

Chapter Four of the Family section
in the book *Lasting Success*

The Citizens' Report

It was my privilege to chair a Grand Jury for the 11th Judicial District of Iowa which investigated university activities and made several recommendations for changes in higher education. The jury's chief concern was the educational environment and its impact upon the emotions and decision-making ability of students.

Though the jury study covered the 1960s, it is very relevant to an understanding of the chapter which follows, entitled "Public Education Now." The same emotionally charged deception that was occurring in our universities is now occurring at the lower level elementary and secondary schools. Leftist anti-American, anti-family, and sex education which borders upon pornography are commonplace. **It is important at this point to note that most professors and public school teachers are well-intended citizens and doing their best. They have no more control over the curriculum for the above subjects than do parents.**

Seven citizens were chosen at random for the jury duty. Upon the recommendation of the Story County attorney, Charles Vanderbur, the judge asked me to be the foreman. The judge, impaneled at the time said (paraphrased), "Mr. Norris, this jury is the most powerful agency of government, and the jurors have the authority to investigate any

operation of government within Story County that they deem appropriate.”

[33]

34 / *The Citizens' Report*

We had certain fixed duties and were guided through them by the county attorney. Our first duty was to inspect the Story County Home. The staff provided us with a sumptuous meal. I gave the county attorney the opportunity to lead in thanksgiving for the meal and was glad to respond when he asked me to say the prayer.

The judge's statement that the jury had authority to investigate any operation of government in Story County stayed with me. News reports suggested that drugs, immorality, and disrespect for constitutional authority had become an acceptable academic menu in our universities. With about six months left in our term, I suggested to the county attorney that the jury should investigate what was going on at Iowa State University. He said, "Dave, I'll do anything I can to help you." He provided us with tape recordings of campus presentations and clerical assistance as needed. After hearing the first tape, the jury members gave the go-ahead to undertake an investigation.

God's providence was evident throughout this experience. My challenge as the foreman was to get unanimous agreement for significant recommendations from four Republican and three Democrat jurors. The jury moved resolutely. Though the impact upon the problems is now marginal, several legislative directives for changes in the administration of Iowa colleges and universities resulted. The greatest impact was that the halo over higher education was removed, and it ceased to be politically untouchable. The presentment received nationwide attention. Requests for copies of the jury's presentment came from leaders in the

administrations of both California Governor Ronald Reagan and President Richard Nixon.

The university's power to shape public opinion was and remains immense. It had a TV station and a prestigious media network. It had political, religious, and social studies courses, statewide extension offices, and adult education

35 / *The Citizens' Report*

outreach. It did everything it could to discredit the Grand Jury's work. Initially, however, news of the presentment was unimpeded. The university president and all members of the Iowa Board of Regents except one were out of the state. I was later told that a university administrative vice-president was briefing the incoming extension course attendees and denigrating the work of the jury. Eventually, a county extension officer attending one of the on-campus short courses stood up and strongly criticized the vice-president's presentation, and with that the practice was discontinued.

Except for the *Des Moines Register* and radical student publications, most news reports were accurate. Those who were critical were very spirited in their objections. A *Des Moines Register* headline read, "ISU President Lashes Out at 'Distorted' Report by Jury." Later, the Iowa State University Press published a book about the Iowa Civil Liberties Union entitled, *Freedom in Iowa*. This publication showered ISU President Parks with honors and attacked the work and reputation of several Iowa leaders past and present, including myself.

The presentment was well documented. One news article reported that the Iowa Civil Liberties Union had decided they would not sue the Grand Jury. Another paper reported that an on-going effort had failed to get the new judge, Harvey Uhlenhopp, serving the 11th Judicial District, to

dismiss the presentment. Within two years Judge Uhlenhopp was elevated to the Iowa Supreme Court.

With the assistance of the editor of the local newspaper, Rod Riggs, the presentment was given to Harrison Webber who headed the central news office in Des Moines, Iowa. As agreed, Mr. Webber released a summary of the presentment after I was assured that Judge Uhlenhopp had received the presentment.

