

The Blumenfeld Education Letter

"My People Are Destroyed For Lack Of Knowledge" HOSEA 4:6

Vol. 11, No. 1 (Letter # 112)

EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld

January 1996

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide knowledge for parents and educators who want to save the children of America from the destructive forces that endanger them. Our children in the public schools are at grave risk in 4 ways: academically, spiritually, morally, and physically — and only a well-informed public will be able to reduce these risks.
"Without vision, the people perish."

(Page 5: *Who Killed Vince Foster?* a review of Michael Kellett's book)

Unitarians Launch Full-Scale Attack on Right-Wing Critics of Public Education

The Unitarians, who, in the 1800s, were leaders in the public-school movement and instrumental in saddling America with a government education system, have become so alarmed at fundamentalist criticism of public education, that they devoted the November/December 1995 issue of *World*, the official journal of the Unitarian-Universalist Association, to a full-scale attack on the religious right (a.k.a. the radical right, conservative Republicans, the far right, right-wing extremists, etc.). What set off the Unitarian alarm were the fundamentalists' recent successes in getting elected to school boards. An article entitled "Fighting the Right on Local School Boards," states:

Like assuring a supply of safe drinking water, overseeing the schools is a necessary, even a crucial function but hardly a thing to arouse strong emotions.

That is, until the town wakes up one morning and discovers its school board has been taken over by folks who think that Halloween is a satanic holiday, Genesis is a science text, and school lunch and social service programs threaten the survival of the family.

It's a terrifying feeling. *Confused, uncertain, worried, and fearful* are words used by Round Rock, Texas, Unitarian-Universalist Jack Bryant to describe his

emotions when a religious right majority took over his district in the May 1993 elections. "Two of the three radical right candidates who won office . . . denied any connection with radical right organizations," says Bryant, a Round Rock school parent and candidate for the Unitarian Universalist ministry who went on to help lead the opposition to the school board theocrats. . . .

Estimates of the number of local school boards with religious right majorities range from a high of 2,200 (religious right leader Robert Simonds) down to several dozen (UUs Skipp Porteous of the Institute for First Amendment Studies and Deanna Duby of People for the American Way).

There are over 15,000 school districts in America, and the Unitarians are alarmed because, according to their own monitors, a few dozen of them have been "taken over" by the religious right! Obviously, the very thought of even one school board being captured by orthodox Christians is enough to terrify UUs. But the lengthy, hysterical article ends on a note of optimism since many of the religious righters were unseated by "moderates" in subsequent elections. Nevertheless, we are told:

Unitarian Universalists in upwards of a dozen

The Blumenfeld Education Letter is published monthly. Original material is copyrighted by The Blumenfeld Education Letter. Permission to quote is granted provided proper credit is given. Readers are encouraged to order and distribute additional copies of those newsletters they believe should be sent to legislators, columnists, talk shows, pastors, etc. Subscription Rate: 1 year \$36.00. Address: Box 45161, Boise, Idaho 83711. (208) 322-4440. WWW address: <http://www.cyberhighway.net/~phil/blumenfed.html>

Southern California school districts were still working to unseat religious right board members and identify stealth candidates for other board seats, with the help of Project Freedom of Religion (Project FOR), a UUSC- and Pacific Southwest District-sponsored networking group that has local committees in 23 of the 41 Pacific Southwest District congregations.

We wonder how many Unitarian Universalists are on school boards across America. We also wonder how it is possible for the UU church to engage in such open political activity and maintain its tax-exempt status. Contributions to the Christian Coalition are not tax-exempt, but contributions to the politically active UU church are.

Unitarianism, by the way, is the great liberal heresy that arose in the late 18th century among the Harvard elite and emerged full bloom in the early 19th century as a rational, liberal religion that rejected the divinity of Christ as well as the Calvinist view of man as totally depraved. (The Universalists, who believe that everyone will be saved, joined the Unitarians in 1961.) The Unitarians believed that man was not only morally perfectible but that education was the only true way to salvation. Since they believed that evil was caused by ignorance, poverty, and social injustice, they were convinced that only a good liberal education, provided by the government at no charge, could get rid of all of those horrible social causes of evil. And so the Unitarians were determined to create their universal public schools in order to prove that they were right and the Calvinists were wrong.

