothe your suspicions...all the while meaning nothing close

to the meanings you'd ascribe to them. "These are the areas we should have been researching years ago. It's because we assume they mean what they say, or that their terms mean, to them, the same that they mean to us, we have neglected to study and scrutinize them. Those of us who have explored the programs found them so alien to our way of thinking, we gave up, trusting our kids' education to the experts. Heck, we certainly couldn't understand it, they must know what they're doing. These terms, and the processes they represent, have "bewildered" us.

IT MAY HELP YOU TO UNDERSTAND this bewildering process if you look at some of the components of HOTS separately.

First, the OBE facilitator wants to begin with a clean slate, so to speak. That is, they want a mind free from prior knowledge or beliefs.

Then knowledge and the key to acquiring it (e.g. proper reading instruction) will be withheld.

After this, they begin the "process" with Mastery Learning i.e. stimulus/response, dialectic thinking, and assessment-remediation (s/r) and re-assessment. (Stimulus/response is the same process that is used to train animals.)

1. Clean The Slate

THE CHILDREN MUST HAVE their minds cleansed of prior beliefs, attitudes and values. (Of course, if children begin going to school at three months of age, think of the time they'll save later.) Altering the child's state of consciousness is one process to accomplish this. You might call it spacing out (we sure would!); the programmers call it Meditation, Visualization or Attention Control -- to make it sound credible, significant and worth-while.

All this is done under the pretense of teaching the child to relax, or maybe to visualize. So just turn on the TV and "veg' out." (However, research has shown that our consciousness is turned off -- not enhanced -- by these techniques.) Then the subconscious is fed the relevant information. This is meant to affect the student's values, but teaching knowledge to the subconscious mind is also advocated -- we'll get to this later.

By no small coincidence, if you're an authority that the child recognizes, it's a lot easier to suggest things that the kid will readily accept.

The reason spacing out (Altered States of Consciousness) is used so frequently with OBE is to clear the mind of whatever view of the world the child had in his head before he came to school. In other words, it gives the behavioral psychologist a blank sheet. It shortens the time period for changing values and thinking. After all, if a hypnotist can entertain an audience by convincing a football player that he can't pick up a ten-pound chair, the facilitator should be quite capable of convincing a child he is "successful" even though he can't read.

The move is towards day dreams, visualization, using pictures, and indeed, towards clearing the mind for the programmer to re-program through stimulus/response. Parents play into the hands of the psychologist or facilitator by allowing their children to space out by watching TV. In this case, it isn't the content that hurts the child. It is the fact they are watching TV. The child who sits in front of the TV with glazed eyes, mouth half open, tongue in the roof of his mouth. and doesn't respond when he is spoken to, is practicing altering his consciousness. As the child practices this behavior it becomes easier for the behaviorist to train him to alter his state of consciousness. Children can quickly learn to go into an altered state of consciousness and the

more they practice the easier it is to do. That is: they can get into an altered state more quickly and with each practice they can learn to go into deeper unconscious states.

2. The Dumb Down

BENJAMIN BLOOM STATES THAT knowledge is the base for Higher Order Thinking; In contrast, Robert Marzano clarifies this to teachers-in-training with an overhead that says we have too much lower order thinking (knowledge) in our present method of teaching.

Bloom's statement is intended to allay the fears of parents who have grown suspicious of the new age of behaviorist education; but, as we will discover, knowledge is unnecessary for OBE. In fact, armed with knowledge, a child will be better able to withstand and resist OBE -- he'd use old-fashioned critical thinking and question the process -- so he'd be more of a threat to the whole program; thus it is actually important for the facilitators to remove what knowledge they can from the curriculum in order to implement OBE.

What Marzano means to suggest is that children can read volumes. They know geography and history. They can recite the Bill of Rights and they've read the constitution. They can do algebra, geometry and calculus. They are excelling in physics and chemistry. They could compete against children from other nations all around the world.

But the parents are up-in-arms because their children just cannot think critically, cannot make decisions and cannot solve problems. So Marzano is coming in as an educational superman to rescue the children from their plight. Thus to begin the rescue of students from our old-fashioned values, and teach them to solve problems and make decisions by the Higher Order Thinking process, the knowledge base (content, or subject matter) is being systematically dumbed down. It is being replaced by "process." We'll cover these "processes" in a moment in steps 3, 4, and 5.