This writing is the only report of the procedure followed

36 / The Citizens' Report

by the jury. I was concerned that some reporters and editors would twist what was said. Consequently, reporters were told that I would respond to inquiries in writing, and this brought their interest to a halt. I personally received approximately 100 letters from citizens, all of whom appreciated the jury's work.

Arrangements were made for a local firm to print and handle requests for the presentment. Later, I received a call from them informing me that the university had purchased all the remaining copies, so I instructed them to print 500 more.

The Grand Jury members all contributed to the report. From a leadership perspective, I did my best to see that they were fully informed. There was a considerable amount of material to review. A few campus administrators and faculty members met with us to give their perspective. Following each meeting, I wrote a brief of what seemed relevant and presented it to the jury members at the next meeting. They would approve most of the brief, and that became our presentment.

Portions of the Grand Jury Presentment follow, word-for-word, with additions for clarification in

parentheses. Commentary about jury findings is below the line at the bottom of the page.

POWER TO CAPTURE A NATION THROUGH INDOCTRINATION OF ITS YOUTH

For many years, psychologists and educators have recognized the processes by which thought and behavioral patterns acquired in youth become the basis for adult motivation. In modern times, thoughtful observers have become progressively aware that moral, social and political concepts implanted during the time of mental immaturity not only participate in the

37 / The Citizens' Report

conduct of later in life, but, once acquired, such concepts become dominant and often unalterable in the adult. **Thus, captive audiences of immature minds provide powerful and much prized forums for anti-Judeo-Christian, anti-American indoctrination.**

Educational environments (for the soft sciences), left unguarded (by citizen and legislative action), can easily be captured by alien militants and, in due course, transformed into climates of unquestioning (one-sided leftist) social and political opinion.

Dr. I. L. Kandell, a refugee from Romania and professor at Columbia University, aptly lamented (education devoid of established knowledge), “. . . is the most Communist feature of the Communist Revolution and the most Nazi expression of the National Socialist Revolution.” Knowledge is not always wisdom.

The modern term for atheistic humanist-based worldview is “political correctness.” Opposing points of view, namely the moral, religious liberty, and political principles upon which America has prospered, are censored from the classroom. Consequently, many young minds are turned away from the basic foundation upon which responsible liberty depends. The non-sectarian theistic alternative leads to the conclusion that our liberties come from God, not government or some religio/social/politically correct elite. It is the higher authority concept for law that placed America far and above the other nations. This principle, adopted from the Hebrew-Christian Bible, provides cover for liberty of conscience by protecting the rights of all the moral religions to practice and compete publicly with other beliefs, Christian and non-Christian. If as a reader there is any confusion about this history, I recommend the reading of Chapter Six, *American Principles*, before proceeding with this and the next chapter.

38/ *The Citizens' Report*

Many radical leaders are college and university graduates. Fidel Castro, who took control of Cuba, has a Juris Doctorate degree.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL REFLECTED IN THE *CONSTITUTIONS* OF THE STATES

1. “We, the People of the State of Iowa, grateful to the Supreme Being for the blessings hitherto enjoyed, and feeling our dependence on Him for a continuation of those blessings, do ordain and establish a free and independent government, by the name of the STATE OF IOWA.”
2. “Government is instituted (by the people) for the protection, security and benefit of the people.”

3. *Bill of Rights*. Section 1: "All men are, by nature, free and equal, and have certain inalienable rights – among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness."

4. Section 2: "All political power is inherent in the people" (the clique who are supposed to run things).

5. ". . . they (the people) have the right at all times, to alter or reform the government, whenever the public good may require it" (provision for peaceful revolution).

Secular militants who oppose our form of government are not new. Control over the use of taxpayer funds and government power has always been a test of wills. The Judeo-Christian approach to reality for government foundations was vehemently opposed during the writing of the *Iowa Constitution*.

39 / *The Citizens' Report*

6. (Provision for a frequent unrestricted exchange of ideas for education and government policy, no matter how radical. The candidates for office are judged and chosen by mature citizens at the ballot box.)

7. Article IX, *Iowa Constitution*, 2nd School . . . Section 3: **"The General Assembly shall encourage by all suitable means the intellectual, scientific, MORAL and agricultural improvement."**

OBSERVATIONS IN THE PROBLEM AREA

(The Iowa State University Press published a book for the Iowa Civil Liberties Union, *Freedom in Iowa*, following

publication of the Grand Jury Presentment. Among many false statements in the book was the statement on page 47 that the Grand Jury "never defined" the word *radicals*.)

