

COPYRIGHT 2000 SUZANNE SHELL  
Reproduction without permission prohibited

I can't believe what is going on at Harbor White's Middle School in Holland, Michigan.

It's pretty scary to learn that our schools have such things as "Hazard and Risk Assessment Teams," which act as Gestapo spy agencies to target children for abduction by social services or to identify a child's politically incorrect thought processes so that he can be "re-trained."

Tim Loutzenhiser reports he received a 9 p.m. phone call from the school stating that the West Ottawa Public Schools felt it was necessary to separate his son from the other students and have him enter the "mentor" program in which he would be put under the watchful eye of an adult to 'monitor his thought processes.' He was casually informed that placing his son in this program would be in the boy's best interest, and that by doing so, the school would not have to involve social services. Father Tim took this as a "naked threat."

And why would this 12 yr. old boy need to have his thought processes monitored?

Did he make threats against the teacher, or his classmates? Did he violently attack somebody in the school? Did he speak offensively about minorities or other identifiable groups? Does he have absent or neglectful parents?

No. During a class discussion about school shootings and safety, undoubtedly triggered by the recent death of the six yr. old Michigan girl who was shot by one of her classmates, this young boy stated that his opinion was that he would feel safer if some of the adults in the school were trained and allowed to carry firearms. Evidently this raised a red flag.

What kind of a red flag? Perhaps the kind of red flag that has something to do with the "Red Letter" that the children were asked to sign in conjunction with Martin Luther King day.

First of all, the designation "Red Letter" sets off a few alarm bells in my mind, but I was assured by the principal that this newsletter was printed on red paper to make it easy for parents to identify. However, let's take the entire letter in context. This letter was written by principal Jerry Clomparens, and Father Tim's 12 yr. old boy refused to sign it.

This letter required the children to take an oath to turn in their friends for suspicious activity e.g. "To report all violent behavior or rumors of violent behavior to my parents and to my teachers;" they would vow never to defend themselves if attacked e.g. "To walk away from violence," and "to never hit or hit back;" and to "never carry any form of weapon on school grounds." I presume this means even butter knives, if past events in others schools is any indication.

Turn in their friends for rumors... it's just a tiny step from that to reporting your parents. Oh, but I forgot, the D.A.R.E. program does that already. For those of us remember our history, this bears a frightening resemblance to what went on in Nazi Germany, and in the Soviet Union. The schools are breeding a generation of informants. Snitches. Big Brother spies.

Oh, undoubtedly this reporting is pretty benign. . .now. But I can't help but

wonder about the effects of randomly slinging accusations and subjecting possibly innocent students to the presumption of guilt, investigations and interrogations in the name of 'safety.' Kids shouldn't have to go through that. But it does have the effect of conditioning tomorrow's citizens against invoking or demanding fourth and fifth amendment protections. After all, investigating rumors is for the good of society, regardless of what it does to individual rights and freedoms.

Principal Klomparens even had a rational explanation for it, citing tragedies like Columbine. In fairness, school administrators have a heck of a problem on their hands, especially with escalating violence. That's why he devised the Pledge for Peace.

The kids vow to never defend themselves if attacked... the pacifist attitude of standing there to be some bully's punching bag has shamelessly become a noble attribute. Cowardice, under the righteous disguise of pacifism, has been elevated to a virtuous new high. Realistically speaking, there is no virtue in being a victim. But our schools are training a new generation of victims, perhaps the better to suppress them under the evolving tyranny. It takes more courage to endure, to walk away from violence than to indulge in it. I won't dispute that. But where do you draw the line in the sand? Sure, we can take some abuse in the name of peace, but the sad truth is that sometimes only a response of violence will beget peace.

