

The Rouge Forum

Summer 2004 Issue #12

No Child Left Behind: The Federal Government's Attack on Equality and Public Education by David Hursh, Bonnie Whitney, and Kyra Hawn

War Dissent and Democracy by Ron Briley

Living in the Mold Culture of Violence by William Boyer

3500 Martin Luther King BLVD by Tom Suber

Ready To Be Drawn by Gloria Nixon-John

Some Basic Questions by Robert Kay, MD

The Invention of the White Race by Greg Queen

Another Brick in the Wall: High-Stakes Testing in Teacher Education by Perry Marker

School Is Bad for Children by John Holt

School Segregation Redux by E. Wayne Ross

The Questions Kids Ask by Amber Goslee

Institute on Education and Society: A Call for Proposals

I participate

What is the Rouge Forum?

For more information contact rougeforum@pipeline.com

The Rouge Forum newspaper was created entirely through voluntary efforts. We extend our thanks to all who have contributed.

War, Dissent, and Democracy by Ron Briley

As I led a discussion of President Woodrow Wilson's military intervention against Mexican President Victoriano Huerta and proclamation that the American President was going to teach Mexico to elect good men, some students made an effort to relate Wilson's failures in Mexico to President George W. Bush's plans for "regime change" in Iraq. When this happened I noticed a reluctance of many students to engage in criticism of either Wilson or Bush. Some stated that they simply did not have enough information to engage in such speculation, while others expressed discomfort, believing that criticizing American foreign policy historically or today was in some way disloyal. This disturbs me, for it demonstrates that as Americans we have forgotten the role that dissent and debate have played in our history. We seem to have bought into the idea that expressing our Constitutional right to question the nation's leaders is in some way disloyal as the President suggested when he asserted that Democrats who did not support his Homeland Defense legislation did not care about the nation's security.

We tend to extol World War II as the model of united we stand, divided we fall. Yet, the nation was bitterly divided over the direction of American foreign policy until the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. And even during that war, overcrowding and efforts to promote African-American workers led to a race riot in Detroit which temporarily shut down the arsenal of democracy. Violence flared in the streets of San Diego and Los Angeles as sailors attacked Chicanos in the Zoot Suit Riots. We do tend to nostalgically embrace the unified war effort of World War II, while ignoring the internal conflicts of the period. For all of American history has produced debate and conflict over the questions of war in a democratic society. Even in the American Revolution, the fledgling nation was divided between patriots and loyalists. In the War of 1812, a declaration of war against Great Britain only carried the U. S. Senate by a vote of 19 to 13, with the Federalist Party and Eastern mercantile interests opposing the conflict. The Manifest Destiny of the Mexican-American War in the 1840s, and its impact upon slavery expansion, also provoked dissent and one of the seminal texts of American democracy: Henry David Thoreau's essay "Civil Disobedience."

Of course, the greatest division in our history was the American Civil War. In the South, the ordinances of succession hardly enjoyed universal support, and many upcountry yeomen farmers refused to support the Confederacy. Abraham Lincoln labeled his Northern Democratic critics as Copperheads, but if the war had not taken a positive turn for the Union, the Republican might have been defeated by George McClellan in 1864.

American expansion into the West after the Civil War produced fierce resistance by Native Americans, although less dissent than the Mexican-American War. Nevertheless, Helen Hunt Jackson's *A Century of Dishonor* (1886) did brand

American Indian policy as a series of broken promises and treaties. The Spanish-American War of 1898 made the United States a colonial power with a naval base in Cuba and territorial possessions in Guam, Puerto Rico, and The Philippines. The war and its aftermath sparked an anti-imperialist movement led by Democratic Presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan.

American entrance into World War I featured considerable opposition. Progressive Republican George Norris of Nebraska asserted that the war would only benefit Wall Street interests and munitions-makers. While Norris continued to serve in the Congress, the government used patriotic fervor to shut down more leftist critics of American foreign policy. Leaders of the Socialist Party, such as Eugene Debs, and the Industrial Workers of the World were imprisoned for opposing the war. The violation of civil liberties during World War I draws a frightening parallel to the present with the chilling effect that such legislation as the Patriot Act has had upon free speech and dissent. In the 1920s and 30s, many Americans grew disillusioned with World War I, and there was a strong anti-war movement to keep the country out of the Second World War. This proved impossible, but the legacy of international failures to stop the rise of Hitler in the 1930s continue to have major repercussions for the present. During the Cold War, communist expansion was compared with Hitler's aggressions, and those, such as former Vice-President Henry Wallace, who urged negotiations with the Soviet Union, were labeled as appeasers. The success of McCarthyism in branding as disloyal and soft on communism those who questioned the Cold War generally blunted criticism of the Korean War, although right-wing critics argued that the nation needed a more aggressive military stance in Korea.

The escalation of the Cold War in Vietnam, with the accompanying growing number of draft notices and body bags, produced bitter divisions and dissent during the late 1960s and early 1970s. While war protesters were often accused of treason, public support for the long war in Southeast Asia eroded and American withdrawal from Vietnam was negotiated.

The experience in Vietnam left a bitter taste in the mouths of most Americans, who began to look back at World War II as a golden age of unity. Accordingly, the Persian Gulf War was orchestrated as a great patriotic war with ticker-tape parades for the soldiers. Yet, the ambiguous outcome of that conflict and the way that veterans with Persian Gulf War Syndrome were treated quickly took the luster off that conflict.

Today, we appear about to embark upon another great crusade in Iraq to topple a dictator who has been compared with Hitler. As the first Gulf War and Wilson's efforts in Mexico demonstrate "regime change" may not be quite as simple as our leaders suggest. As this brief survey indicates there is a rich tradition of dissent with American foreign policy and war. Those who ask the tough questions are simply exercising their democratic rights. But history also suggests that there is risk involved in this process. Nevertheless, I would like to see my students and fellow citizens unafraid to take up the responsibility of democratic citizenship and question our leaders.

Living in the Mold Culture of Violence

By William Boyer

Living in the mold culture of violence, nagging questions ring endlessly like distant car alarms, and many wish we could simply stroll out of the listening range, to somehow float above homicide rates, terrorist attacks and the catch sound bite shrieks of "acceptable loss and affordable risk" or "remaining vigilant," as if the ultimate action in this democracy is to become a vocal cheerleader. More salient inquires, such as, "Can't we all just get along?" and "Is this a just war or just a war?" remain muffled, with answers forever on hold.

As an urban high school social studies teacher of government, psychology, sociology, cultural studies, and even drama, I struggle to go beyond the mere relay of information and the fallacies of supposed objectivity, to somehow ignite the (re)discovery of participation and the power of change. And there I stand, saddling up with friends, on a sunny Saturday afternoon, October 25, 2002, in Washington DC, dressed in jeans and a yellowing T-shirt portraying the grim message of an Iraqi child dying every ten minutes due to economic sanctions, together with my essential props – a plastic scythe of death and a George W. Bush mask (made in China) -- on my way to the largest anti-war rally since the Vietnam era.

Skipping past the polished building glass on the way to the Metro and again in the subway windows, the Ghost Of My Old High School Reflection (Class of 79) periodically collides with the present reflections glancing back at me. The brief memory flare-ups reproduce images of my last visits to the Marine recruiter, of a troubled youth, over twenty years ago, trying to escape with camouflage and camouflage his escape. Now another ghost, one of my former students, the recent GED grad Christian Crampton begins to haunt me as well: Christian, who, like me, had trouble listening and participating as a student, Christian, who, unlike me, even attended a couple of anti-war meetings before deciding to enlist in the Marine Corps-- sadly, like me.

As I erase the chalkboard of another vanishing lesson, Christian looms in front of a circle of empty desks, grinning and mumbling a slightly apprehensive farewell, while his Marine Gunnery Sergeant recruiter waits impatiently outside my classroom door. It's too late to describe the exhilaration of protesting in Washington DC, too late to warn Christian of the Constitutional rights he forfeits when signing up to allegedly protect them. When I ask his concerns about possibly being in the front lines of the impending next war, his recruiter ambles in, as if on cue, to recite the stock reply, "Marines, more than anyone else, know the true horrors of combat and therefore desire war the least, but if called upon, we will serve because it our duty and our job." It is the same answer I once learned to parrot back, in my extended adolescence, when my only exposure to alternative points of view were a few (curiously) treasured folk songs by Bob Dylan and a chance viewing of the once famous black and white film, All Quiet on the Western Front. The Gunnery Sergeant recruiter smiles awkwardly when he admits he has never seen combat himself and soon ushers Christian out the door towards his one-way transport to boot camp and soon after, the Middle East.

If only Christian could have caught an actual demonstration, if only all my classes could witness this, all these ground forces of peace, the dozens holding picket signs on the subway platform multiplying into hundreds surging for a place to huddle in the rail cars, if only I had known way back then what we know now. . . with tributaries of activists swelling into rivers of rising radicalism; it's time to put on my costume and begin four hours of character impersonation, of George W, the Bush Wack, the President who in early September declared he possessed entirely new information on the Iraqi's nuclear weapons program, information actually altered and twisted from a 1998 report by the International Atomic Energy Agency, which actually claimed Iraq had no physical capability to produce nuclear weapons.

A stage rests across from the field below the towering Washington Monument phallus, with human and electronic speakers, yet the gathering appears suspiciously small, with only a few dozen attendees, TV cameras and American flags. Surely, this cannot be it, and surely, our growing peace column gradually realizes it is the pitiful Pro-War Rally, which C-Span would later dutifully devote to over two hours of coverage, suggesting (objectively?) that a pro-war demonstration of less than a 100 people could be just as every bit significant as a demonstration of well over 100,000.

We cross the street leading to Pennsylvania Avenue and suddenly the massive Anti-War assemblage quickly drowns out the pitiful Pro-War Rally. My crowd estimates are aided by many years of attending dozens of sold-out University of Michigan football games of 107,000 plus people, and I will eventually conclude the rally to be a stadium and a half full of protesters (roughly 150,000) but at first, I am easily distracted merrily distracting others along the still waters and excited protesters overflowing the mall. My masked presidential presence, my clumsy prancing, it elicits strange stares, odd cheers and frequent camera clicks. I will be kissed and cavorted throughout the day, along with many other street theater performers (such as an Uncle Sam on stilts) and colorful troupes (not troops) who enter and exit with spontaneous delight. Beneath my rubber face, I sweat and thank my impromptu co-stars, including a heavily wigged (out) group who eagerly pass out play money for me to smoke (as the "Grim Reefer").

I try to time my playful performances to interrupt only the less inspiring speakers, including one minister who grabs the main stage microphone and embarrassingly screams at the masses to "show me the money, show me the money for peace!" While Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton further liven the lively (and the unexpectedly diverse ages and races), and as more bus loads of protesters from all over the country are announced as still on the way, it is surprise guest and Hollywood liberal Susan Sarandon who surprises everyone with the best speech of the day. Sarandon is one of the very few speakers making the war for oil connection, (Iraq is second only to waning ally Saudi Arabia in oil reserves), and she further amplifies this by reviewing the renewable resources and alternative fuels ignored by the Bush administration and a contemptible Congress.

Veteran rocker Patti Smith offers a welcome musical respite, singing her powerful "Power to the People" anthem with a lone guitar accompaniment, and the music guides me as I drift through the sweltering sea of people and wildly assorted picket signs, some with messages standing out in their simplicity, such as "Imagine" or "Peace in Our Time," and my personal favorite, the sign I cheerfully pose with: "Buck Fush."

After a couple of unexpected interviews with some inquisitive student reporters, who happily record my cries of "He tried to kill my daddy" and "I'm just looking for some cheap oil," I continue wandering, along with other smiling bystanders to a row of trees shading a young Korean unification drum circle -- their relentless rhythmic pounding echoes across the hundred rows of protesters, a combination of strict military cadence mixed with a loose Grateful Dead-like jam, defining further the dancing spirit of this historic, international event.

Although this demonstration is initially called by ANSWER, the "Stop War, End Racism" slogan-front better known as the (woeful) Worker's World Party, no leftist or reactionary group can seize the rally or the march, there is simply too many people without a party agenda to let any authoritarian take over the scene. A flatbed truck of bad microphone-screaming unintelligible Worker's World hacks attempts to overtake the ever symbolic front of the march, yet it is obvious their diesel-exhaust spewing headache machine on wheels is going nowhere. Eventually, most of us gleefully surge around and ahead of the idling obstacle after chanting "Fuck the truck!" Meanwhile, the majority of the uniformed police make an orderly retreat back to the White House barricades, where they nervously route the seemingly endless line of demonstrators away from the smaller perimeter of puzzled tourists, back from the street and onto the sidewalks.