At this point perhaps we (the jury) should define to some extent what we mean in this report by "radicals" and "militants" in the context of their behavior on campus (and) as expressed in our interviews and investigation.

I. Their number one goal, both stated and apparent, is that they desire to control the useful university apparatus for a base to promote (their ideology) and direct their activities. There is no apparent limit; university news media (college for training and licensing primary and secondary teachers), selection of guest speakers, extension outlets, *et cetera*.

An example of the power of radicals at ISU (Iowa State University), called to our attention, was provided by a citizen who had contacted a department head. He suggested that the coming News Editors' Seminar might be informed by the University of an Official Pamphlet about the techniques of Communist propaganda in the news

40 / *The Citizens' Report*

media. The citizen was told that it was not the business of the university to get involved in politics. The citizen was shocked to later read in the newspaper that an associate professor of history had lectured the editors on the possible future problem with certain local political groups. (This university outreach was clearly a program for undermining the rights and credibility of citizens who oppose leftist policy.)

II. They have a general goal of destroying and tearing down. (Hateful talk leads to hateful acts, and immoral advocacy leads to immoral acts.) Radical salesmen

appeal to idealistic students with words calculated to destroy their youthful faith in their heritage. The following (provided by the County Attorney to the jury) are quotations from one of many paid speakers at ISU: 'I spend about 90% of my time now on college campuses. This is the most morally polluted, insane nation on the face of this earth and it is your job to change it.' 'And I say to you youngsters in the process of trying to make this peacefully orderly transition of bringing up the constitution over the capitalists, if they offer you too much resistance, then destroy them.' ' . . . let me tell you something, black folks used them two words, _____ _____. We used it a lot but we didn't invent it. White folks invented those two words, you just called it Oedipus Rex and dirty enough to teach world literature with it.' ' . . . Let's always remember that flag still ain't nothing but a rag, like all of the other flags on the face of this earth'

This was not an isolated example but typical of much of the educational approach we observed.

In place of established knowledge, they (contemporary liberals) want relativism as the accepted (approach to education). Relativism for purposes of this discussion refers to the denial of absolutes and puts evil on a par with discerned truth as a legitimate teaching subject.

41 / *The Citizens' Report*

In the area of society and human nature, such denial, when implemented, detaches future generations from past experience. Oddly enough, that is the very reason taxpayers fund colleges and universities. Tolerating such foolishness gives a teaching license to those who promote illicit sex, the use of decimating drugs, flag burning, *et cetera*. and places in question historically known good.

Such a position on fundamental tenets raises a very interesting question. If the desirability of sexual virtue and undesirability of overnight co-habitation in single student dorms is as they say a matter of opinion, if in fact sexual virtue and many other tenets such as basic honesty are not established knowledge suitable for classroom doctrine—what is the good of having humanities courses at all? When a radical teacher lectures, what is he accomplishing with taxpayers' money?

III. Tactics used by radicals disregard the minimum teacher standard of honesty. It is not unusual to hear them proclaim the virtues of equality and love, and extol violence, hatred, and the use of harmful drugs in the same speech. In their effort to present a one-sided picture they suppress opposing views. One jury interviewee (a professor) stated his concern—if students hear a lie often enough some believe it!

IV. Tactics are aggressive, domineering and, when needed, ruthless in character. In such cases the person with average courtesy is no match. The most aggressive prevail over those teachers who feel obligated to spend their time teaching and learning rather than contending with and being buffeted by verbal terrorism. One of their tactics is rule by committee domination. They pressure administrators to relinquish their duty in a specific area and turn it over to a committee (see the last page of this chapter.

42 / *The Citizens' Report*

These practices by employees all fall below what the taxpaying public, in our opinion, expect and have a right to expect of the teachers they hire.

