

# The Impact of Dewey – A Case Study

Jay Jusino – 2/8/21

## Introduction

The case study below arose as a response to a staff meeting held on January 27, 2021, at a Christian school in Southeast TN. In this meeting (see footnote # 5), the teacher-trainer advanced a model of teacher best-practices that had been introduced earlier in the school year to the staff. This model was a collaborative inquiry based model positing the acronym WICOR (writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, reading) and promoted [dialogic discourse](#), AVID (advancement via individual determination - see [About tab, What AVID Is](#)), and stressed *collaboration* as the hub and the key.

This response aims to lovingly ([Eph. 4:15](#)) refute ([Titus 1:9](#)) the value and claimed benefit of this model by giving the reader knowledge to the contrary ([Hosea 4:6](#)) in the spirit of cross-examination ([Prov. 18:13, 17, Prov. 27:17](#)) revealing that the methods taught and the organizations highlighted are, at their core, constructivist (relativistic) in nature and are advancing a progressive, postmodern philosophy of social justice through critical race theory and cultural Marxism. These are strong claims and bear-out personal investigation.

This author's goal is "for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ; until we all attain to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ. As a result, we are no longer to be children, tossed here and there by waves and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the trickery of men, by craftiness in deceitful scheming but speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in all *aspects* into Him who is the head, *even* Christ" – [Eph. 4:12-15](#).

Lastly, the case study was written to be incorporated with the author's pre-existing book, [Truth Is Fallen In The Street: Examining the Pedagogy of Christian Teachers in Public Schools](#), as a new chapter of that book. Its language is to be understood in that context. The [basic thesis](#) for this book is reiterated below to give the reader of *this* paper a running start into the case study that follows.

## Basic Thesis

Knowledge is standard based and exists for a purpose. God is the ultimate standard and so it is His purposes that should stand. This forms then, the basis and purpose for education. Knowledge *starts* with God<sup>1</sup> and is *for* Him ([Col. 1:18, Rom. 11:36](#)). To divorce academic education from Him, which has been done ubiquitously by Christian teachers within the public school system (and sadly, even in Christian schools), is to execute an academic (and biblical) *non-sequitur* and thus does not advance the young heart and mind, but instead, hinders it.

"You shall love the Lord your God with all your . . . mind ([Luke 10:27](#)) . . . so that no advantage would be taken of us by Satan, for we are not ignorant of his schemes ([2 Cor. 2:11](#))."

---

<sup>1</sup> God is omniscient (omni – *science*, Lit., "all knowledge"), God made everything. Hence, knowledge comes from Him.

## The Case Study

In an effort to understand the importance for the teacher of grasping the fact that knowledge is standard-based, and that the purpose (or end goal) of knowledge is predicated upon that standard, the impact of John Dewey will be discussed. While Dewey did not act alone, he is unarguably one of, if not **the, most influential**<sup>2</sup> individual(s) in modern education history and is the key reason why the world of education exists in its current form<sup>3</sup> today.

Many modern teacher training and/or teacher in-service sessions are based on the concepts of *collaboration* and *inquiry*. Not only this, but many modern educational services, from brick-and-mortar institutions to textbook advertisements,<sup>4</sup> champion these words as the lure to what is promised (2 Peter 2:19) to be a great educational experience or tool. As one teacher trainer succinctly put it, *collaboration* is the “hub” and “key”.<sup>5</sup> Collaboration and inquiry literally drive the modern politically correct<sup>6</sup> pedagogical process in education.

Let us go then to John Dewey. Many various documents could be used here because Dewey’s output was extensive. However, this specific excerpt (by Jeremy Roschelle) is used because of the succinct (and thus powerful) manner in which the topic of focus for this position is presented. The paper is entitled, Collaborative Inquiry: Reflections on Dewey and Learning Technology.<sup>7</sup> Roschelle’s goal is to apply Dewey’s perspective to technology education.