It doesn't matter what your school calls its processes; cooperative learning, critical thinking strategies, integrated thematic instruction, future-sensitive training, global village class, earth's children, or any other esoteric term. The children will still learn to read -- if taught phonics. They will learn mathematics -- if taught arithmetic. Same for history, science and all the other basic subjects. Instruction in academics will teach students today just as effectively as it did decades ago.

Beware of any peculiar names; they are likely to be part of the OBE "process." Phonics are not taught in OBE reading classes. Arithmetic is distorted. Knowledge is cast aside in favor of the programs from the behavioral psychologists.

Children are left on their own to discover what the teacher (facilitator) is discouraging them from learning.

Not only will the child be given less knowledge, but the knowledge they are given will not be given as absolutely true. They are working from a philosophy that thinks there is no way to prove that $2 + 2$ will always equal four. This dumb-down process starts with whole language. The average student will not read well and many will be labeled with some learning disability terminology (e.g. dyslexia, attention-deficit disorder). The process will then proceed to the deconstruction of the language.

"Altered states of consciousness" is also promoted as an asset to teach "academics." The child is told to seek a special or inner guide or universal consciousness for all knowledge. If the teacher can program the child in a subconscious state, then the child will believe that all learning is

intuitive. After all, the child will not know when or how he learned c-a-t spells cat. And he certainly will not know why it spells cat, because by using whole language as a learning method, he will not be required to learn the sound of the letters or the phonetic rules governing the sounds and spellings of our words.

It isn't that schools just don't explain letters and sounds, or that sounds make words. They've practiced this for years; they used to call it look-say reading. But now it is much worse. They are teaching that words have NO meaning or they are giving words new meanings -- to further widen the generation gap and cause confusion. Divide and conquer.

In addition, they are using words to depress, frighten and confuse our children. An ordinary spelling book was reviewed by an interested mother. She listed occult words, New Age words, long lists of words defined in such a way as to bring to mind natural disasters and accidents, hostile and angry feelings, behavior disorders, fears, physical and emotional hurts, law-breakers and their weapons, environmental and global concerns. Listed below are a few of those words and the definitions they were to be given as the teacher recited them for the children.

point	The point of a knife.
tackle	The policeman tackled the fleeing burglar.
blow	The bad news came as quite a blow to him.
rock	The earth tremor rocked the house.
jar	The explosion jarred the building.
red	Having the color of blood.

More recently a parent complained of the "hurting" alphabet." Instead of A being represented by apple, it was represented by avalanche. And so the letters, A through Z, were nearly all related in terms of pain or disaster.

The public is routinely deceived by "educators" who explain they are going to fix the literacy problem with whole language (a look-and-guess process which is destined to lower the literacy rate faster than ever). This is basic to Higher Order Thinking and to the critical thinking assessments in Outcome Based Education. Without the ability to read well, the vocabulary is dumbed down sufficiently to keep thought processes at a very elementary level -- for life.

3. Behavioral Modification

MASTERY LEARNING, THE OLD name for what's now called OBE, will be implemented. It's the process of stimulus/response with the ever repetitious positive or negative reinforcement.

This process of Mastery Learning is nothing more than animal training stimulus /response techniques -- more correctly called behavioral control, conditioning, or psychological manipulation. Knowledge is not required -- because as anyone knows, an animal doesn't need knowledge in order to be trained. And this is used in nearly all those "programs" parents find objectionable: sex ed, drug ed, gang ed, death ed, multiculturalisin, environmentalism, group therapy. The use of education jargon differs slightly, but they are discussing the same thing.

There is a deceitful abuse of our language by these behavioral psychologists and change agents who call themselves educators. They will use a word whose meaning you approve of, so that you'll accept their program without question, even though their use of the word has little relation to the real meaning. They know you won't understand what they're talking about. Whole language, higher order thinking skills, outcome-based education, the words are chosen because they have meaning to you, different to what the terms represent to the behaviorists. Compare

their words and their actions to see what they mean by the use of their words. Do their words match their deeds? Do they say they are starting with a knowledge base -- all the while replacing academics with programming? Are they wasting instructional time with "fun" projects and more "process"?