My wife snaps her final photo of the day, next to the EPA headquarters marker while I sweat off the last pounds of moisture and finally remove my mask, exhausted yet exhilarated. Later, as we stagger close to

our hotel, an Iraqi couple gingerly approaches me and thanks me profusely for wearing the anti-sanctions T-shirt. They had been quietly noticing it as we left the subway, seemingly oblivious to the peace rally they have just missed.

The New York Times would mysteriously undercount the demonstration by 100,000 people and bury it in a small article about "disappointed organizers" that Sunday -- three days later it would offer a rare quasi-retraction and more thorough coverage of the same event, adjusting the count to well over 100,000 and quoting the same organizers as quite pleased with the tremendous turn out. National Public Radio (and "Some Things Considered") would also offer an odd apology for its own bizarre miscount, claiming it had dropped a zero from its initial reports of only 10,000 protesters.

The Ghosts of My Older Reflections have long since vanished, yet the ghostly image of Christian, the young recruit, still lingers, as I observe my laughing students jotting down answers to my questions surrounding the enlarged photo of a rubber-faced George W. Bush impersonator. If revolutions and revolutionary thinking can no longer originate in the ever declining factories and shop floors, if instead, a new insurgency for change must come from the schools or institutions of radical political thought, then it still must do so with songs, dance, art, theater, even humor, not just with old and new information. And if the resistance to this (now first-strike) war insanity cannot always reach into the schools, then the teachers and the students have to find a way to sneak out to the resistance, to make it alive outside the mold culture of violence, apathy and resignation.

--William Boyer

(Excerpted from a slightly longer presentation delivered Saturday, November 16, at the Anti-War Symposium on Iraq, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

3500 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd

by Tom Suber

February 2003

On Veteran's day November 2001, citizens were preparing to stage a demonstration in Lansing, Michigan on a street appropriately named Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., after one of America's most famous protest leaders. As citizens approached the building numbered 3500, they were faced with a strange site previously unknown in this small community. Armed soldiers from the Michigan National Guard had surrounded the building providing protection from dangers not apparent to anyone but President George W. Bush.

The story of how the Michigan National Guard had been activated for this duty by President Bush in a face off with its own citizens, most of them former military veterans, is the story of almost unimaginable greed involving the theft of hundreds of millions of dollars of public resources for private gain. It is the story of the poisoning of the American military with a worthless and debilitating Anthrax Vaccine by war profiteers and politicians seeking cheap political and financial advantage.

3500 Martin Luther King Blvd is the site of the former State owned Michigan Biologic Products Institute that had been, now, transformed into the privately owned Bioport Corporation. The hidden history of this transformation is critical to understanding the events of giving rise to the Veteran's Day March of November 2001.

The Michigan Biologic Products Institute of the Michigan Department of Public Health had its origins at the turn of the century when the State of Michigan established a biologics lab within the Health Department.

In the 1920's, the state's biologic lab began the manufacture of vaccines for the public health of the state's citizens. It served this public purpose so well that its combination DaPT vaccine contained the safest Whooping Cough vaccine available anywhere in the nation. The only other available commercial DPT vaccines contained whole killed virus that caused greater adverse antigenic reactions that resulted, many times, in unnecessary brain damage or death of young children. Commercial vaccine developers made their whole virus vaccine cheaper and with more profit than the publicly produced and safer vaccine made by the State of Michigan with only viral parts.

But as time and history moved on, a retrogressive movement began to convert public resources to private gain as corporate greed became bolder and more unrestrained. The first success in these efforts began in England where Margaret Thatcher and the Conservative Party engaged in the wholesale of virtually every conceivable public asset to privateers and plunderers. In 1993 the Thatcher government decided to engage in one particular incident of what was euphemistically called privatization but was more transparently the diversion of public resources to private gain involving the Center for Applied Microbiology and Research (CAMR) at Porton Downs, England. It is relevant to the story of 3500 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd with its subsequent transformation from the public service of children by the production of safe childhood vaccines to the Bioport Corporation with its bio-warfare profiteers and its president Fuad El-Hibri.

The CAMR labs at Porton Downs are the English equivalent of the American bio-warfare labs at Fort Dietrich, Maryland. In particular, they were the only source located outside the United States for the bio-

warfare Anthrax vaccine. In fact, the British Anthrax vaccine has an advantage over the vaccine produced at the Michigan Department of Public Health lab. The British version was actually designed to work on inhaled Anthrax of the more deadly Ames strain while the U.S. produced vaccine was for prevention of cutaneous Anthrax skin infections of agricultural workers by the less virulent Vollum strain.

A group of investors organized by Fuad El-Hibri formed a company that was at the time the largest private biotechnology firm in the world, Porton International. Fuad El-Hibri served as a director of the newly formed company. Porton was given the exclusive right to commercially market the bio-warfare vaccines and other products produced by the British government at its Porton Downs labs by the CAMR. The most notable of these products were Botulinum Type A vaccine and Anthrax vaccine.

Fuad El-Hibri immediately after winning control of the products produced at Porton Downs arranged deliveries of biotech defense products to Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia had previously been rebuffed in its attempts to purchase these agents. Saudi Arabia desired the agents as protection against the possible use by Iraq of Anthrax provided by then C.I.A. director, George W. Bush Sr., to Iraq for possible use against Iran.

Fuad El-Hibri, prior to his creation of Porton International, had worked in the mergers-and-acquisitions department of Citibank in Jedda, Saudi Arabia, where he specialized in arranging investments for large Saudi investors. Citibank and Fuad El-Hibri were bankers both for the individual financial holdings of the bin Laden family group and the larger \$18 billion Carlyse Group of which includes participation of the bin Laden family. Both the bin Laden family and the Carlyse Group are both reputed to have had partnership interests with Fuad El-Hibri's Porton, International and Bioport investments. These embarrassing partnerships are the result of complex web of interlocking private corporate holdings and are publicly denied the El-Hibri family.

The actual ownership relationships are deliberately hidden in a labyrinth of smoke and mirrors involving private corporations and secret partnerships typical of the dark world of international armaments, defense industry, spying, and international intrigue. Publicly, Porton, International is owned by Speywood Holdings Ltd., which, in turn, is owned by I & F Holdings NV, a Netherlands Antilles corporate shell owned by Fuad El-Hibri, a Lebanese Arab with both German and U.S. citizenship; his father, Ibrihim El-Hibri; various Saudi and other unknown investors which almost surely includes the Carlyse Group. The Carlyse Group is a semi-secret financial organization that does not disclose its business affairs, as it is a privately held corporation in the sensitive defense business.

It is important to understand all of the involved personal and financial inter-relationships in order to comprehend the political issues that arise with the involvement of the Carlyse Group. The Carlyse Group is company that achieves extreme profits through investment in the defense industry. It is a politically expedient and profitable money machine for its primarily Saudi investors including the bin Laden family and various military, corporate, banking, and government officials from the United States and Western Europe. These include the former President Gorge W. Bush Sr., James Baker III the former U.S. Secretary of State, Frank Carlucci former deputy CIA Director and U.S. Secretary of Defense, John Major former Prime Minister of the UK, Eberhard Kuenheim former chairman of Bayer and BMW, Dick Darman, Karl-Otto Pohl former President of Deutsche Bundesbank

It is equally important to digress just a bit from our story to explain that the involvement of George Bush Sr. with the bin Laden family and Saudi business interests is not of recent origin but has a very long history. Over thirty years ago, Salem bin Laden, the eldest of Osama bin Laden's brothers, invested in George H. W. Bush's Arbusto Energy. The bin Laden connection was established through James Bath who represented the bin Laden interests in Texas. Bath lived in Houston, Texas and was close friends with Bush. Bath handled the \$50,000 bin Laden investment in Bush's company Arbusto. Salem bin Laden also purchased Houston Gulf Airport through James Bath.

The Center for Public Integrity has stated that current President, "George W. Bush could, some day, benefit financially from his own administration's decisions, through his father's investments." Indeed, somewhat of an understatement.

By 1996, the rape of the public resources of Great Britain was virtually complete. So the profit making interests of the Saudi's and the Carlyse Group began to look to the United States for more promising plunder. They did not have to look very deeply because Bush and company already owned Michigan Republican Governor John Engler. Governor Engler was persuaded by his cronies to sell off the state's biologic products lab after nearly a century of service to the citizens. The Governor removed the biologic lab from the Department of Public Health established it as a new state agency, the "Michigan Biologics Products Institute." This new agency was limited to a two-year term of existence. This action, along with the creation of a three-person commission (Michigan Biologics Products Commission) was the beginning of the privatization of Michigan's vaccine facility by Fuad El-Hibri. Governor Engler gave the most respectable and profitable agency in Michigan government to Fuad El-Hibri without any individual investment whatsoever. The new owners of the Michigan biologics lab incurred no individual expense, made no investments, and did not owe any individual promissory notes or obligations of any kind for their new lab purchase. Receipt of a \$180 million business for absolutely nothing in return. Isn't privatization grand? Isn't it really legalized theft. See the testimony that Fuad El-Hibri, President and Chief Executive Officer, BioPort Corporation presented to *The Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations of the House Committee on Government Reform June 30, 1999*.

The entire business with its enormously profitably sole source contracts with the federal government were transferred wholly to Bioport secured only by corporate promissory notes to be paid out of future income in the amount of 25 million. Yet, State Rep. Lingg Brewer, D-Holt, estimated the lab (MBPI) ". . . to be worth up to \$78 million, because the lab is the only federally approved manufacturer of anthrax vaccine." The only out of pocket expense incurred by Bioport was the indebtedness in the form of a capital lease from Bank One for the purchase of a single blood plasma fractionation centrifuge.

The next hand out the company received was an unsecured, interest-free loan of \$18.7 million as an advance payment from the Defense Department. That was on top of already promised subsidies from the Defense Department that included improvements and renovations of its physical plant that were originally to be a 29 million-windfall gift but quickly escalated as the Bioport cabal were quick to seize their opportunities to pillage. In the end Bioport got the US Government to give them \$126 million ostensibly in the interest of national security.

Additionally, the federal government agreed to pay triple the original cost in the contract for vaccine, from \$3.50 a dose, to over ten dollars on vaccine that had been produced not by Bioport but by the State of Michigan and turned over to Bioport as part of the sale of the MBPI lab.

Fuad El-Hibri testified to *The Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations of the House Committee on Government Reform on June 30, 1999* that:

"Three companies currently hold voting equity in BioPort: Intervac LLC and Intervac Management LLC, which are both Maryland limited liability companies, and Michigan Biologic Products, Inc., a Michigan corporation. Intervac LLC is the controlling shareholder. Intervac LLC is owned by Admiral Crowe, my wife Nancy and me, and I and F Holdings N.V., a Netherlands Antilles investment company owned by my father Ibrahim El-Hibri. As mentioned earlier, I and F Holdings is an investment company in biotech operations, which previously had invested in the management buy-out of Porton Products Ltd. Admiral Crowe and I are the controlling members of Intervac LLC".

While Fuad El-Hibri was needed no financing to take over the State of Michigan biologic lab, he did need a front man to reassure the military with respect to their Anthrax contract. He already had the perfect front

man in former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. William J. Crowe Jr. Adm. Crowe had a long history of involvement with the El-Hibri family.

Crowe owns 22.5 percent of Intervac shares, although he hasn't invested a penny in the venture. Why should he invest real money when no one else has either? Assets are being obtained at the public expense without even the myth of individual investment.

MEDICAL ISSUES AND THE ATTENDANT SCANDALS

But it was not the hundred million dollar financial swindle of taxpayer resources that had so aroused citizens on their Veterans Day march on Bioport. Instead it was the medical scandals involving Anthrax vaccine. These scandals are many and varied and we will attempt to address them but with the realization that it is probably not possible to address all of them adequately without writing a lengthy tome.

The history of the production of the Anthrax vaccine begins with the giant Merck pharmaceutical company. Merck developed and produced an Anthrax vaccine that had been tested and approved by the FDA for human use in a 1955-1959 study. The vaccine was for used primarily to inoculate animals and veterinarians and others coming into close contact with animal products. The vaccine was developed from the Vollum strain of Anthrax for use in the prevention of cutaneous Anthrax skin infections of agricultural workers. It was never tested nor approved for the use in preventing Anthrax infection from inhaled weaponized Anthrax from the more virulent Ames strain. Merck stopped production of this vaccine because of its very limited use and lack of profits.

The Michigan Department of Public Health received a license from the FDA to produce the orphan Merck Anthrax vaccine. The license was subsequently transferred to the Michigan Biologic Products Institute (MBPI) upon the Public Health Department lab's transformation into an independent State agency.

From this point on, many of the parties have maintained a policy of outright lies and obfuscation of the facts typical of the secrecy involved in the illegal activities described below.