This paper presents reflections about learning technology that have been informed by a close reading of John Dewey and detailed investigations of how groups of people **construct shared meaning**.<sup>8</sup> These reflections suggest a Deweyian perspective on how technology supports learning, and may give teachers ways to think about how and why they use technology to support collaborative inquiry learning in their classrooms.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dewey was a key figure in many things, two notable ones being philosophic pragmatism; another, The American Humanist Association in its earliest form in NY. <https://ffrf.org/news/day/dayitems/item/14605-john-dewey>

<sup>3</sup> In short, this “form” is constructivism under the method label of collaborative inquiry. Constructivism is, “based on the idea that people actively construct or make their own knowledge, and that reality is determined by your experiences as a learner”(see first link under the following line which is this author’s comment) **As such, constructivism is postmodern, relativistic, and qualifies clearly as a social justice tool.**

<https://www.wgu.edu/blog/what-constructivism2005.html#:~:text=Constructivism%20is%20an%20important%20learning,your%20experiences%20as%20a%20learner>  
Inquiry-Based Instruction in the Context of Constructivism - ScienceDirect – “In the constructivist definition of the instruction, the role of the teacher is changing – he/she becomes a warrantor of the method, not the warrantor of the truth . . . The constructivist theories are not based on the knowledge transferred in the already done form, but on its creating (constructing, reconstructing) by the pupil” – p. 593. Cf. Inquiry Based Science: A Constructivist Approach in Teacher Education, [ERIC - ED473042 - Inquiry Based Science: A Constructivist Approach in Teacher Education., 2003](#), Constructivist teaching in science - [Constructivist Teaching in Primary Science \(eduhk.hk\)](#)

<sup>4</sup> Even from Christian text publishers and in Christian schools.

<sup>5</sup> Lesson by Maria Losee, presented to The Kings Academy staff, Jan. 27, 2021, 3:15 – 4:14 pm, as professional development.

<sup>6</sup> For a highly recommended source for understanding the origin and scope of political correctness, see: Political Correctness: A Deceptive and Dangerous Worldview, edited by William S. Lind and Richard W. Hawkins.

<sup>7</sup> [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234656681\\_Collaborative\\_Inquiry\\_Reflections\\_on\\_Dewey\\_and\\_Learning\\_Technology](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234656681_Collaborative_Inquiry_Reflections_on_Dewey_and_Learning_Technology)

<sup>8</sup> Again, constructivism is a teaching/educational philosophy that advances the idea that students construct truth based upon their own personal experiences with the instructional material.

The concern here is not with technology (though it *is* relevant), but with what Dewey is all about. Roschelle has indeed done a “close reading of John Dewey” and has captured well the essence of the “Deweyian perspective” regarding teaching methods in the institutional educational setting. Roschelle sets up his argument with three separate hypothetical scenarios and seeks to make the relevant lesson points (from Dewey) using these. Again, he does well in drawing out from these scenarios the main point:

The one feature all these groups have in common is **people working together** to **make sense from** an event. . . Thus, the scenarios have **collaborative inquiry** as a predominant feature in common.  
(all quoted emphasis mine)

What Rochelle is doing, and now *this* author is doing, is drawing the reader’s attention to the main thrust of Dewey as it applies to an instructional exchange between teacher and student. Focusing in further on the heart of Dewey, namely, the phrase “collaborative inquiry,” Roschelle rightly parses out Dewey’s core message, in at least two statements. Using the technology of music as the delivery medium, Rochelle states:

The collaborative effort to **achieve common meaning** is eventually satisfied by **restructuring the experience** of the music so that **each participant can attend selectively** to different patterns in the music.