You can program a person to be a criminal or a saint, they say. They are "fixing" the nation's pregnancy problems, drug, gang and suicide problems the same way. "They are going through a "process" -- a very sophisticated psychological process; not instructing or teaching the student. Educators have stated that the process is more important than the content." That's a bewildering statement; but they state it as though they mean it. Do they mean what they say or do they only use the terminology for the purpose of bewildering people? If they really do mean it, then they would not care if farmers planted corn or cockle burr. Just as long as he went through the "process." Nor would they care what was harvested; corn or cockle burr. Likewise, they wouldn't care if Kellogg's processed corn or cockle burr. But, most important, they wouldn't care whether they poured corn flakes or burr flakes in their cereal bowl. Right? So, do they really mean what they say? Not likely!

When they advocate OBE, they certainly do not believe "any" process is acceptable. With OBE there is a predetermined outcome. That means an exact process has to be used. Perhaps we are being deceived and conditioned to accept burr flakes! (It's just an illustration, but metaphorically, it's exactly what they're after: we should accept anything they give us, and be grateful for it.)

4. Dialectic Thinking

THOSE WHO ADVOCATE Higher Order Thinking call it a process for dialectic thinking. In this instance, they are being truthful. But at the same time, they hope that most people will not understand the meaning of the word. As proposed by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, a noted philosopher, dialectic thinking is the process of thesis/antithesis/synthesis. It's the process Marxists like to use in order to bring about a change in a society. Dialectic thinking is not difficult to understand once it has been explained. It's just one of those things that has been removed from the "knowledge base" of most Americans (our schools don't offer history any more -- now, it's social studies). Typically, the American way of swaying the public was to campaign and persuade and convince, openly and honestly -- sometimes with reason and logic, sometimes with feelings and emotions. But Hegel's method, this dialectic thinking, is subtle, deceitful, hard to pin down; it's difficult to fight because it's difficult to detect. Think about this question: "When is it okay to steal?" Consider it for a moment before you read further. It's a valid question, right? Except that it already assumes that stealing is indeed acceptable in some cases; but how many students will have the perception -- let alone courage -- to challenge the teacher on such a point?

Even if a student were to make such a challenge, the teacher could easily back up and say it was a slip of the tongue, it wasn't meant to sound the way it did. Later, another example would make an appearance, then another, and another, until one slithered past the student's careful scrutiny, to subvert his convictions. Or values. Or beliefs.

So, dialectic thinking works like this:

Thesis -- This is what you or your child accepts as truth.

EXAMPLE: Mommy says it is always wrong to steal. So, never steal; it is WRONG!

Antithesis -- This can be anything that causes the child to question what is true.

EXAMPLE: (in a story) Billy's daddy had to steal so Billy wouldn't starve. IMPLICATION: Mommy could be wrong. At least, it gets the child to "think" in a way he previously knew was wrong. QUESTIONING PROCESS: is stealing, in this instance, permissible? Maybe stealing can be necessary.

Synthesis -- Mommy can be wrong, why even listen to Mommy; Mommy doesn't understand. In short, Ma don't know squat. She hasn't had HOTS.

(Later the child may come to the next "new truth" and decide stealing is always okay, as long as it is taking from the rich -- whoever he might think is rich. Many Americans who now vote have apparently come to that conclusion; soak the rich -- heck, they can afford it, they deserve it...oh, and give me a slice, I need it much more than they do.)

The student cannot hold two opposing, contradictory views at the same time -- no one can. That is: if stealing is always wrong, it can't ever be right. It can't be bad, and at the same time, be good. More important, he cannot stay within the context of the problem and still use the logical thinking he has previously been trained in at home.

EXAMPLE: When solving the problem presented by the story, the student could suggest that Billy's daddy could get a job, or go to a charity, for food. If the teacher is well trained in the ways of dialectic thinking, the teacher will instruct the student to stay in the confines of the question and simply state whether stealing in that instance is okay or not (There was a time when pupils were rewarded for "thinking outside the square." The dangerous ones who do so today are primary targets for reprogramming-remediation.)

This is affective education ("feelings based"). The child is being asked to make a judgment based on sympathy, not reason -- on feelings, not knowledge.

Knowledge is not required.

This causes disorganization of the mind and behavior. The new term is cognitive dissonance; it's disintegration of behavior and mental breakdown. Maybe it would be easier to understand if we were to say it causes mental illness -- a double-minded man. The way to escape this mental dilemma is to fully accept the new thought process without reason (e.g. stealing isn't always wrong) and abandon the old concept completely. (You can't believe that it's completely wrong to ever steal, at the same time you believe that it's okay sometimes.) Now that we've driven a wedge between the kid and his old thinking, the child has a new thesis from which to begin the next session.