And of course, not to carry a gun or weapon on school grounds. My father-in-law used to carry his hunting rifle to school, store it in the cloak room, and hunt for dinner on the way home. Many children of his generation did. Safely. The problem isn't guns or knives, it's our society's tendency to "replace anger and blame with compassion and cooperation." This quote is also from the pledge for peace. Why do people want to eliminate the mechanisms that build responsibility and character? Anger, properly curbed, is a useful emotion; GOD gets angry, Jesus got angry. We fear the wrath of GOD, so it is appropriate that those who commit acts of violence should fear the wrath of their victims and the state. Anger is a consequence of inappropriate behavior. So is blame. Blame assigns responsibility. Accepting responsibility builds character and maturity. If there is no responsibility or consequences, what's to stop any Dylan Klebold from mowing down his classmates?

The parents' part of this pledge includes "to do everything possible to deny my child access to weapons." Naturally this child would never agree not use a gun, since his father is involved with the Michigan Coalition for Responsible Gun Owners. And naturally the father is not going to deny his son access to guns. Instead, he'll train this child in gun safety the same as he trained him in safe handling of fire, electricity, etc.

We must remember, that we have the right, as parents, to control our child's upbringing. For those who are opposed to guns, you won't find pro-gun advocates demanding you keep and bear arms. By the same token, accord gun owning parents the same respect. I speak from experience. My children were raised in a home with guns. Safely. It was my prerogative, and we handled it responsibly. My definition of responsibly did not include locks on anything, it included extensive training in gun safety.

Back to the Red Letter: The child is knowledgeable about the First Amendment, and the Second Amendment to the Constitution thanks to his father.

Therefore he felt he was exercising his rights under the First Amendment when

he voiced his opinion about teachers being armed. Who would have thought that he would've been characterized as having inappropriate thought processes simply for making an observation that appears to many to be eminently logical.

Here we go folks. Inappropriate thought processes, punishment for expressing our opinions, at risk for social services intervention all because someone is not bamboozled by politically correct propaganda. All because a parent, exercising his prerogatives teaches his son patriotic values, the child is targeted for retraining. If the family resists, the boy is targeted for removal to a state-approved home. What's Amerika coming to?

Principle Klomparens described his mentor program as the opportunity for a child to have an adult advocate. It is not an 'official' program, and participation is strictly voluntary. He insisted that there is absolutely no connection between social services and participation in the mentor program. He also insisted that Father Tim was not threatened with social services intervention for refusing to allow his son to participate in the mentor program.

Klomparens mentor program was very warm and fuzzy. Without getting into specifics about our young Constitutional scholar, he admitted that this boy's mentor could possibly have been a pro-second amendment teacher in order to nurture the boy's interest in this subject. I wasn't convinced. Evidently, Father Tim wasn't either.

It has been my experience that what schools say, and what they do, don't always match. You have to examine the words they use, the phrases.

Komparens undoubtedly gets many kudos for his pledge for peace. "There are other ways than violence to solve problems," was the premise for the pledge. I agree completely. But when I asked him what happens if it doesn't work, what if you've exhausted non-violent responses, what happens if the violence against you continues, then what do you do? He gave a non-responsive answer, changing the subject. I'd bet he doesn't have the answer. Because it probably involves anger or blame or (gasp) responsive violence.

You need to know what your child's school is doing. Mr. Komparens seemed very uncomfortable with my interview, but I'm not as easily misdirected as many parents are. Your child's principal will certainly appear open and honest until you start asking the hard questions. Read your child's textbooks and evaluate them for content. Make sure your school knows that you will not allow your child to participate in objectionable classes. See how fast your relationship with administration deteriorates when you do that. You see, while the school may say 'the parent is the first teacher,' they really mean 'the school is the most important teacher.' They have your baby for six or more hours a day, and they can accomplish a lot of 'unlearning' in that time frame. Even if a child's participation in a program is 'voluntary,' peer pressure is very effective at changing a young mind from parental allegiances to political correctness. It's only when you catch the schools at it and expose it, like Father Tim did, that it causes any problem for them.

If you find your school has a 'Hazard and Risk Assessment' team, or county social workers in the school, or alliances with mental health service providers, I'd get very suspicious. I see a growing trend to characterize independent thought as a mental illness, using terms like Authority Defiant," and "Oppositional/Defiant" and "ADHD".

They are targeting everyone, including the very young, and they are in an increasing number of our schools. Are they in yours?