SUMMARY FROM GRAND JURY FINDINGS

The concrete evidence of failures . . . is well illustrated by the article entitled 'New Left's Boasts: We are organizing sedition.' According to the article, the *New York Times* asked an Iowa State University student ' . . . where he picked up his radical ideas.' The article referred to a teacher by name and concluded, 'He was a history teacher here (Iowa State University) two years ago. I took a course in *Ideas of Western Civilization* from him. That got me started.' There . . . (is no) doubt that some teachers are guilty of using their status to effectively subvert or undermine the morals and allegiance of some students.

Tolerance for the breakdown in the citizen authority chain of command, set in place to control the education, makes retention of citizen taxpayer values impossible. This parallels the tyranny of medieval kings who in partnership with government and at the expense of the people controlled education.

The atheistic humanist approach to governance of education is illustrated by a more recent event at ISU. Through denigrating talk and dishonest portrayal of academic freedom, a few tenured professors forced the discontinuation of a very popular university course dealing with the science that is allied to creation. The course came too close to violating the secular humanist presupposition upon which their theory of evolution, anti-American traditions, and anti-morality are constructed. This occurred in spite of the fact that the course was taught by a respected and highly ranked professor/administrator at Iowa State University.

43/ The Citizens' Report

Our investigation indicates that the main reason for the youthful rebellion and attitude of carelessness in their morals is the loss of confidence of the young in

the wisdom embedded in their heritage. Failure to clearly implant these truths detaches future generations from past experience, the very basis of education (curriculum orientation).

In the field of morality all basic truths have been apprehended. All the changing conditions we hear so much about do not affect the validity or applicability of the central directives of human conduct. These truths are demonstrable in terms of benefits and as to how it is that those who disregard them fall easily into alien pitfalls of Fascism, lawlessness, drug addiction, *et cetera*. **There is no greater contribution a teaching institution can make to human progress and purpose than to endow students at all levels with this knowledge. All other aspects of education ought to be subservient.**

Those who place their present faith and future hope in law enforcement to conduct humanity to brighter times ignore . . . , a fundamental psychological truth. Legal and material attempts to correct human conduct resulting from improper training must all end in failure. It is impossible to superimpose an effective code of ethics through compulsion. Police force provides nothing more corrective than temporary control of faulty behavior that is traceable to education's failure to implant established knowledge of morality and the precepts of individual responsibility into the educated.

It is teacher employment guarantees in our laws that are working against the public interest by empowering teachers who impose an anti-morality, anti-democracy agenda.

WHERE TO GO FOR THE SOLUTION

The frustrating inability of the public to correct the distortion of academic freedom is due, in the Grand Jury's view, to the failure of the people to see the continuation of the atrocious abuses by radicals as a breakdown in the responsibility-authority-control principle that it really is. Any organization, educational or otherwise, is an attempt at cooperation. Cooperation is not possible unless responsibility and authority go hand-in-hand.

The parents and taxpayers delegated their responsibility-authority powers indirectly through a chain-of-command selection of people who want to teach and (honestly) **agree with public policy**.

The system of organization varies in the several states, but in Iowa the Board of Regents (chosen by the Governor) is responsible to the public for education at the state universities. It is at this level, the Board of Regents who must lay down corrective policy on behalf of the people. If the problem is ever corrected . . . (changes must be imposed by the public), at this level.

The taxpayers, having the final responsibility for the universities, quite properly should have the authority to change the Board of Regents' membership or take other measures if they find themselves in disagreement with Board policy. If the established procedures for governing at this level leave the Regents insensitive to public interest then it is time to update governing procedures.

Discretion in exercising authority, regardless of where it is vested, is assured. The citizen public, having given the Board of Regents (in this case), the responsibility to implement public policy, must leave them the authority

to go to the university president, who has the executive responsibility of the university. The university president, vested with the responsibility by the Board of Regents, has the authority to change his aides if he believes they are not carrying out his ideas (in the public interest), *et cetera* on down the line.