When two ways of thinking are presented, [1] the parents' (and the child's) and [2] the school's (and the state's), to overcome this conflict of the mind, the child must make a decision. When one view is pounded in, hour after hour, day after day -- assessed, remediated and reassessed; when the child has to recite things which are embarrassing or considered wrong, he should give in, if the behaviorists are correct. The synthesis, that point where the student just slightly changed his thinking, can then be used as a new starting point to move the student on to another slight compromise in his thinking.

This process (moving the child step by step, synthesis by synthesis, away from his prior knowledge, convictions, values, and thought processes) may not be quick or easy. So now you see the need for pre-school for babies as young as 3 months old and year round school for all children. In fact, Attorney General Reno, called for early intervention -- as early as the prenatal period -- as a means of ensuring that children have the chance to develop into "responsible citizens" by stating: " ...(W)e've got to develop the continuum from the beginning...to make sure

that parents are old enough, wise enough, and financially able to take care of their children..." This sounds a bit like people may have to pass an OBE assessment before they are allowed to conceive. If the children can be taught the "correct" values, attitudes and beliefs from the beginning, there will be no need for the long drawn-out process of compromising their old thinking, step-by-step, to get them to the proper thoughts.

How efficient! Gotta conserve those resources! This process to create mental confusion, so that the values and beliefs of another culture can be used to replace one's existing values, has been referred to as cross-culturalization. It can be explained like this:

Each person, each family, each community and each nation, has a "platform" of beliefs that make them who they are. By introducing this process of dialectic thinking, they are being undermined by having the platform removed out from under them, one plank at a time. As one plank is gently pulled out; another is gently pushed in to replace the removed one. If it is done cautiously enough (and if the platform was not too sturdy to begin with it can be accomplished with greater ease), no one will become aware of what has been going on. Everyone will accept the new culture without resistance. In fact, they will not know they are standing on a new platform.

When all their liberties are removed at once, the people will rebel. But erode them away, one at a time, and they will thank you for it. Perhaps you have noticed that our belief system has changed. Think back a few years -- maybe ten, fifteen or twenty. Was homosexuality widely discussed? Would you openly and without embarrassment discuss condoms? How many couples did you know who were divorced? How many unwed mothers did you know? These traditional values are changing by design. While the political right inched to the left, the left flew off the scale. This is why those who are making the radical changes can turn on the traditionalist and call him the radical. The traditionalist -- by standing on his principles -- has appeared to move to the right; he's simply is not staying on the platform. It's been replaced by a new one.

Farther to the left.

5. Assessments, Remediation, Re-assessments

ASSESSMENTS WILL BE PERFORMED to be certain ALL the children have been properly trained. The assessments will be done through what is called authentic assessments and portfolios. This is not to be confused with academic testing.

If knowledge is removed all that is left is process and assessment. If knowledge is removed, and the outcome is predetermined, then the process has to be controlled to properly "demonstrate" or "perform" the expected outcome. This is outcome based education: demonstration and performance, as many states call it. This is what you expect from mastery teaching and learning. Responses are demonstrated or performed -- any monkey can "perform."

Intelligence, on the other hand, can be tested but not always performed. It's a human function that the children are being deprived of, under OBE.

A reading specialist, Frank Smith, in *Understanding Reading* gives us information on B. F. Skinner. He states:

"A response, quite simply, is a piece of observable behavior -- not an idea, or a prediction, or an emotion, or a memory -- all of these are unobservable, and therefore in the behaviorist view "fictions"...A stimulus, also quite simply, is an occasion for a response. A red light is the stimulus for stopping a car...and the printed word cat is a stimulus for the spoken word "cat".

Positive reinforcement is anything that increases the probability that a response will recur in the presence of a particular stimulus; negative reinforcement reduces that probability."

Performance or demonstration of "learned" abilities will require teachers to abandon traditional testing of intelligence. Teachers will be retrained to keep portfolios which the child or parent will not be aware of. The portfolios will be kept from one class to the next; one year after another. The authentic assessments, however, may be done by using a computer scanner to scan the child's bar coded name and the bar coded behavior the teacher wanted to observe. Or the teacher may videotape the students. This will be an ongoing process as teachers will be instructed to observe behavior on the playground, in the school garden, at the ball games and on field trips, in addition to the regular classroom mayhem. Of course, the scanner will make the data keeping much easier as it will be electronically exchanged into the computer data system at night.