The Calvinists Were Right

But 150 years later we know now that the Calvinists were right and the Unitarians were wrong, that the utopian notion of moral perfectibility is a fantasy spawned by a refusal to face the reality of man's fallen nature. But while the vast majority of Unitarian

Universalists still believe in public education almost as a public religion, some UUs are actually homeschooling! In fact, there is even a support network for UU homeschoolers. (Homeschooling Unitarian Universalists and Humanists [HUUH], c/o Jacki Willard, 3135 Lakeland Drive, Nashville, TN 37214-3312). But many UU congregations strongly believe in getting involved with their public schools. For example, according to *World*:

Many congregations have well-established partnerships with local public schools. These usually start with church members tutoring students, but congregations have added programs like management training for teachers (Atlanta, Georgia), "breakfast club" tutorials to attract additional volunteers (All Souls Church, New York), day-care for students who are also parents (Portland, Maine), and other variations.

Numerous individual UUs are innovators within public education. In New Haven, Connecticut, Muriel Hamilton-Lee has set up a program that gives Head Start parents a 10-month training course leading to a nationally recognized certificate in child development. In rural New Hampshire, Warren Priest has pioneered the introduction of "service learning" (don't call it "community service") to elementary classes.

Whatever happened to the separation of Church and State? Can you imagine the hue and cry if, instead of UUs, these were fundamentalist Christians involved in these "partnerships" and programs? The article continues:

Of course, schools throughout the United States have been facing budget cuts for years. Back in 1988, the Rochester, New York, school district, its budget slashed, issued an urgent appeal for help—and the city's First Unitarian Church responded by establishing a partnership with the city's ailing School 22 that continues to this day. And when some School 22 teachers, including congregation member Miriam Thomas, started a more innovative, "whole language" school called Children's School (School 55), the church agreed to work with that school, too.

In 1990, the church's "22/UU/55 Task Force" hired a part-time coordinator, Sonia Meetze, to back

up the 40 members who tutor in the two schools. Meetze, a former teacher, works with faculty members to identify needs, make plans to address them, and iron out problems in the relationship. . . .

The congregation also collects and donates items requested by the teachers. Church volunteers have run after-school clubs and led other special programs in the schools. . . .

John Proctor, a fifth-generation Unitarian Universalist and superintendent of the regional school system covering Chester, Deep River, and Essex, Connecticut, is unhappy that many UU parents are opting out of the public schools. "These are just the families we need inside the system," he says. ". . . Perhaps the people who are coming into the denomination now are not as steeped in its commitment to social justice as its older members. . . ."

Like many UU educators, Proctor talks eloquently about the extent to which working in the public schools allows him to live out his firmly held UU values. "We are teaching openness, tolerance, a respect for differences—all those Emersonian values," he says. "I would even say our goals in the public schools are exactly the same as the goals of good UU RE [Unitarian Universalist Religious Education] programs."

Is it any wonder that some Christians call the public schools Unitarian parochial schools? It's amazing to what legal lengths Unitarians will go to prevent school prayer or Bible reading in the classroom, or a non-sectarian blessing at a high school graduation, or the teaching of creationism along with evolution, or an abstinence-based sex education program on the grounds that all of these activities promote religion.

Tom Payzant and Goals 2000

Isn't it interesting that Tom Payzant, the new superintendent of Boston's schools, is an active Unitarian Universalist who also happens to believe in whole language and outcome-based education. In a glowing article about Payzant in *World*, we read:

Goals 2000 was not only the brainchild of Payzant and a few others but also the centerpiece of the Clinton administration's public education program

when it first took office. It was passed by the 1994 Congress with wide bipartisan support, only to be killed by the new Republican Congress with its appropriations rescission bill a year later. But that bill, in turn was vetoed by the president, and the compromise that replaced it restored Goals 2000 with virtually full funding. As we go to press, its fate is once more hanging in the balance: the House 1996 appropriations bill again kills the program; the Senate has not yet acted; President Clinton has vowed to use his veto once again if what reaches his desk resembles the House version. . . .