The 1972 *Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction*, also known as the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention or BWC, prohibits the development, production, stockpiling and acquisition of these weapons. The BWC thus supplements the prohibition on use of biological weapons contained in the 1925 Geneva Protocol. The United States is a signatory to this treaty. But, like many other international agreements by which the United States is bound, this treaty remains largely ignored by the United States. While publicly destroying stockpiles of nerve gas weapons and their delivery rockets, the United States continued its illegal research and development of biological weapons at Fort Detrick, Maryland. One of the illegal biological weapons, which the United States was engaged in research and development was, weaponized Anthrax.

Part of the development of biological weapons is the need to develop and maintain antidotes to such weapons. As a result of this need the Department of Defense in the late 1980's ordered large amounts of the Anthrax vaccine from the State of Michigan that was the sole source manufacturer of the vaccine.

The State of Michigan changed the process and chemical composition of its vaccine to meet the Department of Defense need for a vaccine to counteract inhaled Anthrax. The government needed a vaccine that prompted a stronger immune response in order to be effective against a virulent inhaled Anthrax. Michigan complied by adding several ingredients needed to accomplish the Defense Department objective. The DOD will later falsely claim that it did not have any knowledge of the changes in the vaccine. .

The vaccine changes included an increase in protective antigen (PA) 4,000 times greater than in lots of anthrax vaccine manufactured following the earlier FDA approved formula. This and the addition of other

components is what give rise to the problems with vaccine safety.

One of the other ingredients included in the Anthrax vaccine is an additive to boost its immune reaction in the hopes of making it effective against inhaled Anthrax. It is Squalene which is found in shark oil, the human liver, some vegetable oils and; as an additive to enhance vaccine immune reactions. According to a 1999 U.S. Government Accounting Office report Squalene is used to foster a faster, stronger or longer protective reaction from vaccines.

The Pentagon denied the presence of Squalene until that position was publicly proved to be a lie as a result of a 1999 Tulane University study of blood samples taken from sick gulf war veterans detected the presence of antibodies to Squalene.. The Pentagon then quickly adopted the position that the amount was so small as to be inconsequential. The FDA has not approved the use of Squalene for use in the anthrax vaccine.

Previously, Congress' watchdog agency, the General Accounting Office, had reported that gulf war veterans were complaining of mysterious, undiagnosed illnesses similar to patients with auto-immune disorders. A Tennessee immunologist, Dr. Pamela B. Asa, concluded those illnesses were caused by exposure to additives in vaccines, the GAO said.

GAO investigators accused the Pentagon of a "pattern of deception" with respect to vaccine additives. U.S. Rep. Jack Metcalf, R-Washington, said his official inquiry concluded that Pentagon officials "stonewalled" attempts to examine the Anthrax vaccine's additives. Metcalf distributed his inquiry report to the House Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs and International Relations headed by U.S. Rep. Christopher Shays, R-Conn. during an appearance in September 2000.

The medical evidence is aptly summarized by Autoimmune Technologies as follows:

ANTI-SQUALENE ANTIBODIES

LINK GULF WAR SYNDROME TO ANTHRAX VACCINE

Data published in the February 2000 and August 2002 issues of *Experimental and Molecular Pathology* strongly suggests that Gulf War Syndrome is caused by a vaccine contaminated with squalene. The August 2002 article is entitled "Antibodies to Squalene in Recipients of Anthrax Vaccine" (*Exp. Mol. Pathol.* 73,19-27 2002).

Gulf War Syndrome, or GWS, is the term which has been applied to the multi-symptom rheumatic disorder experienced by many veterans of the 1990-1991 Persian Gulf war. A similar disorder appeared in 1990-1991-era personnel who were never deployed to the Persian Gulf theater of operations and also in other military personnel, including participants in the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program, or AVIP, which was inaugurated in 1997. No data has ever suggested that the disorder experienced by the deployed 1990-1991 soldiers is different from the disorder experienced by the other groups of patients, but the other cases have not been considered to be cases of GWS.

Squalene was found by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration in five lots of the AVIP anthrax vaccine. The discovery of serum anti-squalene antibodies and the development of a test to detect these antibodies has made it possible to see that links appear to exist between the contaminated AVIP vaccine lots, the illness experienced by post-1997 vaccine recipients, the illness experienced by non-deployed 1990-1991-era patients, and the illness in deployed 1990-1991-era patients that has been referred to as GWS.

The data establishing these links is presented in the peer-reviewed February 2000 and August 2002 articles. The published findings (1) strongly suggest that the GWS-like illness being reported by all of the various patient groups is the same illness, (2) strongly suggest that the contaminated vaccine caused the illness in the AVIP group, and (3) further suggest that squalene contamination of one or more 1990-1991-era vaccines accounts for the GWS cases from that era.

The veteran's suffering from Gulf War syndrome or more appropriately Anthrax vaccine poisoning were forced to do so needlessly. Not only was the vaccine not effective against inhalation Anthrax but also was not even effective for the cutaneous Anthrax skin infections for which it was designed. That is because the 1990-1991 Gulf War military personnel were given only two of the required six injections necessary for immunity.

Perhaps the Pentagon thought and acted on the belief that if any protection were to be afforded by the vaccine it would have to be as a result of the additives and 4000 fold increase in the Gulf War era vaccine PA levels. But it is clearly known that their reckless behavior resulted in thousands of injuries.

Another principal chemical component of the Anthrax Vaccine, formaldehyde, is not approved for human consumption according to the U. S. Government Material Data Safety Sheet. It is a known carcinogen.

2.4 mg of aluminum hydroxide as adjuvant is added to the vaccine to increase antibody response. Aluminum is a cardiovascular or blood toxicant, neurotoxicant, and respiratory toxicant. More hazardous than most chemicals in 2 out of 6 ranking systems on at least 2 federal regulatory lists.

Some medical researchers note a link between aluminum hydroxide and a condition called "Macrophagic Myofasciitis." Muscle biopsies from tissue samples of some patients who were experiencing muscle pain and fatigue show unusual concentrations of macrophages, the immune system's scavenger cells.

Remain Gherardi, a pathologist in Paris published an article in the journal, BRAIN that suggests that the immune reactions that are triggered by aluminum hydroxide could help explain some of the chronic fatigue and associated symptoms known as GULF WAR SYNDROME. Gherardi explains that some of the symptoms he finds in his MMF patients are "strikingly similar to those reported by Gulf war veterans, citing an article published by Coker et. al. (British Medical Journal 1999; 318: 290-294).

He writes that multiple vaccinations over a short period of time have been seen as a risk factor for Gulf War Syndrome. Keep in mind the anthrax vaccine that uses aluminum hydroxide is a 6-shot regimen, followed by annual boosters.

Our military reacted with promptly and with more common sense than the Pentagon leaders with mass resistance

Thomas D. Williams reports in the The Hartford Courant of September 28, 2000 that:

"more than 1,500 service people have complained about side effects of varying severity that they blame on the vaccine. Hundreds of service people have refused to be inoculated and have been disciplined or discharged, while hundreds more in the reserve and National Guard and at least 250 military pilots have resigned rather than take the six shots required. At least 250 military pilots have resigned, raising questions about U.S. battle readiness. Seasoned fighter pilots can cost as much as \$3 million to train, according to Air Force."

The Pentagon was well aware during the Gulf War that this vaccine had not been approved as to efficacy or safety for inhalation Anthrax. That is why the President was forced to waive the informed consent requirements for administration of an unapproved drug.

In 1984 a group of military experts recommended to the DOD that an application to FDA be made to obtain that approval. The FDA claims it was not aware of the Pentagon report until notified by the GAO on October 15th 2001. Perhaps the FDA failed to notice the use of the vaccine during the 1990-1991 Gulf War. No doubt they missed the debate about the Presidential waiver on informed consent also.

In 1996, after the vaccine license had been transferred to the MBPI, the institute filed the application for such a license change. Processing of the application automatically throws a vaccine back into the category of experimental or "investigational" drugs, which have to have the (informed) consent of the person getting the inoculation. Only the president can waive the informed consent requirement, which the first President Bush did in the Gulf War.

In 1998, President Bush, apparently more concerned about profits for his father's business cronies than the safety of our soldiers reinstated the previously suspended mandatory Anthrax vaccinations.

That is the true story behind the Veteran's Day march at 3500 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

Ready To Be Drawn

by Gloria Nixon-John

In Berkey Hall
he is reading his paper
about Albertine's lies, telling how
(in the anti-locution of the line)
Marcel does a quick step then
sort of plunks us on the forehead.
Earlier today the news was about
dairy farms, how it is that the distance
from Wisconsin sets the price of milk,
how it is all tied to welfare reform
and the American conscience
 stretched out like the loneliest of back roads.

Before it rains the cows
in Hickmott's pasture know, and so they
glide on the diagonal toward home
heavy udders like military duffels swing.
And I can only stop to watch them,
to ask who amongst us
knows the milk first drawn
(or the lie while it is being told)
before it becomes some other continent
like words in Berkey Hall.

Some Basic Questions -- or -- Why Are Schools And Even Colleges Both Well-Meaning And The Most Ineffective And/Or Counterproductive Places For Learning Yet Devised By The Mind Of Man?

- 1) Why, at home, do little kids teach themselves both a zillion things plus a very complicated language and then usually think/learn poorly when we try to make them do it in school?
- 2) When will we realize that coercive teaching cannot MAKE learning happen? When will we see that only the child, if they're INTERESTED, can decide to absorb and integrate the information we have to offer?
- 3) Why don't we think about the fact that every toddler learns rapidly and efficiently, without any formal instruction whatsoever, even if many parents allow far-too-much television and are doing a far-less-than-ideal job of chatting and playing with the young?
- 4) What is the impact of taking immature little children away from their support system for six or more hours a day and make them relate to other, sometimes disturbed, young peers?
- 5) What may possibly happen when one stuffs hundreds -- or even thousands -- of undeveloped and/or dysfunctional brains into a single building, expect them to sit still, to stop talking, and then obey, even if the the teachers are good, caring, highly-paid, and well-trained people?
- 6) When are we going to understand that it's very scary and/or paralyzing to be put on the spot to answer a question when the teacher -- or the parent -- already knows the answer -- something that adults would never dare do to each other?
- 7) Why are most kids in most schools, public or private, anxious, bored, somewhat confused, and very resistant most of the time?
- 8) What are we going to do about the humiliation and rage that are apt to result when we tell little kids that they've already failed, one way or another, before their brains are fully developed and before their lives have hardly begun?
- 9) Why did a former Supt. of the Philadelphia. School District once state that, "The formal assessment of elementary-school children is the dumbest thing I've ever heard of" ?

10) How many adults in the U.S. would let the govt. force them into a school building for even 3 hours a week, make them study some obscure subject mandated from on high, and then make their future careers dependent on passing the course?

11) Why do 50 percent of Philadelphia public school students drop out while, nationally, one-third of high-school students are competent readers, even as virtually all subject matter, from kindergarten through graduate school, is happily forgotten just as soon as summer rolls around?

12) So, should the first order of business be to just STOP doing what we're now doing?

13) And then why do we ignore those few teachers, in both public and private places, who have shown us how to HELP children keep on learning with the enthusiasm and effectiveness of almost any pre-school child?

14) Finally, would George Bernard Shaw still say that, "The only time my education was interrupted was when I was in school."

Robert E. Kay, MD
Adult and Child Psychiatrist
robertekaymd@mycidco.com

References

HOW CHILDREN FAIL by John Holt
DUMBING US DOWN by John Taylor Gatto
DESCHOOLING SOCIETY by Ivan Illich
WHAT DO I DO MONDAY? by John Holt
EVERY STUDENT CAN SUCCEED by William Glasser, MD
WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO RECESS AND WHY ARE OUR CHILDREN STRUGGLING IN KINDERGARTEN? by Susan Ohanian (www.susanohanian.org)

<http://w.geom.umn.edu/~rfrankel/holt/fear.html>
www.educationrevolution.org
<http://www.RougeForum.org>

***THE INVENTION OF THE WHITE RACE:
THE ORIGIN OF RACIAL OPPRESSION IN
ANGLO-AMERICA
BY THEODORE ALLEN***

REVIEW BY GREG QUEEN

Allen, Theodore. *The Invention of the White Race: The Origin of Racial Oppression in Anglo-America*. Verso. New York: 1997.