It sounds convenient; swipe the card through the machine and the teacher is done. But what if Jennifer doesn't happen to fall directly into one of the categories expected by the computer? No time for extensive notes or explanations; just file her under "authority-challenged."

Children will be subjected to positive and negative reinforcement (to get the proper responses) in large doses as the schools move to co-operative learning, group counseling and peer dependency. Rejection by the group -- a negative reinforcement -- is to be dehumanized. The group will not proceed until ALL THE CHILDREN LEARN what has been determined to be necessary. Imagine the peer pressure on a student who makes an attempt to exercise his integrity! The teacher will assess and re-assess. All children will learn that hard work has no reward, and that studying for a test is a waste of time (because they can simply take it, over and over again, until they get it right). Positive and negative reinforcement will be repeated until every outcome is accomplished by every student."

One teacher told the story of an elementary child who did not get a positive reinforcement (an ice cream sundae with ANY kind of topping a child could want) simply because that child had taken one lunch to school over a particular period of time. The "treats" were only for those children who ate the school lunches every day.

One lunch from home and this child was no longer "part of the group."

This worked as both positive and negative reinforcement. The children who got the sundaes (positive reinforcement) may have thought it a worse punishment for the non-conformist to have to sit and watch them eat their sundaes (the noneater was "different" -- an outcast) than to be deprived of eating something good at a time when you are very hungry. So they (in theory) would say to themselves, "I'll always conform to the group. I don't want to be pointed out as "different". And besides, I did what was right, and I got this reward. The punished child (again, in theory) should feel so disgraced, the temptation to do anything different would never really be appealing. But, just to be certain, the hunger also will help to negatively reinforce any nonconformist act.

The children aren't the only ones subjected to this. For instance, a negative reinforcement aimed at parents might be rejection from a committee, being snubbed by the educator you thought was a friend, or receiving threatening or harassing phone calls. If you were nothing more than an animal, as the behaviorists believe, you would quit the behavior which produced the unpleasant result. Parents may withstand this treatment, but how could children be expected to withstand it day after day, year after year?

All of this falls outside the realm of intelligence. This is the way to train a porpoise to perform at Sea World, or an elephant to perform for a circus.

This is Mastery Learning -- OBE.

Here's another example: The difference in OBE and traditional academic instruction may be understood by using the subject of citizenship as an example of how different the assessments would be.

In traditional schools, with traditional testing, the student would be instructed in history, geography, government, etc. He would be taught what the Constitution says; who wrote it and -- from historical documentation -- why. He would be taught about rights, privileges and responsibilities. He would be taught what a democracy is; a republic, a dictatorship, oligarchy, monarchy, anarchy. He would know the meaning of fascism, Nazism, socialism, slavery, servitude and freedom. He would learn that actions have consequences. He would know that if he failed to read, and participate as a good citizen, his nation could deteriorate.

He would be tested -- to be certain that he understood these academic things, so that as he matured he could make informed decisions about values and duties. If he did not have the knowledge to base good decision making on, he would repeat the classes.

In OBE, the student will be told what to do. That is, they must do "community service" (state approved, of course), they must register to vote, they must recycle, they must join protests (politically correct ones -- like writing their legislators to increase spending for schools) and they must be tolerant of everyone and everything. (Everyone has diplomatic immunity -- except you and your traditional values.) Just go along with the pack, and you'll get high marks in OBE.

Authentic assessments will then be done to judge the students' performance. How well can they "demonstrate" what they have been stimulated to do -- what they have been programmed to do? If they aren't demonstrating political correctness, they will be remediated and none of those in the class will go on to the next lessons until they ALL succeed in demonstrating acceptable behavior.

While most people do not connect whole language with stimulus/response, Frank Smith, previously quoted, seems to make that connection: see c-a-t, say cat. Stimulus, response. Since the confusion of the language has been recognized as a perfect way to split a culture" (when no one knows what anyone else means by the words they use), the social planners would never underrate its potential. So the children are taught to read by stimulus/response. If they see a group of letters together, they are to respond by saying a particular word. That is far different than learning the sounds in the language, learning the spellings for those sounds and then reading words.