A look at Goals 2000—which, as Payzant points out, initially had the backing of virtually every major national parent, education, and business organization—throws into clear perspective the radical reversal in values brought about by the 1994 election. . . .

"It reflects a fundamental difference in philosophy," he says.

Payzant is one of the nation's most experienced change agents. He is a member of Marc Tucker's National Alliance for Restructuring Education, a team of high-level change agents dedicated to designing and implementing transformational outcome-based education throughout the United States. The chief honchos of the Alliance are Marc Tucker, David Hornbeck, and Michael Cohen. Tucker is responsible for the disastrous reform program in Rochester, New York; David Hornbeck brought OBE to Kentucky and is now superintendent of Philadelphia's public schools; and Michael Cohen was Education Program Director at the National Governors' Association. Tom Payzant is listed in the Alliance's grant proposal to the New American Schools Development Corporation as:

Superintendent, San Diego City Schools. Tom has served as Superintendent in a number of states, including Pennsylvania, Oregon, Oklahoma and California. He is Chair of the Board of Directors for the Council for Basic Education and a member of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

In San Diego, Payzant clashed with conservative Christian groups because he

banned the Boy Scouts of America from using school buildings because of their discrimination against homosexuals. But, as *World* explains:

Despite such controversies, Payzant's accomplishments won him a national reputation as an educational innovator, earning him the UU [Unitarian Universalist] of the Year award from his home congregation in San Diego in 1993, and, more significantly, led to his appointment as assistant secretary of education.

His accomplishments in that position go far beyond the launch of Goals 2000. He himself cites his role in refocusing federal education programs.

"Previous federal programs were often narrowly focused in categorical areas," he explains, "with the results that the efforts were often fragmented. What Secretary [of Education] Riley and I have tried to do is to focus on . . . improving teaching and learning for all students in the country. . . ."

Those who share Payzant's commitment to improving public education will be sorry to see him leave his influential federal job. And saying, "There is much work left to be done," Payzant himself admits the decision to leave was "very, very difficult." . . .

He sees the Boston move as presenting opportunities both personal—to return, at 54, to the place of his birth—and professional. "Conditions are ripe in Boston to make some really significant changes and improvements," he explains. . . .

Which brings up the impact of religious issues on public education. Here is Payzant's assessment:

"Every high-profile issue eventually finds its way to the schoolhouse door, and that includes such religious issues as school prayer, the teaching of values, and the teaching of religion. . . ."

"Over the years, starting as a teacher of history and government, I developed a strong belief in the separation of church and state, and I always viewed my role as a school superintendent as one where I had to be very respectful of that separation and the reasons for it. . . . I believe it is very appropriate to have education about religions in our public schools, as distinguished from advocacy for any particular religion."

Of course, Mr. Payzant doesn't have to worry about advocating any particular religion in the public schools since the humanist public-school curriculum is a direct reflection of the Unitarian Universalist phi-

losophy. As John Proctor, UU superintendent of a regional school system in Connecticut says, "I would even say our goals in the public schools are exactly the same as the goals of good UU RE programs."

World also lists several organizations devoted to "fighting the religious right": Community Coalition Network," Solana Beach, CA 92075, "an organization that helps inform and involve citizens by providing resources and a support network; *The Freedom Writer*, published by the Institute for First Amendment Studies, Inc., Great Barrington, MA 01230, "a newsletter that offers, in addition to up-to-date news about religious right activities, advice for activists working against them." This is Skip Porteous's group that monitors right-wing activities and maintains extensive files on right wingers. Porteous's phone number is (413) 528-3800; newsletter price is \$25 a year.

Another UUA effort is Project Freedom of Religion (FOR), Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, Southern California Unit, La Puente, CA 91747, "an education and training program that helps UUs in Southern California fight religious right attacks on public schools by providing resources and a support network."

If you want to find out what Unitarian Universalists mean by "religious education," the UUA has published a guide entitled *Starting from Scratch: How to Begin Your Own RE Program for Children and Youth*. Since John Proctor claims that the goals of public education are exactly the same as the goals of the UUA's religious education program, is this not proof enough that the public schools are de facto UU parochial schools? The UUA's RE curricula can be ordered by mail or phone from the UUA Bookstore, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, MA 02108; (617) 742-2100 or 1-800-215-9076.