CAPITALISM

Karl Marx says that the goal of any capitalist is to produce a commodity that not only has a use and exchange value but a commodity that has the potential to create surplus value. The creation of surplus values happens in the following manner. Marx says that the value of a commodity is nothing more than a way to measure the amount of labor consumed in its creation. Like a commodity, labor also has a value and that value is the amount of material it takes to provide for the basic needs of the laborer (material to sustain the life of the laborer). The value of commodities, including labor, is its exchange value. However, surplus value is “created” by the use-value of labor. According to Marx’s assertion, when a person sells his labor, he is not only exchanging value but handing over to the capitalist the use-value of the commodity, labor. This, according to Marx, is the eternal law of the exchange of commodities. That is, like the seller of any other commodity, the seller of labor-power realizes its exchange-value by selling it and parts with its use-value. Hence, although it may only cost the capitalist a half-day’s labor to pay for the labor, the capitalist can use that labor for a whole day. The fact that a person labors beyond his exchange value and is not paid for that special service is what causes the creation of surplus-value, or capital. The labor used beyond the exchange value is surplus labor.

Since the nature of exchange-values states that the purchaser has the right to use the commodity he has bought in any way he sees fit, he can, therefore, use the labor for as long as the laborer can work and still maintain existence. Thus, he is not violating the law of exchange values. However, the nature of the commodity (labor) which the purchaser is buying has special limits to its consumption. Therefore, the seller (laborer) maintains his right as seller to “reduce the working day to one of definite normal duration.” This is a contradiction. Stated more simply, the struggle is between the capitalist desire to create conditions of surplus labor (thus creating capital) and the laborer’s desire

to consume his own surplus labor (higher wages or less time working). As Marx says, “between equal rights force decides (Tucker).” In seventeenth century colonial America, this contradiction inherent in capitalism was being worked out.

Capitalism creates a non-productive elite who own the means of production. The goal of this numerically small group is to create a social system that reproduces and maintains its elite position. Politically and economically, the social system is created through the legislature and the formation of an intermediate buffer social control stratum respectively. The goal of this intermediate social control stratum is to subordinate but align themselves to the elite and come into daily contact with the majority of the population, whose position in society is dependency and insecurity. In other words, the goal of the capitalist is to hoard as much capital as possible through the creation of surplus labor while facilitating enough room in society for a social group (artisans and small landowners during early colonial America) who have some hope of not being on the “bottom of the heap.” This social group, although they perceive themselves as independent, they are dependent upon the ruling class and generally support and enforce its values. During seventeenth century colonial America, this intermediate buffer social control stratum did not immediately exist but was being created. Theodore W. Allen argues that the desire for surplus value and the need to suck labor dry caused the ruling class to create an intermediate buffer social control stratum in early colonial America that emphasized racial over class oppression. This would become known as the peculiar institution

The peculiarity of the “peculiar institution” was the fact that it was a social control system that was based upon the exclusion of any non-European from the intermediate buffer social control stratum and that a “major, indispensable, and decisive factor of the buffer social control stratum maintained against the unfree proletarians was that it was itself made up of free proletarians and semi-proletarians (Allen 12-13).” In other words, the ruling class capitalist constructed racial oppression to divide the proletariat class; one portion (European-Americans) was denied fewer freedoms than the other portion (African-Americans) creating for the most part an appearance of privilege. Our starting point is the early decades of the seventeenth century.

SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In early seventeenth century colonial America, the capitalist were competing for survival. The survival of the capitalist depended upon his ability to produce a commodity (tobacco) that “creates” surplus value. His ability to create surplus value depended upon his ability to “force” his workers to labor beyond the amount of time it would take to keep him alive and provide his basic amenities. Because of the degree of competition, this dynamic became particularly exploitative. One of the critical shifts happened in the second quarter of the seventeenth century.

During the early 1620's, the price of tobacco dropped precipitously. The drop in tobacco prices acted upon the capitalist in two ways. First, even though there was not a rise in the absolute or relative cost of labor, the drop in tobacco prices caused his overall profit rate from tobacco production to decline. Secondly, in order to get a higher rate of return on his investments, the capitalist overall needed to reduce the cost of production. Since the primary cost of production was labor power, the goal was to reduce its cost. Thus, the capitalist class acted collectively in shifting from using tenant farmers (who got more "entitlements") to using indentured servants (who got fewer "entitlements") as the primary source of labor. (Allen 63-64). This was possible, in part, because an attack upon colonist by Indians in 1622 severely disrupted life in Virginia.

The Indian attack and laboring class debt completely disrupted property relations. The laboring class (tenant farmers) was in a precarious position and the "plantations bourgeoisie [had] opportunities for direct capitalist expropriation of land and labor power in the furtherance of the alteration of labor relations to that of chattel-servitude (92)." The elite used their position of power and forced the tenants into debt by restricting the amount of tobacco they could grow, applying a fixed rate for their rent and forbidding them to plant corn causing them to pay extortionate prices to the corn elite. This undermined any economic power the tenant farmer may have had. Because of these changes, there was an increased concentration of the means of production and laborers. Although it may appear that this shift in power between the laboring and capitalist class was temporary and primarily caused by the Indian attack, the planter class was able to maintain this superior position of power in labor relations.

ALTERING LABOR'S RELATIONSHIP TO CAPITAL

Although one of capitalism's underlying assumption is that both the worker and the capitalist have the "right" to end the relationship with one another, in colonial Virginia, because of the planter class' superior position, they were able to alter labor's relationship to capital by converting the laboring class from tenants to indentured servants. They first started by being able to use "tenant" workers as property/wealth. In other words, tenant workers could be used to pay debt, avoid bankruptcy, as hereditary property and as liquidation of an estate. In addition to being able to "buy and sell" tenants, the London Company said that "[T]he shedding of this blood [in reference to the Indian attack] wilbe the Seed of the Plantation, for the future...instead of Tentants[,] sending you servants." By the undermining of tenants and the London Company's desire to trade in indentured servants would indicate the beginning of the end of tenants and the start of indentured servants as the primary source of labor. However, by choosing the indentured servant route, the elite were choosing a potentially disastrous set of circumstances for their interests. Because they did not create an intermediate buffer social control stratum but destroyed the only potential for one (the tenants), their disregard for history would lead them into trouble as will be seen later.

The planter class used many methods to squeeze surplus value from the indentured servants. Again, this was possible because of the submissive relationship of labor to capital. This was accomplished primarily by increasing the length of the workday and intensifying the effort of each worker. Some servants came to the plantation colony with a contract that stated their length of service in return for transportation, but most did not. For indentured servants lacking a specific contract, the duration of bondage was specified in law. In 1666, the Virginia Assembly changed the law so that the normal duration of bondage increased from four to five years. In addition, prior to legislative change, if an individual was less than sixteen when originally sold into bond-labor, you were bound to the master until the age of twenty-four. In 1666, the legislature changed the law so that it said bond laborers under age nineteen would have to serve the master until age twenty-four effectively increasing the length of free labor for the planter. In addition, as punishment the courts frequently lengthened the time a servant was in bondage. For example, a 1643 Virginia law made it illegal for indentured servants to marry, fornicate and/or have children. When they did and were caught, the consequence was an increase in their length of the servitude. Of particular interest in terms of the reproduction of the laboring class is the relationship of children in this exploitative system.

During seventeenth century colonial Virginia, the scarce labor supply led the planter class to find ways to create a permanent laboring class. The problem that indentured servants posed for the elite was that they were eventually freed which required the capitalist class to find replacements. This can be difficult when the main supplier was thousands of mile away in England and the native inhabitants refused to partake in such an absurd system (this is not entirely accurate statement but good enough for this paper). The planter class looked to children born to mothers who were servants as the continuous supply of labor. Prior to 1662, bastard children could eventually receive their freedom either by just doing their time or by their fathers purchasing them out of servitude. In 1662, the planter class created a law that changed English common law tradition in that they imposed lifetime hereditary bondage on African-Americans by instituting the principle that a child would be “bond or free according to the condition of the mother.” In 1681, a child born to a European mother and African father would be in bondage until the age of thirty (Allen 133-134). In addition to these changes in law, there were other oppressive measures taken by the elite to ensure a certain amount of capital accumulation.

The laws protecting bond-laborers were weak. There was no minimum level of food, clothing, housing, etc. Thus if the planter wanted to reduce his cost of production, he would reduce the cost of maintaining the existence the workers. In terms of food, the planter class primarily forced the workers to survive on corn. The other advantage of indentured servants was you did not have to “pay” them. In other words, they did not get a paycheck until the day of their release from bondage usually about five years later. “Spurred on by the all-or-nothing nature of monocultural economy, and subject to the vagaries of a generally glutted market, Virginia employers pushed matters to the limit to secure the highest possible return on their investment in laborers.” These laws and

actions especially those governing women, children, marriage and family were an “indispensable condition for the preservation of that particular form of capitalist production and accumulation.” However, it denied the planter class “the benefits of the patriarchy as a system of social control over the laboring people (137-147).” The increased oppression led to resistance.

RACIAL OPPRESSION DID NOT EXIST, YET

Allen says:

Where there is oppression, there is resistance, insufficient though it may be. When resistance is enough it becomes rebellion. Where the intermediate buffer social control stratum becomes dysfunctional, rebellion breaks through... Attenuate the intermediate social control stratum; and at an opportune moment, they would join *en masse* in armed rebellion (149).

Allen argues that a significant number of the acts of resistance and plots against the planter class were interracial and that the few decades prior to Bacon’s Rebellion, the relative status of African-Americans to that of European-Americans can be determined to have been indeterminate. The “reduction of all members of the oppressed group to one undifferentiated social status, a status beneath that of any member of any social class within the oppressor group” did not exist. Thus, “a system of rule, designed to deny, disregard, delegitimize previous or potential social distinctions that may have existed or that might tend to emerge in the normal course of development of a class society,” in other words, racial oppression did not yet exist. Although Allen provides many cases to demonstrate his point, I will explain two.

Elizabeth Key

In 1660, the Virginia legislature implemented a law that restricted the length of indentured servitude to a maximum of five years if you came from a Christian country. Although this does not explicitly state that African-Americans would not be “protected” by this law, it was aimed towards them. However, this law was “only” aimed at bond-laborers which is class oppression and not racial oppression. In contrast, there existed African-Americans like Anthony Johnson who were not denied the elite privilege of owning large tracts of land and/or servants. In the case of Anthony Johnson, he purchased an African-American bond-laborer. In fact, Allen interprets the fact that the elite passed a law in 1670 denying African-Americans the privilege of importing bond-laborers as evidence that it was an accepted practice (177-183). However, as we have already seen, there was increased pressure from planters to increase unpaid labor time by trying to change the status of African-Americans bond-laborers into lifetime

servants (187). Although this is the case, there are elements within the ruling class that did not operate with the assumption that African-American bond-servants should serve for life but rather made sure the freedom was “guaranteed” like European-American bond servants (193-194). The case of a woman named Elizabeth Key is critical to this argument of Allen.

Elizabeth Key was the child of an African-American bond-servant and European-American father. Her father made arrangements before moving back to England that Elizabeth’s godfather would have possession of Key for nine years. Messing up this arrangement was the fact that both the father and godfather died before the nine years passed. The executors of the godfather’s estate (who died second) did not grant Elizabeth her freedom on the grounds that because her mother was a lifetime bond-servant, Elizabeth was the same. However, a jury of twelve did not agree and granted Elizabeth her freedom. The case was appealed to the Virginia General Assembly who appointed a committee. The committee agreed with the twelve men basing their decision upon two ancient common law principles. First, English common law says that you trace your status through the condition of the father who in regards to Key was a free European-American. Secondly, because Key was a Christian, she could not be held for life for that would be slavery and illegal. There was an appeal to the governor but because there are no records it is assumed that the matter was resolved. Other evidence to support this assumption is the fact that Key later married her lawyer and if you are a bond-laborer and get married you must have the support of your master. Thus the estate executors felt they had no legal ground to prevent the marriage (194-196). Allen believes that there is more to this story than what appears on the surface. He says that the Elizabeth Key case was a confrontation between factions within the elite over whether “owners can impose lifetime servitude on African-Americans” or whether African-Americans right to freedom on the basis of Christian principles and English common law is more important than profit rates.

In 1656, when the case was being heard, the traditional English common law of patriarchy and Christianity applied. Allen states that if the principles applied to this case had prevailed, than racial slavery would have been prevented. The reality was that within six years of the Key case, the General Assembly enacted a law stating that the status of a child would be determined by the status of the mother not the father. Five years later, in 1667, the General Assembly stated that whether a person was a Christian or not did not alter the person’s condition as it related to bondage. Coincidentally and concurrently, the English government re-chartered the Company of Royal Adventurers to Africa and the British Navy fought with the Dutch to open up trade in Africa. Although the planters generally wanted a continuous low cost labor force, the problem was managing this low cost labor force, or creating social control mechanisms that would enforce the increasingly racially oppressive laws. The problem of control was exemplified through Bacon’s Rebellion.