In reality, it is even worse than that in the modern classroom. The child may respond by saying cat when they see the letters c-a-t together. Then again, they may respond kitten. Kitten would not be graded as wrong. (Heavens, it might injure the child's self-esteem.) But, still worse, the children are taught that they should guess what the words are if they don't know. They are to create meaning from the words they don't know.

It works a lot like estimation in math -- but that's changed, too. In schools a few years ago, we were taught how to do percentages. Then we were taught how to make a close estimate. Businesses estimate all the time -- before they commit to a project, and once they commit, they calculate everything down to the inch, to the penny, to the minute. If the estimate wasn't close, it

was wrong. But today it can't be wrong; after all, it is only an "estimate." So, they are estimating meaning, without the knowledge base upon which the estimation would take place. And since it is only an estimation, nothing can be wrong. This is Higher Order Thinking! The only thing bewildering about it is that they give it a name like "Higher Order Thinking." It's not what you would consider higher order thinking (we certainly wouldn't); and they hope nobody challenges them on the definition of their term. We would probably call it something like Propaganda 101, or Modern Conditioning. That's not so bewildering.

The idea of twisting and distorting the meanings of words (or, as they would have us believe, that "words have no meaning") is not new. It is just that it is new to the United States. Traditionally, Americans have recognized that some things are true; some are false. There could be no truth if there was no such thing as meaning. This has been one of those huge bewildering things that we have been unwilling to confront. If one were to hear a school administrator say "it isn't where you are going, but the travel that's important," it would be far easier to ignore the statement than to deal with it. After all, one would recognize that the administrator still returned to his office every day. Was his destination important or not? Is he saying this to confuse parents? Is his mind so messed up that he believes this? Is he a liar? Hmm? It is important to recognize that the thought process, and therefore thinking, has radically changed in this nation. We are actually losing the meaning of words. To complicate the situation more, some people know the meanings are changing and take advantage of that. Those who don't know meanings of words are changing simply become more bewildered, more easily confused -- and more easily dominated.

There is a difference between a liar and someone who doesn't believe words have meaning. The liar knows he is lying and most people can understand what is happening even if they don't like it.

Think about trying to convince your parents that you came in before curfew when you (and they) knew you were late. They and you knew you were lying. It was a right and wrong issue. You lost. You were wrong. If they were doing their job, you didn't really want to attempt lying again.

Today the thought process has changed. There are honestly people who believe that words don't really mean anything. You might say your teenagers are to be in before 11:30. They may come in at 12:15 and argue that they are on time. After all, 11:30 comes twice a day, fourteen times a week, in different time zones. Time is relative. Heck, you probably didn't know what you meant, either.

Try building a rocket that way. Or coordinating an invasion. Or running an assembly line. Perhaps, most people would think we have simply become more loose with the use of our words. For instance, in a world of robbery, violence, hatred, abuse, battery and so forth, everyone seems to be in love with everyone. The performer who "loves" his fans; parents who can't interrupt entertainment or hobbies but will call home to tell their children how much they "love" them. And the child who is getting dressed to go out for the evening will no doubt tell her mother how much she loves her. Mother may be called to the county jail in a few hours and be humiliated by the child's behavior; behavior that would never have taken place if the child honestly loved and respected the parent. The word "love" has lost all meaning in these situations. Yet it is still used. In fact, it is used much more now than ever before. But a few years ago it wasn't necessary to say it so much. Real love (with meaning) is demonstrated or displayed through behavior. To be more accurate (and that is what words are for), parents who love their children put them before

themselves, and children who love their parents honor them with good behavior. And, perhaps, the entertainer simply *appreciates* his fans, or their money.

This may be a simplistic illustration. But the performer, the parent and the child are not lying -- in the true sense of the word. Either they don't know the MEANING of the word 'love' or they are not careful to use the proper word.

But the deliberate misuse of the meanings of words (the semantic deception) -- the new-age terminology for what we once called "lying" -- is a powerful manipulation tool when placed in skilled hands.

Outcome Based Education is hardly education -- it's animal training: if you bark when you hear the bell ring, you'll get your treat. No understanding required. No intellect required. Just a desire to gain approval. That's OBE.

And their Higher Order Thinking Skills actually have very little to do with thought; rather, it's how well you get along with the group. How sensitive you are to the feelings of others. How willing you are to measure yourself by anyone else's standards. How you're willing to be a doormat for everyone else. How much your self-esteem depends on the approval of anyone, absolutely anyone, besides yourself. How dependent you are on that approval. How far you will go, the things you will do, to get that approval.