And then, clarifying the word inquiry, Roschelle states:

By inquiry, Dewey means a practical activity that **transforms the situation** *into one* that is more clearly articulated, unified, and comprehensible, and **in which the directions for *successful* action are now clear.**

In Dewey’s own words, inquiry is to be understood as:

“The controlled or directed **transformation** of an indeterminate situation into one that is so determinate in its constituent distinctions and relations as to **convert** <sup>9</sup> the elements of the **original** situation into **a unified whole.**” (Dewey, 1938a, p. 104).<sup>10</sup>

If Dewey seeks to take something that is original, and then *successfully* transform or convert it into a clear, unified whole, one must ask then, what is “successful” in Dewey’s eyes? Just what does being *clear* and *whole* look like to Dewey? If one looks only at a condensed version of what Dewey believed (and also marketed), it does not take long to find out. [Humanist Manifesto I](#),<sup>11</sup> (1933), is just such a document. Dewey is the ninth name down on the signatory list. Dewey not only signed on to this worldview document, but more

---

<sup>9</sup> “Transform” and “convert” alert one to the warning of [Prov. 24:21](#): *My son, fear the LORD and the king; Do not associate with those who are given to **change***. Notice in the quote that the original turns into something new, a “unified whole”.

<sup>10</sup> Dewey, J. (1938a). *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. New York: Henry Holt.

<sup>11</sup> <https://americanhumanist.org/what-is-humanism/manifesto1/>

importantly, he dedicated his life's work to seeing it come to fruition in local and global culture.<sup>12</sup> From this Manifesto, through his ubiquitous literature through Teachers College at Columbia University, and thus through countless teacher-training programs that have been created to reproduce<sup>13</sup> Dewey's methods, Dewey thus advances (importantly - even today), the following ideals (direct quotes from the Manifesto are italicized – all emphasis mine):

**Dewey Ideal # 1** – For Dewey et. al., collaboration is unification of men against God.

From the introduction (by Raymond Bragg, 1933) to the Manifesto:

*The Manifesto is a product of many minds. It was designed to represent a developing point of view, not a new creed . . . The importance of the document is that more than thirty men have come to general agreement on matters of final concern and that these men are undoubtedly representative of a large number who are forging a new philosophy<sup>14</sup> out of the materials of the modern world.*

“Many minds,” “more than thirty men,” “large numbers,” and “general agreement,”<sup>15</sup> all bear the collaboration portion out. In other words, collaborate (work with others to produce a product) to unify. Given that the whole context of the Humanist Manifesto I was to advance religious humanism, the references to the “developing point of view,” and the “forging a new philosophy,” show the fruit of the collaborative unification efforts. That is, elevating man in opposition to, and against, God. In short, this *is* success for Dewey.<sup>16</sup> Unification of men against God *is* collaborations goal, as Dewey sees it and desired it.<sup>17</sup> All of this required radical changes in societal beliefs.

Again, from the introduction:

*There is great danger of a final, and we believe fatal, identification of the word religion with doctrines and methods which have lost their significance and which are powerless to solve the problem of human living . . .*

---

<sup>12</sup> If one focuses enough on the local, the effect will eventually be global. Just like the gospel. Reaching those around you and motivating new believers to do the same, the gospel of Jesus Christ has gone global and literally changed the world. Here, Dewey simply uses the relevant principle, only for an evil and wicked purpose. This is why dealing with local educators and schools is important regarding proper biblical pedagogy.

<sup>13</sup> The operative verse here is Luke 6:40, [*when a student is fully trained he will be like his teacher*], the principle of which applies regardless of which type of teacher is used. After all, he who walks with wise men will be wise but the companion of fools will suffer harm ([Prov. 13:20a](#)).

<sup>14</sup> Contrast the “new philosophy” of Dewey with [Jer. 6:16](#) - *Stand by the ways and see and ask for the ancient paths, Where the good way is, and walk in it; And you will find rest for your souls.*

<sup>15</sup> Note the *ad populum* fallacy here.

<sup>16</sup> If unification of man against God is “success” for Dewey, his methods ought to be exposed and avoided by Christian schools and teachers. Any evidence-based measure of “success” will have God’s demise as the criterion and reference standard. Any “education” (so called) using this as a “standard” opposes knowledge.