Bacon’s Rebellion

Allen breaks Bacon's Rebellion into two parts, one "controlled" by the elite and the other controlled by the interracial proletariat. The Virginia ruling elite divided over frontier Indian policy and Nathaniel Bacon, cousin of Governor Berkeley, wanted to push the Indians further west whereas the more traditional elite did not see the necessity in doing this so immediately. This faction within the elite were the more established elite who had more land than they could currently use whereas Bacon represented the less established faction seeking more land. At any rate, Bacon gathered up a group and attacked the Indians and then turned towards Jamestown. The rebels had gathered around the Assembly in Jamestown and forced the group to raise an anti-Indian army of 1,000 men and forced Berkeley to sign. At this point, the reality was that rebels were in "control" of the colony. In fact, one of the initial rebel leaders from the elite class would become critical is reestablishing ruling class control. Until then, there was not much support for the elite. The rebels were demanding a redistribution in land and that the colony be broken down into smaller more diversified farms. Meanwhile, in England, Virginia's representatives said that the best hope of ending the insurrection was in "a speedy separation of the sound parts from the rabble." The elite were extremely frightened that this rebellion was going to destroy the oligarchic rule and monocultural economy that they had created for themselves at the expense of the chattel bond-laborers. Retrospectively, the Virginia Assembly declared that "many evill disposed servants in these late tymes of horrid rebellion taking advantage of the loosenes of the tymes did depart from their servince and followed the rebels in rebellion." The significance of this rebellion to Allen's argument is that African-American and European Americans "fought side by side for the abolition of slavery." In so doing, they provided the supreme proof that the white race did not then exist. In addition, Allen argues that at this historic point, there still did not exist an intermediate buffer social control stratum as evidenced by the lack of enthusiasm to support the colonial elite in suppressing the rebellion. In the end, During and immediately following Bacon's Rebellion, the Lieutenant Governor of Maryland said that what the leaders need in Virginia is a "new" way of governing that preserves the ruling elite but would accommodate enough people so that it could rule. In other words, the elite needed to divide the proletariat so that some would support the elite rather than having most of the proletariat not supporting the elite as shown in Bacon's Rebellion. The answer was the invention of the white race (203-222).

THE INVENTION OF THE WHITE RACE

The ruling elite did not want to alter the underlying labor relations that caused Bacon's Rebellion. In other words, they were not interested in paying out more surplus value to create a intermediate buffer social control stratum. Rather, to "maintain the degree of social control necessary for proceeding with capital accumulation on the basis of chattel bond-labor," the elite decided to use race consciousness in order to supersede class consciousness. This racial oppression was used to create a social distinction between the poorest of the oppressor group from any member of the oppressed group. According to Allen, because of the number of laboring class European-Americans, the creation of a categorical

exclusion of African-Americans from the intermediate buffer social control stratum was necessary. In other words, unlike the West Indies, there were too many European-Americans to become “petty Bourgeoisie.” Thus, the elite substituted racial oppression for class oppression to create the intermediate stratum. The conclusion that once the gentry class created a ‘yeoman’ class, they could ignore the rest of society is wrong because although the poor European-Americans were not in lifetime bond servitude, their inability to compete with the gentry class would naturally cause them to align themselves with the lifetime bond servants despite race was evident in Bacon’s Rebellion. Thus, instead of social mobility and altering labor’s relation to capital, the ruling class by denying all African-Americans of their liberties was able to say to the poorest European-American in Virginia that although they did not own bond-laborers, they were still part of the elite in that they “enjoyed” privileges that were denied to African-Americans, *free or slave*. As Allen says “the solution was to establish a new birthright not only for Anglos but for every Euro-American, the white identity that ‘set them apart at a distance....’” The announcement of the new legislative birthrights, passed during the generation following Bacon’s Rebellion, were required at the end of church twice a year and twice in the summer at the county courts. In other words, people heard that no free African-American dare raise his hand to a white Christian; that English and Negroes should not mate; and that any white person who is illegally congregated African-Americans would be fined; So, in the end, the laboring whites had in their heads the socially constructed concept that they were privileged and that to maintain their privilege, they need to deny African Americans their freedoms and not fight against the elite (247-251). So there we have it. The elite’s desire to create a very inexpensive permanent laboring class, one portion enslaved to the planter class and the other enslaved to white superiority, was achieved. The capitalist ruling elite entrenched their power and created an institutional superstructure to enforce their “right to rule.”

[Author’ Note: Although I would recommend reading the two volumes, Theodore Allen has written a summary of *The Invention of the White Race* and made it available on the World Wide Web at <http://eserver.org/clogic/1-2/allen.html>.]

Allen, Theodore. *The Invention of the White Race: The Origin of Racial Oppression in Anglo-America*. Verso. New York: 1997.

Another Brick in the Wall: High Stakes Testing in Teacher Education - The California Teacher Performance Assessment

By Perry M. Marker

Ph.D. Sonoma State University

A paper presented at American Educational Studies Association
2002 Annual Meeting
Omni William Penn Hotel
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
October 30-November 3, 2002

We don't need no education
We don't need no thought control
No dark sarcasm in the classroom
Teacher leave the kids alone
Hey teacher leave us kids alone
All in all it's just another brick in the wall
All in a all you're just another brick in the wall

Roger Waters, 1979

“ In speech after speech, it is our corporate CEO's who state that an educated, literate work force is the key to American competitiveness. They pontificate on the importance of education. They point out their magnanimous corporate contributions to education in one breath, and then they pull the tax base out from under the local schools in the next. Business criticizes the job our local schools are doing and then proceed to nail down every tax break they can get, further eroding the school's ability to do the job” (in Bracy, 2002) *Former Senator Howard Metzenbaum, D-Ohio*

Roger Waters wrote these words for 70's rock icons Pink Floyd before it became fashionable in to place the blame for education's "failures" on the shoulders of our teachers. In today's world, blaming teachers for the education's perceived "failures" is part of the conservative culture of criticism that has made teachers the culprit in every imaginable aspect of education decline.

We blame P-12 teachers and university professors for the "failure" of the schools. We blame them on a lot of levels. We blame their professional teacher education; we blame what they teach; we blame how they teach. The simplistic, and punitive reform efforts that have resulted in the creation standards and the

development of high stakes testing reflect the fact that, for over twenty years, teachers in public schools and institutions of higher education have been blamed for all that is wrong with education.

This paper will briefly explore the context for standards in public schools and universities in California, and the relationship between standards and the latest volley in the quest for standardization of the curriculum - now aimed at teacher education - the California "Teacher Performance Assessment."

The Initiative Process: a non-deliberative democracy

In 1975, the passage of Proposition 13 (Jarvis-Gann) is a germane way of dividing the post World War II California, between that postwar exhilaration -- with its huge investment in the public infrastructure era and its strong commitment to the development of quality education systems and other services - and a generation of declining confidence and shrinking public services (Schrag, pp. 10-11). The squeeze on public services that Proposition 13 brought about came at the time California was experiencing significant demographic change -- moving from a society that thought of itself (albeit incorrectly) mostly as white, middle class, to one in which whites became another minority. Latinos, Asians, and African Americans now constitute a sizable majority of school enrollment and the use of public services.

The revolt against government taxation that Proposition 13 set in motion in California resulted in the increased use of the initiative process. Initiatives-- once a bastion of "the people" and their power to influence public policy -- are now most often used by well organized political and economic entities on the left and the right, and by incumbent politicians from the government on down. It is those interest groups, backed by media consultants, direct mail specialists, pollsters and others, that usually finance the costly signature drives that costs millions of dollars to get measures on the ballot. And, it is the advertising campaigns that drive the support for the initiative, or effectively block, through the influx of millions of advertising dollars, the measures of its opponents (Schrag, 1998, p. 11).

It is interesting to note that the further the initiative process proceeds, the more problematic effective citizenship becomes. Each initiative moves control further from the public and the legislature, and closer to the special interests. This non-deliberative democracy, as found in the California style initiative process, has no public hearings, no rules of procedure, no formal debates, and no informed voice. Non-deliberative democracy fails to present downside arguments, to outline implications, to control the cost, and to speak for minorities. On the national scene, some twenty four states have some form of initiative or referendum in their constitutions. And, there is increasing pressure to use it as an agent of political reform. Non-deliberative democracy, based on the initiative process, is undermining the people's faith in our democratic processes.

During the period of time since Proposition 13, initiatives have been passed that imposed specific spending formulas on schools, abolished affirmative action in public education, denied public schooling and public services to illegal immigrants, and eliminated bilingual education. California's schools, which thirty years ago, had been among the best funded on the planet, are now in the bottom quartile among states in virtually every major indicator of educational progress and success. California has an average class size of over 32, and in many cases, there are over 40 students in classrooms designed for 25. A vast majority of California's educational facilities are at least 30 years old, and many are over 40 years of age, and are in various and dangerous states of disrepair. In California, we have chosen to spend less on education and more on prisons. California is currently 41st out of 50 states in per capita educational spending. The fact is, that during the past twenty-five years, the best educational system in the world has been fundamentally and systematically dismantled.

Lost in this plethora of initiatives, budget cuts and decline of funding, is the fact that despite what politicians and the popular press would like us to believe, during the last decade standardized scores have been holding relatively steady, with modest increases in both math and reading scores (Berliner and Biddle, 1998). In an international comparison United States nine year olds were second only to Finland's nine year olds, and United States' fourteen year olds finished ninth, well above average, and a few points from the top (Bracy, 1992). This despite the fact that more students are taking the tests than ever before whose first language is not English. Berliner and Biddle conclude that there is no support for the myth that American students fail in reading achievement, *or any other subject*. Simply put, schools are in better shape than we are led to believe and teachers have done incredible work despite that fact that the educational system in California has been crumbling around them.

Standards and High Stakes Testing: no rich kids left behind

As teachers have become convenient scapegoats for all that is wrong with education, "education reform" has turned its attention to students and punished them by the introduction of plethora of standards and high stakes testing proposals. These standards and high stakes tests have used concepts such as 'world class,' 'accountability,' 'competitive,' and 'standards' that are taken directly from the corporate world. Kohn (2002) makes the argument that "anyone whose goal was to serve-up our schools to the market-place could hardly find a shrewder strategy than to hold schools 'accountable' through wave after wave of standardized tests" (p. 117).

All too often, these proposals result in a racist, one-size-fits-all approach to education that is designed to present a singular and simplistic view of knowledge, truth, and learning that ignores the diverse needs of our children of color and those who live in poverty. These so called "reform" efforts are intended to blame teachers and punish students for the problems of education by mandating a focus on drill and practice, and "teaching to the test," instead of fostering students' critical thinking skills. As a result of these efforts to blame teachers and

punish students, we are relinquishing control of the classroom and curriculum solely to those who construct the tests.

Martha Rapp Ruddell (2001) quotes Elliot Eisner who reminds us that standards in education are not new; “they are in fact a ‘recapitulation’ of behavioral objectives that so preoccupied us in the 1960’s, and actually grew from the ‘efficiency’ movement in education of 1913-1930 that was based on an industrial model of high productivity.” Ruddell goes on to further quote Eisner:

“Uniformity in curriculum content is a virtue if one’s aim is to be able to compare students in one part of the country with students in others. Uniformity is a virtue when the aspiration is to compare the performance of American students with students in Korea, Japan, and Germany. But why should we wish to make such comparisons?” (p.11)

Susan Ohanian (in Ruddell, 2001) notes that framers of standards regularly ignore the developmental reality of adolescence. She says:

“Now you and I know that anyone who says high schoolers should read Moby Dick 1) doesn’t know any fifteen year olds; 2) has never read Moby Dick or 3) has read Moby Dick , has a fifteen year old in the house, and wants to get even” (p. 12)

Perhaps the most astounding thing about standards and high stakes tests is the there is *no research evidence* whatsoever that their use enhances student achievement and learning (Black and Wilam, 1998). Still, tests have become so all consuming that more than 20 million school days were devoted to them in one year. The case for high stakes testing and standards is based on simplistic solutions designed to raise the self esteem of politicians, businesspersons, and policy makers. High stakes tests, coupled with standards, sustains and maintains a classist and corporate system of education where a small and select number of schools receive an embarrassment of riches.

Our fixation on standards and high stakes testing was demonstrated when, the day after the tragic killings in Littleton, Colorado, high schools continued their scheduled standardized tests rather than postpone them and discuss the incomprehensible events that shocked students and adults throughout the country and world. One is left to wonder how high the scores were on that day of testing? Will teachers be blamed, yet again, for these “low” scores?

Things are bound to only get worse with standards and high stakes testing. Schools will lose funding or may even be closed if their test scores don’t improve. The test scores of schools will be compared with others regarding how well they do on the tests. Teachers in “low performing” schools may be subjected to disciplinary pressures, and even firing, if their students don’t score well on one test. And, “low performing” schools may be taken over by the state and/or assigned to for-profit corporate entities.