How easily and simply you can be controlled.

B. F. Skinner has repeatedly suggested that adequate methods of behavioral control are already available and could improve the human condition tomorrow *if we were not too timid to put them into practice* (emphasis added).

Behaviorists assert that all behavior can be understood -- in Skinnerian terminology "predicted and controlled" -- by establishing habits through the reinforcement of a response in the presence of a particular stimulus.

The hero in *Walden Two* (written by B. F. Skinner) states:

"Now that we know how positive reinforcement works...we can be more deliberate and hence more successful, in our cultural design. We can achieve a sort of control under which the controlled, though they are following a code much more scrupulously than was ever the case under the old system nevertheless feel free. They are doing what they want to do, not what they are forced to do. That's the source of the tremendous power of positive reinforcement -- there's no restraint and no revolt. By a careful cultural design, we control not the final behavior, but the inclination to behave--the motives, the desires, the wishes. The curious thing is that...the question of freedom never arises."

Maybe that is the situation today. Maybe it is as simple as clearing the minds of previous beliefs, attitudes, behaviors and knowledge. Maybe all we need is the appropriate stimulus and the proper reinforcement to develop constructive attitudes and values. Maybe there are some superhuman behavioral psychologists and social planners who have their lives so wonderfully whole and their act so completely together that they know what is best for everyone. Maybe they can structure a utopian paradise, run by compliant human resources. Maybe.

Except, how can we know the button-pushers are going to push the right buttons? And who pushed their buttons? And who programmed the button-pushers' button-pushers? They'll confidently and smugly inform you that they have the background -- they were brought up in the right environment, you see -- and that you just won't understand (your environment was inadequate, got it?), so you just trust everything to them, and it'll all work out nice and lovely.

Now go away and let the busy programmers do their job. Here, have an ice cream cone, and watch some TV. All comfy now?

Behaviorism. It's a question of control -- who has it, and over whom. They want the control over the future via you and your kids.

So What's The Point?

THE ALTERNATIVE IS TO ARM people, beginning when they're children, with facts, information and knowledge so that they can make their own decisions. Nobody would have control over anybody; everybody would have -- and should have -- an opportunity to gather what resources he needs to be able to make his own way: to profit from his knowledge or to squander it, to improve his lot or to degrade it. This way, every individual has control over his own destiny, in his own hands. But this is in dire opposition to what the behaviorists are after. If your kids are armed with knowledge, they'll be much more difficult to control, to train, to program. This gets in the behaviorist's way. It's a nuisance. An independent mind is difficult to enslave.

This is why it is important for you and your community to keep academics in the curriculum at your local schools. HISTORY -- learn from the mistakes others have made. LANGUAGE -- learn how to communicate with fellow human beings, in writing and in speech. MATHEMATICS -- learn how to use numbers as a powerful tool, to plan, to estimate, to measure, and to build. SCIENCE -- learn to discover the secrets of the universe and how to make them useful to mankind. VOCABULARY -- constantly improve your ability to reason by finding more precise terms for your thoughts. And perhaps most important and basic of all, READING -- learn to benefit from the learnings of others; tap into their imaginations, their conclusions, their discoveries; learn from their failures and their triumphs.

It is not enough to object to a program simply due to questionable content. Objectionable content is not the reason to question a program, for even true academics may genuinely encounter content which you'd find objectionable. The questionable behaviorist programs will only be a small symptom of the huge disease spreading throughout our education system. Attack the virus, not the inflammation. After a minor program is abandoned, another program -- or a modified version of the same one, under a different name -- will take its place. Idling mere programs will prove fruitless. Attack behaviorism, not just objectionable programs.

Stop the behaviorism. Anything that replaces academics is unacceptable -- IT WILL NOT DO. Academics, academics, academics. Be sure your kids are learning facts, knowledge and information -- not sensitivity, multiculturalism and global awareness.

Do not simply trust the education of your children to "the experts." It's the future that's at stake -- your future, our future, and your children's future. Anything that takes the place of academics should be questioned -- if not rejected outright.

The behaviorists claim that they have the right and the power to brainwash and control the ignorant masses. They will have the power, if we give it to them, but they do not have the right. So, the masses simply need to shed ignorance, overcome bewilderment, and overwhelm the enemy by acquiring knowledge, using reason and logic, and out-working the planners.