<sup>17</sup> Note the Biblical principal – human unification, save for the Church unifying in Christ, is always against God! These principles are seen clearly in [Gen. 11:1-9](#), [Ps. 2](#), and [Rev. 12:9](#).

The doctrines being set aside clearly being, in major, a reference to the Bible and its teachings. These doctrines and the methods that spring from them needed to be set aside in order to “establish” a new religion which would, of necessity, come with its own attendant methods (a focus of this work).

*While this age does owe a vast debt to the traditional religions, it is none the less obvious that any religion that can hope to be a synthesizing and dynamic force for today must be shaped for the needs of this age. To establish such a religion [i.e., that of religious humanism] is a major necessity of the present. It is a responsibility which rests upon this [Dewey’s] generation.*

Dewey picked up on this “responsibility” more so than most of the other signatories. In fact, Dewey essentially devoted the rest of his life to carrying out this responsibility. This began, and continues today, as a new language (of education) which birthed and sustains new methods complete with new criteria for measuring “success.”

**Dewey Ideal # 2** – . . . was atheistic evolution. One could equally argue pantheism. These ideas can be seen throughout the Manifesto.

**FIRST:** *Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.*

**SECOND:** *Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as a result of a continuous process.*

While the idea of evolution comes through loud and clear in the words “not created,” pantheism, the idea that the universe is god (sometimes expressed, all is god), is equally clear by the words “self-existing,” clearly an attribute of God Himself as seen in His name, YHWH [Yahwah – [Ex. 3:14](#)], - I AM WHO I AM (cf. [Jn. 8:58-59](#), [Jn. 8:16](#), [Rev. 1:8](#)).<sup>18</sup>

The “not created” claim releases the adherent from any moral responsibility while the “self-existing” claim allows the adherent to worship nature (self being part of nature of course). This is because everyone (even a four-year-old child) knows that the creator (say of a Lego car) has authority over his creation. To *remove* the authority, simply *remove* the creator. This is the desired benefit of atheism. To *shift* the authority to another

---

<sup>18</sup> Reminiscent of the late Carl Sagan who claimed, “The Cosmos is all that is or was or ever will be” (see link below). Neal DeGrasse Tyson similarly espousing pantheistic nature worship of the sun and stars (see link below). What is evident here is the joining of atheism and pantheism. For the one who loves darkness instead of the light ([John 3:19-21](#)), these ideas go together very well. For in order to switch to a new morality, one must first dispense with the old/original authority (this is atheism), and then establish a new authority (pantheism – or nature). So, the language of each necessary ideal is mingled together by their adherents. The pure doctrine of evolution intrinsically and overtly stresses an unguided (no God) process, but then immediately substitutes nature (i.e., natural selection – nature chooses) as the creative force (creator) being in the vacuum just made by the removal of God, the real Creator. This is how men justify their sin allowing themselves to be removed from the pangs of guilt as their consciences are now released from the chains that once bound them ([1 Tim. 4:2](#)).

<https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/178439-the-cosmos-is-all-that-is-or-was-or-ever>

<https://answersingenesis.org/public-school/students-told-to-worship-sun/>

(e.g., self), one just needs to *shift* to a different maker, one that is less stringent regarding moral behavior. This is the sought after value of idolatry. Hence, the pangs of a guilty conscience are removed, “freeing” men to do as they please. Remember, Jesus said, “This is the judgment, that the Light has come into the world, and/[but]<sup>19</sup> men loved the darkness rather than the Light, for their deeds were evil” ([Jn. 3:19](#)). In short, Dewey and his collaborators were at war with God and their language and methods reflect this fact.