Standards and high stakes testing determine the form of most teaching, since for any given exam, there is a best way to prepare for it. Repetition, forced memorization, rote learning and frequent quizzes leave precious little time for more creative approaches where students convey, exchange and question facts and ideas. Course content is determined by the exam, leaving little time for any materials not on the exam, such as student reactions, reflection on main issues of the day, alternative points of view, or anything else that is likely to promote creative, cooperative or critical thinking .

High stakes tests have proven to be very reliable predictors of factors related to socio-economic class, and poverty. Standardized testing is a strong indicator of where the wealthiest schools are, and where children of poverty go to school. Students of color, second language learners, and children in poverty consistently score lower on all standardized tests. High stakes tests are strong indicators that children of poverty get an education that does not compare to that received by wealthier, white students. What these tests seemingly predict and ensure - with their enormously high price tags - is that no rich kids will be left behind. The National Commission on Testing and Public Policy (1990) says that as early as 1990 standardized testing in America consumed more than \$900 million in one year. A decade later, the price tag is much, much higher.

Alfie Kohn (2002) argues that standardized testing promotes the presence of corporations, and a corporate ethos, in public schools. Kohn states that testing promotes a corporate mentality that does testing four things very effectively: 1) testing brings in hundreds of millions of dollars to the handful of corporations that produce the tests; 2) testing serves as a sorter and screener of students for the convenience of industry; 3) testing fosters a corporate ideology where assessment is used to compare and evaluate people in uniform ways; 4) testing is used to shock the public into a need to “improve” education through vouchers, and for-profit schools (p.116). Corporate influence and the quest for profits that is encouraged and supported by testing

What testing reveals - more than any other factor - is the absolute certainty is that testing does not serve the needs of *all* students in a democratic society, and the democratic goal to help *all* students become enthusiastic learners.

A Nation at Risk?

One can pinpoint in time when the clarion call for accountability began. In 1983, the Regan administration, amid much fanfare, released the incendiary report on the state of American education entitled *A Nation At Risk* , prepared by a prestigious committee under the direction of then Secretary of Education Terrell Bell. *A Nation At Risk* made sweeping claims attacking the conduct and achievement of America’s public schools and documented these claims by “evidence.”

The “evidence” provided in *A Nation At Risk* made the case that the failures of the public schools were damaging the nation, and if not addressed,

stood to weaken our democratic future. Though some of the claims had validity and were made to genuinely improve public education, a disproportionate number of these claims can be construed as blatant attacks that were contradicted by sound research-based evidence, and were outright hostile or untrue. As more and more of the attacks denouncing public education made the front pages of the news media and the six o'clock news, business persons and governmental leaders were endlessly repeating the attacks, and giving life to these distortions and falsehoods. Ironically, many prominent members of the educational establishment often supported the attacks that were endlessly reported by an unquestioning press (Berliner and Biddle, 1997). David C. Berliner and Bruce J. Biddle (1997) in their examination of the rise of the standards and accountability movement argue that:

“..it is small wonder that many Americans have come to believe that education in our country is now in a deplorable state. Indeed, how could they have concluded anything else, given such an energetic and widely reported campaign of criticism, from such prestigious resources, attacking America’s public schools? To the best of our knowledge, no campaign of this sort has ever before appeared in American history. Never before had an American government been so critical of the public schools, and never had so many false claims been made about education in the name of ‘evidence.’ We shall refer to this campaign of criticism as the Manufactured Crisis.” (pg. 4)

The most recent results of the 34th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public’s Attitudes Toward Public Schools (Phi Delta Kappan, 2002) support Berliner and Biddle’s assertion that there is a disconnect between the public’s attitudes toward education and the critics unfounded attacks on education. The poll reported that national public support for and reliance on public schools is strong and increases as people have more contact with schools. This trend for public support of schools has been steadily rising since 1992.

Regarding testing, the public attitude toward testing remains remarkably stable over time. Even when the call for testing is increasing, 47% of those polled indicated that the amount of testing is about right, down from forty eight percent in 1997. Thirty one per cent think there is too much testing up from 27% in 1997. When asked which is the best way to measure student achievement - by means of test scores or by classroom work and homework - fifty three percent support classroom work and homework over test scores, while only 23% think test scores is the best way to measure student achievement. When asked how they would grade schools in their own community 47% give schools an “A” or “B.” Interestingly, 24% think the schools in the nation deserve an “A” or “B”, while when asked to grade the school their oldest child attends, a stunning 71% give that school either an “A” or “B.” Finally, 69% of those polled support reforming the existing system while only 27% think we should find an alternative to a “failing” system of schooling.

Seldom do we see these results that support the work of schools reported in the media. What seems to be the case is that the public is not inclined to believe

negative and unfounded media reports when it comes to schools they know and trust to educate their children - even when deluged with negative attacks daily in the media. In spite of a continued negative avalanche of unsupported attacks on public schools, the public remains, as it has for the past decade, unconvinced that schools are as terrible its conservative critics suggest.

The California Teacher Performance Assessment

In the wake of the testing mania that swept through P-12 education like a firestorm, the hegemony of accountability and standardization of the curriculum has finally arrived at the door step of teacher education and it is embodied as the California Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). Senate Bill -2042, signed into law by governor in 1998, requires all preliminary credential candidates to pass a high stakes teaching performance assessment, the TPA. The law provides that professional teacher preparation programs may use the TPA or they may develop their own assessment.

Prototypes of the TPA were developed and piloted to measure thirteen Teacher Performance Expectations, TPE. The TPEs purportedly describe and measure on a singular exam “what California teachers need to know and be able to do” before receiving a preliminary credential. There are four performance tasks that collectively measure the TPEs in the following areas: (adapted from the California Department of Education Pilot Draft of the TPA)

Task I: Principles of Content-Specific and Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy- students are asked to demonstrate knowledge of principles of developmentally appropriate pedagogy and current specific pedagogy from four specific prompts

Task II: Connecting Student Characteristics to Instructional Planning- students demonstrate their ability to learn important details about a small group of learners and to plan instruction that is shaped by those student characteristics.

Task III: Classroom Assessment of Academic Learning Goals - students demonstrate their ability to use standards-based, developmentally appropriate student assessment activities with a group of students. Students will demonstrate their ability to assess student learning and diagnose student needs based on their responses to the assessment activity

Task IV: Academic Lesson Design, Implementation and Reflection after Instruction - students demonstrate their ability to design a standards-based lesson, via a 30 minute video tape, for a particular group of students, implementing that lesson making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meet differing needs of individuals within the class, manage instruction and student interaction, assess student learning, and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson

Currently, many “early adopter” credential programs are engaged in piloting the TPA and its four tasks. These “early adopters” have been given the task of trying to determine how best to administer and field test the TPA. To date, little information is known regarding the success of the state’s pilot program. However, a closer examination of the TPA raises some interesting issues, questions and concerns.

The TPA: a time worn, top down ideology

At first glance, the TPA is a somewhat innocuous measure of teaching effectiveness. It is based upon Teacher Performance Standards (TPE) standards that, for the most part, remain unquestioned by most teacher educators. The four tasks that comprise the TPA assessment are based upon ideas in performance-based assessment that has been used widely by teacher educators across the country. Many educators believe the concept of examination to determine teacher readiness is not a bad idea. Witness efforts by the University of California and Stanford Universities to develop their own high stakes examinations as substitutes for the state developed and administered examination. These efforts remain unquestioned by even the most radical opponents of curricular standardization and the TPA.

Many teacher educators object to the top-down nature of the TPA process. Not only does it ignore the professional commitment professors have toward building effective teacher education programs, the TPA also moves the State of California’s historical responsibility for teacher education from *accrediting* teacher education programs, to externally *controlling* and effectively *mandating* what should be taught and how it should be delivered in Universities.

This change of course is viewed as political, and driven by a genuine mistrust of teacher educators - led by policy makers and large corporations (Kohn, 2002). More importantly, this top-down regulation undermines the ability of teacher educators to prepare highly qualified and effective teachers.

Bertell Ollman (2002) in “Why So Many Exams?” details eight myths that surround exams and testing in our society. Among these, is the largely unquestioned belief *that exams are unbiased* and that it is *possible* to produce an exam that is “culture free.” It is this largely unchallenged assertion that drives the examination mania that grips our culture. The fact remains that there is no singular high stakes examination that has been proven to be totally unbiased.

More importantly, this myth of unbiased testing supports the assumption that a complex set of concepts and behaviors embedded in a year-long teacher education curriculum *can*, and *should* be measured in a singular examination.

Teaching is an ever-changing enterprise. It has been estimated that a teacher, in the course of a single day, makes thousands of decisions that impact the quality of education for their students and ultimately how well they perform the complex tasks of teaching.

In teaching, the ambiguity of not knowing what can and will happen from moment to moment is as frightening and as it is challenging. To consider that the task of teaching *should* and *can* be measured by a *singular* high stakes examination reduces the complex act of teaching to a fragmented, de-contextualized set of unrelated exercises that have no real meaning. The fundamental assumption and largely unquestioned belief is that teaching can be simplistically measured by a single examination.

Rather than testing prospective teachers, we need to be working with our future teachers to expand the idea of assessment to provide multiple, yet rigorous, ways for students to demonstrate what they know. We cannot expect prospective teachers in the 21st century to adopt new means of assessment in their curriculum and for their students, if their future careers are based upon a hackneyed, high stakes, testing ideology rooted in 19th century beliefs about testing. Among these beliefs is the time worn notion that students learn best when performing short, segmented tasks - stressing speed and neatness - to the ticking of a clock. This ideology is embedded in the work culture of late 19th century America where students were being prepared to work in factories. Most would agree that the world of the 21st century teacher has changed inestimably since the late 19th century. .

Political Ramifications, Economic Costs

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the TPA is the fact that its existence increases the likelihood that the scores it generates will be used to compare - for political purposes - students, institutions and ultimately professors. The TPA will serve as a bellwether, as has been done with most standardized tests, to the public as to the institutions that are "best" doing their job of educating teachers. The scores of students will most likely be reported to the public with lower performing schools with rewards and punishments being distributed accordingly. In response to this kind of application of standardized test scores, Nancy Kober (2002) reported that high stakes test scores do not seem to generalize to any other index of achievement other than its own. In fact, Berliner and Amrein (2002) discovered that in states where high stakes testing scores were on the rise, math scores on the NAEP, ACT and SAT fell. Higher education may wish to enter this highly questionable area of test score interpretation and application with some degree of trepidation.

There is also some discussion that individual TPA scores would be released to schools who are hiring new teachers for the purpose of screening and evaluation. With the meaning of these test scores under question, such a

development could possibly prevent hundreds of potential teachers from becoming employed based upon a singular score on the TPA

In a era of declining educational budgets, the economic costs of the TPA have yet to be resolved. However, the main accrediting body of teacher education, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) has entered into a \$3.7 million contract with the Educational Testing Service to develop a prototype TPA examination (see Appendix 1-IV). No exact figures have been agreed upon regarding the direct costs of the TPA will have for School of Education, but it is clear that issues such as administering the test and “training” teachers to score the TPA exams will place additional burdens on already overwhelmed and under-supported schools of education. One educator stated that archiving the 30 minute video tapes (each tape must be kept for 5 years) and supporting documents that are required of the TPA’s four tasks will require that the California State University to “buy a barge and park it in the San Francisco Bay for the purpose of storing the tapes and documents that the TPA will generate.”

Ultimately, some believe that the TPA may actually be part of a maneuver to discredit and weaken schools of education, and open the door to the idea that teacher education be disseminated by districts and private corporations, leaving schools of education out of the process.

High Stakes in High Stakes Exams

The TPA is the first volley for standardizing the curriculum of higher education. The TPA is a high-stakes process that holds severe consequences for students, professors and the university. Its ultimate success will determine how much teacher education and the university will succumb to even more demands of the standardization movement.

Teacher educators, not state bureaucrats or professional test makers, are best equipped to develop demanding and yet inclusive proficiency exit standards that combine student portfolios, and performance based projects - not just one high stakes standardized test - to credential teachers.

If we are move to a new age of assessment that rejects 19th century idea ideas and practices, multiple assessments need to determine the success of a program, provide information to students regarding their achievement, and hold schools responsible for how well taxpayers’ money is being spent to prepare high quality and effective teachers. It is time to demand that our nation, and our state and its schools stop relying on a single, corporate influenced, standardized, measure of student achievement and adopt a variety of student assessments that:

- 1) are designed to provide feedback that improves student learning;
- 2) involve students, parents, teachers and the community collaborating for improved student learning and better schools;

- 3) allow a variety of measures that focus on individual student learning;
- 4) do not limit the curriculum to a singular, standardized, assessment based on a high stakes approach.