Vital Reading

Who Killed Vince Foster?

Did Vince Foster commit suicide or was he murdered? The more one delves into the matter, the more one smells a huge White House coverup. Vince Foster, as we all know, was about as close to the Clintons as anyone could be. In fact, Foster and Bill Clinton were classmates in primary school in Hope, Arkansas, and Foster worked with Hillary at the Rose Law Firm. He came to Washington at the behest of the Clintons to serve as the President's personal deputy counsel.

On July 20, 1993, Vince Foster was found dead in an obscure park in McLean, Virginia, with a gun in his hand. As deputy White House counsel, he was the highest ranking government official to die in office since John F. Kennedy.

The one book that tries to answer the sixty-four-dollar question is Michael Kellett's paperback, *The Murder of Vince Foster*, which is indeed dedicated to Foster. Kellett writes:

This book is about more than murder. It is about arrogance and the abuse of power. It is about government officials caring more about their careers, money, and their political philosophies than for truth.

It will also become clear that one man stood above it all. When speaking to the graduating class of the University of Arkansas Law School, Vince Foster spoke these words:

"Sometimes doing the right thing will be very unpopular. . . . When the heat of controversy swarms around you, the conviction that you did the right thing will be the best salve and the best sleeping medicine."

When the heat swarmed around him, he did the right thing. He could not be bribed or threatened.

Kellett, who owns a printing company in Maryland, felt compelled to write this book because he could no longer take the obvious lies and distortions that were coming out of official Washington concerning

Vince Foster's death. He writes:

I believe anyone who knows me would deny that I'm inclined to accuse anyone of murder without an overwhelming abundance of evidence. . . . I believe that I would also score reasonably well in the area of politeness. If some statements in this book indicate otherwise, I can only say that we are dealing with an extraordinary situation, unique in American history, and I have dealt with it as fairly and as honestly as I can.

In other words, since the politicians are reluctant to deal with this problem, a concerned private citizen has no choice but to do the investigating himself in order to eventually force the politicians to take notice and determine the truth. This is not easily done in today's conformist climate. It will require enough people to read this book so that pressure will build from below for an investigation. That's what got Congress to investigate the Waco and Weaver affairs. But note how scantily the establishment media reported these hearings.

And it will be even more difficult to get a full-fledged, open investigation of the Vince Foster case since both Democrats and Republicans have accepted the flawed Fiske verdict that Foster committed suicide. That is why Kellett's book must be read by several million people before the Congress will even think of opening up this can of worms. The politicians are scared stiff, not so much of the Clintonistas, but of what the establishment media will do to them if they so much as suggest that Foster was murdered, because to do so is to implicate the President of the United States and his wife and their associates in the crime of homicide. No President in American history has ever faced that charge. Richard Nixon was the first President to resign, but Bill Clinton may be the first President to be accused of homicide.

In fact, on page 194 of his book, Kellett accuses Bill and Hillary Clinton of murder:

The evidence is overwhelming. There is no doubt. I hereby accuse the both of you of being responsible for the initiation, and orchestration of, the murder of Vincent W. Foster, Jr.

This booklet and accusation shall be distributed nationally, maybe internationally. If you lowlives feel that I have written, printed, and distributed information that is untrue and maligns your character, then I challenge you to sue me in a court of law. You can present your case and submit to cross-examination and an investigation. Let's make all witnesses and documentation available. Let's utilize lie-detector tests. Let's get it out in the open.

To understand what happened to Vince Foster, one must understand the context in which these events took place. Foster, as Hillary's co-partner at the Rose Law Firm, and personal attorney to the Clintons in the White House, had accumulated over the years enough concrete evidence that could be used by investigators to indict the Clintons and their Arkansas mafia for high crimes and misdemeanors. It seems that in July 1993, federal investigators were about to go through Foster's files and the files at the Rose Law Firm to find evidence of wrongdoing in the Whitewater affair. In fact, on the very day of Foster's death, the F.B.I. issued a subpoena and took records out of the office of Little Rock municipal judge David L. Hale. (Subsequently, Hale pleaded guilty to defrauding the government and has become a key witness in the Whitewater investigation by independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr.) Kellett writes:

[I]t is clear that Foster's office contained concrete evidence and concrete documented evidence is all that matters to Clinton. Jennifer Flowers taped a phone conversation with him in which he advised her on how to deal with investigators prying into the allegation that he manipulated state job requirements for her. As long as no one actually admits anything, he told her, it will be no problem. He indicated that it didn't matter what many people thought. It was only concrete evidence that matters. To him, guilt or innocence is all political. He knows that liberals will not allow themselves to think of their man as a criminal. Nothing will convince them, including this book.