**Dewey Ideal # 3** - Intelligent inquiry via [collaboration \(2 Cor. 10:12\)](#) determines truth. In educational terms, this is called [constructivism](#). A modern way to say this in politically correct vernacular is consensus; consensus through collaboration.<sup>20</sup>

***FIFTH:** Humanism asserts that the nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values. Obviously humanism does not deny the possibility of realities as yet undiscovered, but **it does insist** that the way to determine the existence and value of any and all realities is by means of intelligent inquiry and by the assessment of their relations to human needs. Religion must formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and methods.*

Please recall Dewey’s definition of inquiry, namely, to transform or convert an original into a unified whole, in other words, into something new. The Manifesto (and thus Dewey) “asserts” and “insist[s]” to “determine the existence and value of any and all realities” by this transformational and converting means, pursuant of course, to how well these attend to “human needs.”<sup>21</sup> This is dramatic and sweeping language that literally redefines any and all realities into a “new truth” according to the humanist’s perception of “human needs.” In this way then, “new truth” is constructed via “inquiry.”

**Dewey Ideal # 4** - The pinnacle of man’s purpose is temporal personal (individual) fulfillment.

***EIGHTH:** Religious Humanism considers the complete realization of human personality to be the end of man’s life and seeks its development and fulfillment in the here and now. This is the explanation of the humanist’s social passion.*

This is the end of Dewey’s “collaborative inquiry” for an/any individual. All methodologies using the language and practices of collaborative inquiry are employing and implementing Dewey’s vision.<sup>22</sup> Compare the *humanist’s social passion* of the *complete realization of the human personality as the end of man’s life* this with [Col. 3:4](#), “When Christ, **who is your life**, appears, then you also will appear with him in glory.” The contrast cannot be greater.

---

<sup>19</sup> The NIV translates the article “and” as “but” which captures better the sense of Jesus’ contrast here.

<sup>20</sup> This is similar to the social state in the time of the Judges ([Judges 21:25](#)). There is truly nothing new under the sun ([Eccl. 1:9](#)).

<sup>21</sup> This is philosophic pragmatism.

<sup>22</sup> How this is done by unwittingly by well-meaning Christian teachers is addressed below.

**Dewey Ideal # 5** – Pride in one’s cooperative social skills leads to the worship of self, a religiously emotional experience.

***NINTH:*** *In the place of the old attitudes involved in worship and prayer the humanist finds his religious emotions expressed in a heightened sense of personal life and in a cooperative effort to promote social well-being.*

Contrast this with Paul’s statement regarding himself that he put “no confidence in the flesh” ([Phil 3:19](#)). Combining Dewey Ideal’s # 4 and 5 we find Dewey’s fullness in “realizing the satisfactory life.” This is total relativism with a focus on self. Dewey has been very “successful,” by his standard, as this is our culture in a nut shell. “In those days Israel had no king; everyone did as they saw fit” ([Judges 21:25](#)) .

By using the method of collaboration and inquiry, teachers are encouraged to dismantle the old/traditional methods of teaching such as lecture, quiet class, teacher lead, focus on truths to be transferred to next generation, hard work, and to replace them with the new social, group-think, and feel-good/self-esteem classroom. But the former are the methods that sent and funded missionaries around the world, produced an atomic bomb,<sup>23</sup> forged the foundation of our modern technological society, put a man on the moon, and made America the one of the greatest economic, military, and inspirational countries in world history. Why we need to discard those traditional methods opting for the use of new and “evidenced based instructional strategies”<sup>24</sup> such that the new goal of *the complete realization of human personality . . . attending diligently to its development and fulfillment in the here and now*, is the operative question.

**Dewey Ideal # 6** – Nationalistic free-market society *must* be *destroyed* to make way for a global democratic socialism (aka – global communism) as the highest civil end of cooperative inquiry, existing into the future as an indeterminate utopian<sup>25</sup> society.

***FOURTEENTH:*** *The humanists are firmly convinced that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society has shown itself to be inadequate and that a radical change in methods, controls, and motives must be instituted. A socialized and cooperative economic order **must** be established to the end that the equitable distribution<sup>26</sup> of the means of life be possible. The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good. Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.*

---

<sup>23</sup> Primarily listed here to highlight the purely scientific expertise needed to create this, regardless of one’s opinion of its moral implications.