University and teacher educators need to be reminded of the truly high stakes involved in the high stakes examination called the TPA. The control of the curriculum and its assessment by teacher educators is at risk. A closer look by all interested in teacher education is warranted.

References

Berliner, D. and Biddle, B. (1997). *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Frauds and the Attack on America's Public Schools*. Longman, USA.

Bracy, G.W. (1992) International Comparisons and the Condition of American Education, *Educational Researcher*, 25(1), 5-11

Bracy, G.W. (2002) "The 12th Bracey Report on the Condition of Public Education,

Phi Delta Kappan, Bloomington Indiana, October.

Black, P. and Wiliam, D. (1998) Inside the Black Box: raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, Bloomington Indiana, October.

Kober, N. (2002) "Teaching to the Test", *TestTalk for Leaders*, Center on Educational Policy, Washington, D.C. June.

Kohn, A. (2002) "The Gorilla in the Classroom," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Bloomington Indiana, October.

Phi Delta Kappan (2002) "34th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of Public's Attitudes Toward Public Schools", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Bloomington Indiana, September.

National Commission on Testing and Public Policy (1990). *From gatekeeper to gateway: Transforming testing in America*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College.

Olman, B. (2002) "Why So Many Exams, a Marxist response: *Z Magazine*, October 2002)

Ruddell, M.R. (2001). *Teaching Content Reading and Writing*, (3rd ed.) New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Schrag, P. (1998) *Paradise Lost: California's Experience, America's Future*
The New Press: New York.

SCHOOL IS BAD FOR CHILDREN

By John Holt

Almost every child on the first day he sets foot in a school building, is smarter, more curious, less afraid of what he doesn't know, better at finding and figuring things out, more confident, resourceful, persistent and independent than he will ever be again in his schooling – or, unless he is very unusual and very lucky, for the rest of his life. Already, by paying close attention to and interacting with the world and people around him, and without any school-type formal instruction, he has done a task far more difficult, complicated and abstract than anything he will be asked to do in school, or than any of his teachers has done for years. He has solved the mystery of language. He has discovered it – babies don't even know that language exists – and he has found out how it works and learned to use it. He has done it by exploring, by experimenting, by developing his own model of the grammar of language, by trying it out and seeing whether it works, by gradually changing it and refining it until it does work. And while he has been doing this, he has been learning other things as well, including many of the "concepts" that the schools think only they can teach him, and many that are more complicated than the ones they do try to teach him.

In he comes, this curious, patient, determined, energetic, skillful learner. We sit him down at a desk, and what do we teach him? Many things. First, that learning is separate from living. "You come to school to learn," we tell him, as if the child hadn't been learning before, as if living were out there and learning were in here, and there were no connection between the two. Secondly, that he cannot be trusted to learn and is no good at it. Everything we teach about reading, a task far simpler than many that the child has already mastered, says to him, "If we don't make you read, you won't, and if you don't do it exactly the way we tell you, you can't. In short, he comes to feel that learning is a passive process, something that someone else does to you, instead of something you do for yourself.

In a great many other ways he learns that he is worthless, untrustworthy, fit only to take other people's orders, a blank sheet for other people to write on. Oh, we make a lot of nice noises in school about respect for the child and individual differences, and the like. But our acts, as opposed to our talk, says to the child, "Your experience, your concerns, your curiosities, your needs, what you know, what you want, what you wonder about, what you hope for, what you fear, what you like and dislike, what you are good at or not so good at – all this is of not the slightest importance, it counts for nothing. What counts here, and the only thing that counts, is what we know, what we think is important, what we want you to do, think and be." The child soon learns not to ask questions - the teacher isn't there to satisfy his curiosity. Having learned to hide his curiosity, he later learns

to be ashamed of it. Given no chance to find out who he is – and to develop that person, whoever it is – he soon comes to accept the adults evaluation of him.

He learns many other things. He learns that to be wrong, uncertain, confused, is a crime. Right Answers are what the school wants, and he learns countless strategies for prying these answers out of the teacher, for conning her into thinking he knows what he doesn't know. He learns to dodge, bluff, fake, cheat. He learns to be lazy! Before he came to school, he would work for hours on end, on his own, with no thought of reward, at business of making sense of the world and gaining competence in it. In school he learns, like every buck private, how to goldbrick, how not to work when the sergeant isn't looking, how to know when he is looking, how to make him think you are working even when he is looking. He learns that in real life you don't do anything unless you are bribed, bullied or conned into doing it, that nothing is worth doing for its own sake, or that if it is, you can't do it in school. He learns to be bored, to work with a small part of his mind, to escape from the reality around him into daydreams and fantasies – but not like the fantasies of his preschool years, in which he played a very active part.

The child comes to school curious about other people, particularly other children, and the school teaches him to be indifferent. The most interesting thing in the classroom – often the only interesting thing in it – is the other children, but he has to act as if these other children, all about him, only a few feet away, are not really there. He cannot interact with them, talk with them, smile at them. In many schools he can't talk to other children in the halls between classes; in more than a few, and some of these in stylish suburbs, he can't even talk to them at lunch. Splendid training for a world in which, when you're not studying the other person to figure out how to do him in, you pay no attention to him.

In fact, he learns how to live without paying attention to anything going on around him. You might say that school is a long lesson in how to turn yourself off, which may be one reason why so many young people, seeking the awareness of the world and responsiveness to it they had when they were little, think they can only find it in drugs. Aside from being boring, the school is almost always ugly, cold, inhuman – even the most stylish, glass-windowed, \$20-a-square-foot schools.

And so, in this dull and ugly place, where nobody ever says anything very truthful, where everybody is playing a kind of role, as in a charade where the teachers are no more free to respond honestly to the students than the students are free to respond to the teachers or each other, where the air practically vibrates with suspicion and anxiety, the child learns to live in a daze, saving his energies for those small parts of his life that are too trivial for the adults to bother with, and thus remain his. It is a rare child who can come through his schooling with much left of his curiosity, his independence or his sense of his own dignity, competence and worth.

So much for criticism. What do we need to do? Many things. Some are easy – we can do them right away. Some are hard, and may take some time. Take a hard one first. We should abolish compulsory school attendance. At the very least we should modify it perhaps by giving children every year a large number of authorized absences. Our compulsory school-attendance laws once served a humane and useful purpose. They protected childrens' right to some schooling, against those adults who would otherwise have denied it to them in order to exploit their labor, in farm, store, mine or factory. Today the laws help nobody, not the schools, not the teachers, not the children. To keep kids in school who would rather not be there costs the schools an enormous amount of time and trouble – to say nothing of what it costs to repair the damage that these angry and resentful prisoners do every time they get a chance. Every teacher knows that any kid in class who, for whatever reason, would rather not be there, not only doesn't learn anything himself but makes it a great deal tougher for anyone else. As for protecting the children from exploitation, the chief and indeed only exploiters of children these days are the schools. Kids caught in the college rush more often than not work 70 hours or more a week, most of it on paper busy work. For kids who aren't going to college, school is just a useless time waster, preventing them from earning some money or doing some useful work, or even doing some true learnings.

Objections. "If kids didn't have to go, they'd all be out in the streets." No, they wouldn't. In the first place, even if schools stayed the way they are, children would spend at least some time there because that's where they'd be likely to find friends; it's a natural meeting place for children. In the second place, schools wouldn't stay the way they are, they'd get better, because we would have to start making them what they ought to be right now – places where children would want to be. In the third place, those children who did not want to go to school could find, particularly if we stirred up our brains and gave them a little help, other things to do – the things many children now do during their summers and holidays.

There's something easier we could do. We need to get kids out of the school buildings, give them a chance to learn about the world at first hand. It is a very recent idea, and a crazy one, that the way to teach our young people about the world they live in is to take them out of it and shut them up in brick boxes. Fortunately, educators are beginning to realize this. In Philadelphia and Portland, Oregon, to pick only two places I happen to have heard about, plans are being drawn up for public schools that won't have any school buildings at all, that will take the students out into the city and help them to use it and its people as a learning resource. In other words, students, perhaps in groups, perhaps independently, will go to libraries museums, exhibits, courtrooms, legislatures, radio and TV stations, meetings, businesses and laboratories to learn about their world and society at first hand. A small private school in Washington is already doing this. It makes sense. We need more of it.

As we help children get out into the world, to do their learning there, we can get more of the world into the schools. Aside from their parents, most children never have any close contact with any adults except people whose sole business is children. No wonder they have no idea what adult life or work is like. We need to bring a lot more people who are not full-time teachers into the schools, and into contact with the children. In New York City, under the Teachers and Writers Collaborative, real writers working writers – novelists, poets, playwrights – come into the schools, read their work, and talk to the children about the problems of their craft. The children eat it up. In another school I know of a practicing attorney from a nearby city comes in every month or so and talks to several classes about the law. Not the law as it is in books but as he sees it and encounters it in his cases, his problems, his work. And the children love it. It is real, grown-up, true, not My Weekly Reader, not “social studies,” not lies and baloney.

Something easier yet. Let children work together, help each other, learn from each other and each others' mistakes. We now know, from the experience of many schools, both rich-suburban and poor-city, that children are often the best teachers of other children. What is more important, we know that when a fifth-or sixth-grader who has been having trouble with reading starts helping a first grader, his own reading sharply improves. A number of schools are beginning to use what some call Paired Learning. This means that you let children form partnerships with other children, do their work, even including their tests, together, and share whatever marks or results this work gets – just like grownups in the real world. It seems to work.

Let the children learn to judge their own work. A child learning to talk does not learn by being corrected all the time – if corrected too much, he will stop talking. He compares, a thousand times a day, the difference between language as he uses it and as those around him use it. Bit by bit, he makes the necessary changes to make his language like other peoples. In the same way, kids learning to do all the other things they learn without adult teachers – to walk, run, climb, whistle, ride a bike, skate, play games, jump rope – compare their own performance with what more skilled people do, and slowly make the needed changes. But in school we never give a child a chance to detect his mistakes, let alone correct them. We do it all for him. We act as if we thought he would never notice a mistake unless it was pointed out to him, or correct it unless he was made to. Soon he becomes dependent on the expert. We should let him do it himself. Let him figure out, with the help of other children if he wants it, what this word says, what is the answer to that problem, whether this is a good way of saying or doing this or that. If right answers are involved, as in some math or science, give him the answer book, let him correct his own papers. Why should we teachers waste time on such donkey work? Our job should be to help the kid when he tells us that he can't find a way to get the right answer. Let's get rid of all this nonsense of grades, exams, marks. We don't know now, and we never will know, how to measure what another person knows or understands. We certainly can't find out by asking him questions. All we find out is what he doesn't know which is what most tests are

for, anyway. Throw it all out, and let the child learn what every educated person must someday learn, how to measure his own understanding, how to know what he knows or does not know.

We could also abolish the fixed, required curriculum. People remember only what is interesting and useful to them, what helps them make sense of the world, or helps them get along in it. All else they quickly forget, if they ever learn it at all. The idea of a "body of knowledge," to be picked up in school and used for the rest of one's life, is nonsense in a world as complicated and rapidly changing as ours. Anyway, the most important questions and problems of our time are not in the curriculum, not even in the hotshot universities, let alone the schools.

Children want, more than they want anything else, and even after years of miseducation, to make sense of the world, themselves, other human beings. Let them get at this job, with our help if they ask for it, in the way that makes most sense to them.

Copied from
Saturday Evening Post
February 8 1969

Reprinted with permission

School Segregation Redux

By: E. Wayne Ross

School desegregation—an invaluable accomplishment of the long struggle against Jim Crow and its vestiges—is linked to important educational and social gains for minority and white students. Despite public support for desegregated schools, recent federal court decisions and educational reform legislation have led to both the resegregation of students and erection of barriers that limit the racial diversity of the teaching profession.

Dismantling Desegregation

While public schools were continuously desegregated from the 1950s to the 1980s, the past 12 years has seen a rapid retreat from these efforts as federal courts terminated major and successful desegregation orders. In the 1990s, US Supreme Court rulings in cases such as *Board of Education of Oklahoma City v. Dowell* and *Freeman v. Pitts* made it easier for school districts to be declared "unified" or desegregated. In the last seven years, in the wake of these decisions, nearly 50 districts across the country have had their court-ordered desegregation plans abolished. A recent Harvard study concludes that desegregation has receded to levels not seen in three decades; although the South remains the nation's most integrated region, it is also the region that is most rapidly moving backwards as courts terminate successful desegregation orders.