He thus knows that if he keeps his political base, he remains innocent—as long as concrete evidence that would convince even liberals is not allowed to surface.

And so, in July 1993, Vince Foster was faced with a dilemma: open his files to the federal investigators or destroy them. Kellett writes:

Clinton and Foster were on the phone the evening of July 19 discussing the impending federal investigation. It was no friendly chat. Foster told Clinton in no uncertain terms that he would not destroy evidence; that he was not going to jail to protect the Bill 'n Hill gang.

Kellett quotes Alan Dershowitz, the Harvard defense lawyer, who said:

In my 30 years of experience as a criminal defense lawyer, I have noticed one general distinction between the actions of innocent and guilty clients: The innocent save every scrap of paper in the hope and expectation that somewhere in the boxes of files, bills, phone logs, and diaries they will find some proof of their innocence; the guilty, on the other hand, destroy as much as they can, in the fear that somewhere the prosecutor will find something incriminating.

And so, a showdown evidently took place between Foster and his Arkansas colleagues over what to do to thwart the federal investigators. Foster would not do what they wanted. He was going to let the federal investigators into his office and go through his files. He had no choice. Several months before this showdown, Foster had addressed the graduates at the University of Arkansas Law School in which he said:

The reputation you develop for intellectual and ethical integrity will be your greatest asset or your worst enemy. There is no victory, no advantage, no fee, no favor, which is worth even a blemish on your reputation for intellect and integrity.

Obviously, the Clintons had chosen their

old colleague to be their personal attorney because he was honest, reliable, and meticulous about his job. And while he knew about some of their questionable practices, he kept his mouth shut. But when it came to a federal investigation, Foster apparently decided that he would not become an accomplice to his clients' crimes by destroying evidence and obstructing justice.

Since Foster could not be persuaded by Clinton and his gang to do what they knew had to be done to save their skins, they had no choice but to get rid of him. Which is to say that the situation had reached so critical a point that murder was considered the only way to solve the problem. With Foster out of the way, they could get into his office and destroy the evidence that could bring down the entire Clinton administration in disgrace and send them all to jail in a scandal that would rock the nation.

How was it to be done. Foster's murder was to be made to look like a suicide. But his body had to be found fast, so that they could get into his office as soon as possible. But where was he to be done in? The night before his death, Foster was visited at his home by Bruce Lindsey and another unidentified Washington lawyer. Kellet writes:

Lindsey was a stock broker in Arkansas, whose firm received big contracts to sell state bonds when Clinton was governor and also contributed heavily to Clinton's campaigns. He is now Clinton's personal attorney and it was in his office that numerous White-water related files eventually showed up. Lindsey said the two invited Foster to see a movie, but he declined. . . .

Surprisingly, one would think Lindsey, who knew Foster, would have known that Foster was definitely not the type to want to go to a movie with two other middle-aged men on a Monday night. . . . Reader, when was the last time you saw three middle-aged men go to a movie?

Incidentally, Clinton, as part of his 20-minute chat, also invited Foster to come over and see a movie at the White House. And who was with Clinton at the time? None other than Webb Hubell, the former number two man in the justice department who quit

when his past activities as president of Hillary's Rose law firm started being scrutinized.