<sup>24</sup> It is important to note here that evidence is always in need of interpretation and that is always done so within a definable worldview. For example, if the new standard in education is that kids enjoy school more than they used to, collaborative inquiry will produce that result. If the standard is to make kids more willing to accept sexually deviant lifestyles, then collaborative inquiry will achieve it and the teacher trainer will claim that the methods are “evidenced-based”. Therefore, one must be careful of evidence-based claims.

<sup>25</sup> Always Satan’s goal, to convince men that paradise can exist apart from God. The modern utopian society is based on the belief that all men are basically good (the Nobel Savage concept) and totally independent (i.e., of moral rules).

<sup>26</sup> I.e., legalized state theft.

Herein lies the civil, social, or societal end of collaborative inquiry, namely, totalitarian utopianism. This is a pleasant way to say full communism, but a “happy democratic”<sup>27</sup> form of it. Another way to make communism sound good is to call it collectivism.

One way that Dewey’s success has been obvious is to point out that some in the Christian academic world have had the boldness to claim that the early church was in fact communist. They cite [Acts 2:44](#), “And all those who had believed were together and had all things in common.” What is not grasped by proponents of this idea is first, the history<sup>28</sup> and purpose/goal of communism, being essentially to topple God from His throne. Second is the deception and manner of communism, only being able to be instated through massive propaganda combined with an iron grip. Third, the nature of the early church was that they willingly gave up their own possessions, in love, to serve others and thus to glorify God. Conversely, communism’s way to having all things in common is for the state to steal what the people produce and supposedly distribute it to others so everyone can be happy, having enough. What is missed here is that human nature never has enough but, if it did, it gets lazy and thus becomes unproductive. With the recent “election” debacle in the U.S., Dewey-Ideal #6 has largely been finally accomplished. Its final form has not made it fully down the pike yet. But it will ([Dan. 7:23](#)).

### Corroboration of historical facts

Before moving on to the discussion below, it should first be established that the above assessment is not some mere fanciful conservative pet interpretation of Humanist Manifesto I, Dewey, and the connection to educational theory and practice. What the above has shown is not the mere claim that inquiry and collaboration are traced to Dewey *et. al.*, but it has shown the core of how and why<sup>29</sup> Dewey is associated with this/these method(s). Again, Dewey did not act alone, but he made the bad ideas of many of his predecessors (and contemporaries) commonplace within the educational strata. However, for establishing the credibility of the above associations, please consider the following two sources (all emphasis mine).

First, from [learningtheories.org](#):<sup>30</sup> Inquiry-Based Learning – General:

Inquiry-based learning (also *enquiry-based learning*, *inquiry learning* or *inquiry-guided learning*) is a [constructivist instructional strategy](#) widely adopted in the **1970s** and based on [John Dewey](#)'s views on learning as **active, learner-centered** process which should be based on **real-world examples** instead of rote fact memorization.

This is very straightforward connecting inquiry-based learning directly to Dewey and constructivist philosophy.

---

<sup>27</sup> True to Satan’s deceptive nature, communism is always sold to the disenfranchise as a happy, productive, peaceful, and unifying thing. It must be remembered that the thief comes only to kill, steal, and destroy ([Jn. 10:10](#)), and that Satan’s nature is that of a murder and a liar ([Jn. 8:44](#))

<sup>28</sup> An excellent concise treatment of this is Joshua Philipps work: [The Dark Origins of Communism, Parts 1 – 3](#).

<sup>29</sup> Remember, the new standard (inquiry) of atheism (no God) and pantheism (all is God) frees men from their guilty feelings due to their sin. Once “free” men revel in it as the follow Satan and openly confirm their status of being at war with God.