MOST IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL CHANGE NEEDED

1. Regents' policy changes which will sufficiently define and implement the elimination of moral pollution by faculty and paid speakers will by all suitable means encourage "moral . . . improvement," [*Constitution of the State of Iowa, Article IX, 2nd School . . . Sec. 3*].
2. There is a need for increased emphasis on the American ideal at all levels of education (respect for our Republic 'grateful to the Supreme Being for the blessings hitherto enjoyed' as stated in the *Iowa Constitution*). We believe this ideal needs (to be a continuing emphasis) from kindergarten through to maturity. Our revolutionary concepts are a most exciting and important subject. Our soldier boys have been dying for this ideal. Education, as never before, should clearly teach it. Even in imperfection it has achieved greatness for America unparalleled in history. Every individual is important, and the mature public makes the decisions over government. Something alien (atheist humanist) based governments do not provide.

It seems rather clear that the nerve center for society, the power for social revolution, is inherent in the adult electorate rather than in the schools and that the radical missionaries should be sent to the electorate, not to the captive audience of youthful minds.

The idea . . . that the people of this land should not be trusted with the complexities of education is absurd. The very definition of practical greatness, which built America, entrusts the educational and political emphasis to the control of the people. This is much safer than providing a haven (employment guarantees) for . . . teachers (in the soft sciences) who refuse to be responsible to the public and emphasize what they want with impunity.

News article

RIGHT OF TAXPAYERS TO CONTROL EDUCATION CHALLENGED

Who has academic freedom, the parent/taxpayer or the teacher? Is the parent, who once had academic freedom, now to be deprived because a teacher was hired? Most agree that anyone can teach what he pleases on his own responsibility, but must not yield to his cry of academic freedom and rob taxpayers of their

freedom to direct public education in the public's interest, based upon the learning process and established knowledge.

PROBLEMS FEED BACK AND COMPOUND
IF NOT CORRECTED

No single level of education can be considered in a vacuum, good or bad. But it is going on! The students of colleges are, after all, the graduates of American elementary and secondary schools. We, the adults and teachers of today, are the graduates of high schools, colleges, and universities in the recent past. Not only are various levels of American education interrelated, but the problems also feed back upon one another to produce a complex of relationships which affect us all and must be handled wisely. In professions such as medicine or architecture, failures soon become apparent and are corrected. A faulty experiment impacting the social-political mindset may not be detected for two or three generations, when it is too late to reverse and avoid disaster.

End of Presentment

Hostility against the traditional American approach to education is an attack on the heart of America. When citizen control of taxpayer-funded education is superceded by non-representative powers, tyranny is bound to follow, and tyranny against the moral fiber of our youth and nation we now have.

At the time of the Grand Jury study we did not realize the linkage between the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and, what appears to be a prosecutory arm, the leftist American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) lawyers. Teacher employee contracts structured according to their academic freedom and tenure definitions shift the decision-making authority from the president of the university to the militant liberal faculty. In reality, it is the aggressive professors/teachers, not the president or superintendent (hired as the administrator for taxpayer-funded

49/ The Citizens' Report

education), who are the administrators. The president is very busy putting out fires, lobbying reporters, alumni, and the legislature for more money (see pages 74 -78).

Also, the ACLU/AAUP version of academic freedom is not a legal concept. It is wholly dependent upon the internal culture of the faculty at the universities and the lower level government (public) schools. In other words, there is no mechanism which the taxpaying public can implement to assure that both the theistic and the atheist perspectives for soft science instruction will be taught truthfully. The tradition for education in America requires a truthful presentation of both worldviews based upon outcomes they have generated in human history (see pages 110-111). The control mechanism for this is a firm linkage between an independent local citizen school board and school administrator. The larger the school, the weaker the linkage. Education was undermined by school consolidation, pushed under the guise of cost savings. What happened was a decline in learning and a phenomenal increase in costs. Going along with that big mistake came the corrupting influence of collective paternalism. To this day, the moral foundations of home-taught students and students from smaller schools tend to be strengthened rather than be ridiculed and undermined. The students also get better

grades. **In contrast, atheistic-based instruction which flows from monopoly secularism trashes belief in God and moral values.**

Your voice on behalf of sanity in education is the key. By insisting that soft science instruction be **delivered by non-government citizen choice entities**, leftist educators' undermining belief in constitutional intent and turning government power against moral law would run into hard times. When teacher unions no longer operate as extensions of government, education will again benefit from the pressure of competition, and the taxpaying public will again be treated with respect. The many thousands of honest and morally upright teachers will also be treated respectfully.