Had they planned to kill Foster that night, but Foster simply wouldn't cooperate? Or were they to use the occasion to persuade Foster to let them go through his files? This was the middle of July, and Foster and his wife had spent the weekend with the Hubbells at a vacation resort. What did Hubbell and Foster talk about that weekend? Did Hubbell bring back to Clinton the bad news that, try as he did, he could not convince Foster to cooperate? In any case, Foster went to his White House office that Tuesday morning, was visited by Web Hubbell, took phone calls which were all duly noted in his phone log, had lunch in his office, read the newspaper, and left the office at about 1 p.m. for an appointment somewhere. He took his White House pager with him. The last person who saw him alive was Secret Service Security officer John Skyles who was guarding the gate that Foster exited shortly after 1 p.m. When interviewed, Skyles said that he asked Foster, "How are you doing sir?" and that Foster replied, "Hello-fine" and nodded his head to Skyles with what Skyles remembers as a "half smile." He recalled that Foster didn't look at all depressed or preoccupied as he went by, and that he was quite surprised to hear that Foster had committed suicide a few hours later.

Where did Foster go? His appointment book has never been found. All we know is that at about 5:30 p.m. Foster's body was discovered at Fort Marcy Park by a witness whose identity has never been made public. The Park Police got there at about 6:10 p.m. Kellett estimates that Foster was killed no later than 3:45 p.m. and that his body was transported to Ft. Marcy Park and laid out to appear as if it had been a suicide. Kellett writes:

ALL THE AVAILABLE EVIDENCE OVER-

WHELMINGLY SUPPORTS THE CONCLUSION THAT VINCENT FOSTER JR. WAS MURDERED, AND HIS BODY TRANSPORTED TO FORT MARCY PARK, AND THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY.

A good deal of the book is devoted to an examination of the evidence. For example, neither the bullet nor skull fragments were ever found at the scene. Foster's clothes were covered with carpet fibers, and there was a relatively small quantity of blood, suggesting that the shooting had occurred elsewhere. Also, none of Foster's fingerprints were on the gun held in his right hand, but a fingerprint belonging to someone else was on the gun. There was no dirt on his shoes although he would have had to walk 600 feet on a dirt path from his car to where his body was found. Also, the location of his eyeglasses indicated that some other person must have tossed them there. How did the Fiske report handle all of this evidence? Kellett writes:

In the course of analyzing the Fiske report we have seen the boys ignore data from the laboratory and autopsy. We have seen them intentionally omit eye-witness statements and manipulate responses and data to support their position. We have seen them withhold information that would have given more significance to the data they obtained.

The White House was informed of the "suicide" at about 7:05 p.m., and less than two hours later the Clinton team—Kellett calls them the four ghouls—grieving over the sudden death of their beloved colleague, rushed back to the White House, broke into into his office, stole documents out of his files, which should have been sealed pending an investigation by the F.B.I. into the the suspicious death of a high-ranking White House official.

Normally, the F.B.I. investigates murders and suicides involving government officials. But Clinton had fired F.B.I. chief

William Sessions the day before Foster's death and placed the investigation in the hands of the Park Police whose main functions are chasing litterbugs and issuing parking tickets! The Clintonistas knew that the Park Police could be intimidated by the power of the White House to hand over Foster's wallet and pager and not question the ransacking of Foster's office. Someone had already stolen Foster's briefcase from his car in the park which six days later wound up in the White House with a forged "suicide note" torn into 27 pieces. How did the briefcase get there? Who stole it out of the car? Who forged the note and why weren't Foster's fingerprints on it? The Fiske commission never bothered to find out. Kellett writes:

This was not a marvelously well-planned fake suicide—if it were not for the president and politics, an average detective would have considered the thought of suicide laughable.

Are the Clintons and the Arkansas mafia capable of murdering a dear friend? The *Washington Times* of July 19, 1994 commented:

It is true . . . that a peculiar pattern of suicides and violence surrounds people connected to the Clintons and their associates. It may be no more than a coincidence, but it prompts questions.

We urge you to get a copy of this book and read it. Kellett has done what the Bernsteins and Woodwards have refused to do. They were willing to bring down Nixon, but apparently they are not willing to bring down Clinton. The book is \$11.95 plus \$2.50 for shipping and handling. Send your check to CLS Publishing, 7188 Cradlerock Way, Suite 162, Dept. BEL, Columbia, MD 21045.

There is also an excellent video on the subject available from Citizens for Honest Government, P.O. Box 220, Winchester, CA 92596, 1-800-828-2290.