The study released by the Harvard Civil Rights Project in January, illustrates how federal court rulings have contributed to the resegregation of public schools across the nation. "A Multiracial Society with Segregated Schools: Are We Losing the Dream?" examines research on the impact of desegregation and describes patterns of racial enrollment and segregation in US public schools at the national, regional, state, and district levels based on the latest data from the US Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics. (The report is available online at: www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu)

Common myths about school desegregation—such as it was a good idea that didn't work, that it increased "white flight," or didn't solve educational problems—are not supported by the enormous amount of research on the effects of desegregation. The report's authors—Erica Frankenberg, Chungmei Lee, and Gary Orfield—summarize the research on desegregation into three general findings:

1. Segregated schools have much higher concentrations of poverty and other problems and much lower average test scores, levels of teacher qualifications, and advanced courses. With few exceptions, separate schools are still unequal schools. Ending desegregation tends to produce a rapid increase of such schools within a district and more qualified teachers tend to leave these segregated schools.
2. In systems with desegregation plans, particularly those areas with substantial white enrollment, minority students tend to transfer to

better schools and learn more, though a racial “achievement” gap remains. Going to desegregated schools improves students’ chances for a desegregated future life, for going to and succeeding in college and living and working in interracial settings.

3. When teachers create positive academic interactions in racially diverse schools, the benefits of desegregated schools increase substantially.

In addition, the author’s point to more recent research that shows educational and civic benefits of desegregation for all racial groups. For example, in Louisville-Jefferson County, Kentucky—the largest urban area in what the report claims is the nation’s most integrated state—both black and white students report very positive results on a range of questions on educational and social outcomes. Ninety-three of white juniors and 95 percent of black African Americans said they are comfortable working with students of other races on group projects. Even higher percentages of white and black students said they were comfortable in classes learning about each other’s cultures.

Despite the educational and social successes of desegregation, federal court rulings combined with the failure of the federal government fund desegregation assistance programs for over two decades have created conditions for, indeed encouraged, the resegregation of public schools.

The Civil Rights Project report highlights the rapid racial transformation of US schools. Since 1968, black student enrollment has increased nearly 30% and Latino student enrollment up 283%. In contrast, public school enrollment of whites is down 17 percent. In every region of the country the school population has become less white and schools in the South and West have the highest concentrations of black and Latino students (and these regions are approaching student populations where whites are in the minority). There are now six states where white students are a minority of the enrolled school population: California, Hawai’i, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, and Texas. Schools in the Northeast and Midwest still have large white majorities.

The Harvard study reports that, on average, white, black, and Latino students all attend schools in which the majority of the student body is composed of students of their own race. Whites are now the most segregated group in public schools—attending schools that on average are 80% white. In contrast, the average Asian student attends the most integrated schools (although Asian students still attend schools that are on average 22% Asian). Native American students attend schools, on average, in which half the student body is white and slightly less than one-third of students are their race. Native American students have the lowest exposure to black students among all racial groups.

White students are attending majority white schools at time when minority students make up nearly one-half of the public school enrollment. During the 1990s, the proportion of black students in majority white schools decreased by 13%—a level lower than any year since 1968.

There are only two states that have not shown an increase in black segregation in recent years and these states—Michigan and New Jersey—are highly segregated and

showed virtually no change. States with large increases in segregation (such as Florida, Missouri and North Carolina) are home to school districts that had long-running desegregation orders terminated in the 1990s.

Over the past two decades in Kentucky, there has been nearly a 10% decrease in the percentage of white students in schools attended by blacks. Despite this decrease in integration, the Harvard report notes Kentucky has had the highest level of black-white exposure in schools since 1980. This is largely the result of consolidation of city and county school systems in metro Louisville, which remain under a desegregation plan.

The Harvard study also identifies the importance of the relationship between racial segregation and poverty. High poverty schools have been shown to increase educational inequality for students because of a lack of resources and qualified teachers as well as low parental involvement and high teacher turnover rates. (There are nearly 200,000 noncertified teachers now, mostly in schools serving poor, minority, and immigrant children.) Almost half of the students in schools attended by the average black or Latino student are poor or very poor, while less than 20% of students in schools attended by the average white student is classified as poor. A substantial number of public schools that are virtually all non-white, what the study's authors label "apartheid" schools, have emerged in recent years. These schools educate a quarter of the students in the Midwest and Northeast and are often schools plagued by substantial poverty, social, and health problems.

The Teaching Profession: For Whites Only?

In addition to the racial segregation of students, there is a serious race gap between teachers (86% of whom are white) and the nearly 50% of students who are minorities.

Courts are largely responsible for the resegregation of students, but state and federal legislation has become a serious barrier to increasing diversity of the teachers in public schools, compounding the deleterious effects of resegregated schools. This legislation, in particular the No Child Left Behind Act, relies on standardized tests to improve education and teacher quality.

There is overwhelming evidence that standardized tests are primarily measures of race and class, rather than educational achievement of public school students. These findings are consistent with what we know about college-admissions and teacher licensure tests, which contribute to educational inequality by denying education, scholarships, and access to the teaching profession to minority students thereby sustaining the race gap between teachers and students in schools.

ACT college admissions test scores, for example, are directly related to family income (the richer the students' parents are, the higher the average scores across income groups) and race (whites outscore all groups when factors such as course work, grades, and family income are equal). The ACT also does a poor job of predicting the college performance of minority students—explaining only 7% of the difference in first-semester college grades of black students. Despite its inaccuracies and biases, ACT scores are often used to determine entrance into colleges and for allocation of scholarships. The SAT, which is a direct descendent of the racist anti-immigrant Army Mental Tests of the 1920s, is also plagued by biases that are

effective in eliminating academically promising low-income and minority students from college classrooms.

ACT or SAT test scores above a specified level are required for admission to most teacher education programs. As a result of biases in both these tests large numbers of potential minority teachers are being excluded from opportunities to become classroom teachers. A detailed study of the impact of standardized tests on the teacher candidate pool in Florida indicated that test score requirements eliminated 80% of black and 61% of Latino applicants to teacher education programs, but only 37% of whites.

There is also a long history of cultural bias on teacher licensure tests, which are typically taken upon exit from teacher education programs. A recent National Research Council report on teacher tests concludes that raising cut-off scores on these tests will reduce racial diversity in the teaching profession without improving quality. The differences in average scores among racial/ethnic groups on teacher licensure tests are similar to the differences found among these groups on college admission tests, showing substantial disparities between the passing rates of white and minority test takers.

Most importantly, the NRC found that these tests do not predict who will become effective teachers. The NRC concluded that by their design and as currently used tests like the PRAXIS—the most widely-used teacher licensure test—fall short in their use as accountability tools, as levers for improving teacher preparation, and encourage erroneous conclusions about the quality of teacher preparation. Nevertheless, over 40 states rely on standardized tests for teacher licensure.

Current efforts to improve learning and teacher quality rest on a misguided use of standardized tests. Rather than improving learning or increasing teacher quality, the latest research indicates that an emphasis on testing results actually lowers student academic performance, increases dropout rates, and serves as a barrier to diversifying the teaching profession with improving teacher quality. A recent study by Arizona State University researchers showed that in states that have adopted high-stakes exams there has actually been a decline in student performance on independent measures of achievement, such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (aka “The Nation’s Report Card”).

What is To Be Done?

As the authors of the Harvard study note, segregation is a failed educational policy that produces deeply unequal education and a polarized society. So too is test-driven educational reform. Clearly the struggle for the civil rights continues and desegregated schools are an important achievement that must be preserved, but school desegregation is not a panacea. For example, even though the city of Louisville has a highly integrated public school system, in the past three years five African American men have been shot dead by white Louisville police officers.

Frankenberg and her colleagues at the Civil Rights Project offer a basic policy framework that they say is needed to increase integration in US public schools. The framework includes principles such as: (1) explicit recognition of integrated education as a basic education goal and judicial recognition that integrated education

is a compelling educational interest in our society; (2) a resistance to terminating desegregation plans; and (3) in cases where schools districts are forbidden to continue its desegregation plan by a federal court, that consideration should be given to efforts to keep diversity by social and economic desegregation.

There is a mountain of evidence documenting the deleterious effects of high-stakes tests on teaching, learning, and society. Many of the backers of these tests are aware of the problems and nonetheless remain committed to their use as a tool to regulate knowledge in schools and universities; to sort students by race and class; and limit access of minorities to the teaching profession. Increasing numbers of students, parents, and educators are pushing back against educational “reform” efforts that divide students and teachers along racial, ethnic, and class lines. The Rouge Forum (www.rougeforum.org), The Whole Schooling Consortium (www.coe.wayne.edu/CommunityBuilding/WSC.html), and the Coalition for Commonsense in Education (free.freespeech.org/ccse) are but three examples of grassroots groups working for more inclusive schools and classrooms; organizing across the barriers of race, class, ability; and acknowledging that schools remain a pivotal, if not the most important, battleground of political and economic interests in the US today.

Author note: E. Wayne Ross is a Distinguished University Scholar at the University of Louisville and a co-editor of the journals Workplace: The Journal for Academic Labor and Cultural Logic.

The Questions Students Ask

by Amber Goslee

I noticed that since we came back from winter break a couple of my boys were interested in writing to each other in codes, which I recognize as being a typical thing that many kids do. Now, as the teacher I could do many things, right? I could tell them to stop (which they wouldn't, but might hide better), I could ignore it, or I could approach them with interest in what they were doing.

Well, I approached them and said I noticed that they had been writing each other cool notes in code. I asked them if they wanted to learn more about codes and their faces lit up with excitement. So, I told them to list at least ten questions they had about codes. Their questions are fascinating and are listed below. Their curiosity stems from ancient languages, which I had not known before reading their questions. (We study ancient cultures in sixth grade). As you will see, some are quite philosophical. From their questions we will formulate some research. I am interested in what they discover!

STUDENT ONE

Can I do ancient languages like Old English, ancient Greek, Anglo Saxon, Finnish and Gothic?

What about number codes, letter codes, picture codes that we could do on the assignment?

Why did people in ancient times figure out their own symbols and writing?

How do we figure out ancient writing from ancient times?

Why are there so many ancient languages?

If our ancestors are from the old world why don't we use their old ancient language?

Without codes, what would the world be like?

Without ancient languages what would the world be like?

What's bad and good about codes and ancient languages?

Are codes and languages of ancient times necessary for us in our time?

In ancient times, did people use codes too?

Are ancient languages used as codes as well?

Is the world better with codes or without codes and ancient languages?

Do codes help us?

Do ancient or old languages help us?

Do we need these to survive?

STUDENT TWO

How do people figure out symbols?

How do people create a language?

How can we create and decode our own words?

How come English is one of the hardest languages to learn?

How did people figure out Morse code?
Who did people figure out flag code?
How was English created?
Why are there so many languages?
Why are hieroglyphics so mysterious?

**I participate.
You participate.
He, she, or they participate.
We all participate.**

They profit.

But things change.

Join us

[Rouge Forum](#)



School reform requires social and economic justice
<http://www.coe.wayne.edu/CommunityBuilding/WSC.html>

I Participate. You Participate. He, She, or They Participate. We All Participate.

They Profit. But Things Change! Join Us.

The Rouge Forum



**The Rouge Forum
is interested in teaching
and learning for a
democratic society. You
are invited to join us.**

The *Rouge Forum* is a group of educators, students, and parents seeking a democratic society. We are concerned about questions like these: How can we teach against racism, national chauvinism and sexism in an increasingly authoritarian and undemocratic society? How can we gain enough real power to keep our ideals and still teach—or learn? Whose interests shall school serve in a society that is ever more unequal? We are both research and action oriented. We want to learn about equality, democracy and social justice as we simultaneously struggle to bring into practice our present understanding of what that is. We seek to build a caring inclusive community which understands that an injury to one is an injury to all. At the same time, our caring community is going to need to deal decisively with an opposition that is sometimes ruthless

We hope to demonstrate that the power necessary to win greater democracy will likely rise out of an organization that unites people in new ways—across union boundaries, across community lines, across the fences of race and sex/gender. We believe that good humor and friendships are a vital part of building this kind of organization, as important as theoretical clarity. Friendships allow us to understand that action always reveals errors—the key way we learn. We chose Brer Rabbit as a symbol to underline the good cheer that rightfully guides the struggle for justice. Every part of the world is our briar patch.

We had modest success in defeating the standardized test, the MEAP, in Michigan. We work in faculty organizations and unions to deal with the racism and sexism in academia. We try to press forward questions of class size, curricular freedom, anti-racist pedagogy, real inclusion, and a just tax system. As part of the *Whole Schooling Consortium*, we have sponsored forums in the U.S., uniting hundreds of people for democracy and equality.

There are no dues to join the Rouge Forum. Just email elethinker@yahoo.com

Visit http://www.pipeline.com/~rgibson/rouge_forum/ for updates