<sup>30</sup> [https://www.learning-theories.org/doku.php?id=instructional\\_design:inquiry-based\\_learning](https://www.learning-theories.org/doku.php?id=instructional_design:inquiry-based_learning)



Second, [Lumen Planning and Teaching Strategies](#)<sup>31</sup> has placed a well referenced and concise historical and philosophical summary of inquiry based learning which will demonstrate the origin and genera of inquiry-based collaborative learning. Note the original footnotes have been removed to avoid confusion with the footnotes of this work. Second, please note the comments given in the footnotes from this author regarding the excerpt.

**Inquiry-based learning** (also **enquiry-based learning** in [British English](#)) starts by posing questions, problems or scenarios—rather than simply presenting established facts or portraying a smooth path to knowledge.<sup>32</sup> The process is often assisted by a [facilitator](#).<sup>33</sup> Inquirers will identify and research issues and questions to develop their knowledge or solutions.<sup>34</sup>

Inquiry-based learning is primarily a [pedagogical](#) method, developed during the [discovery learning](#) movement<sup>35</sup> of the 1960s as a response to traditional<sup>36</sup> forms of instruction – where people were required to memorize information<sup>37</sup> from instructional materials. The philosophy of inquiry based learning finds its antecedents in [constructivist learning](#) theories, such as the work of [Piaget](#), [Dewey](#), [Vygotsky](#), and [Freire](#) among others, and can be considered a constructivist philosophy.

Inquiry can be conducted through experiential learning because inquiry values the same concepts, which include engaging with the content/material in questioning,<sup>38</sup> as well as investigating and collaborating to make meaning.<sup>39</sup> Vygotsky approached constructivism as learning from an experience that is influenced by society<sup>40</sup> and the facilitator. The meaning constructed from an experience<sup>41</sup> can be concluded as an individual or within a group.

---

<sup>31</sup> [Inquiry-based Learning | Planning & Teaching Strategies \(lumenlearning.com\)](#)

<sup>32</sup> **Note: A smooth path to knowledge is inhibited.**

<sup>33</sup> **From this hyperlink, notice the job of the facilitator is not to teach truths, but to remain “neutral” and “assist the group in achieving consensus.”**

<sup>34</sup> **Notice the knowledge is developed by identifying “issues and questions” - not clear facts.**

<sup>35</sup> **Note that this is constructivist and associated strongly by the terms and phrases, “learning by doing” (today, commonly called *hands-on*) and “experiential learning.”**

<sup>36</sup> **I.e., biblical, and successful (Western).**

<sup>37</sup> **Extremely effective, though hard work, but now vilified.**

<sup>38</sup> **Enter critical theory, challenging the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic-based society. I.e., not questioning for truth, as Jesus questioned, but calling into question the old, traditional, Judeo-Christian values taught by parents to children (the family being God’s first created institution charged with passing on the knowledge of God to the next generation - [Ps. 78:1-7](#)). The school and social systems essentially cause the child to question (be critical of) every truth their parents have taught them. This divides the family and takes the child out from under the wisdom and protection of their parents. This is what inquiry-based collaboration “values.” Cf. footnote # 42.**

<sup>39</sup> **Again, consensus becomes the new standard.**

<sup>40</sup> **The social majority determines “truth”.**

<sup>41</sup> **Students trained to follow emotions not facts.**

Inquiry-based learning is fundamental for the development of higher order thinking skills. According to Bloom's Taxonomy,<sup>42</sup> the ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information or new understandings indicates a high level of thinking.

Lastly, a bit of immediate discussion prior the official discussion portion of this work. The above entries are more like encyclopedic data summaries of inquiry-based, collaborative learning giving the factual associations that underlie it. But, in stark contrast to the above, the average pitch to teachers and/or school administrators or school boards looks something like the following [real example](#):

Collaborative inquiry is a process in which participants come together to examine their own educational practice systematically and carefully using techniques of research. It may include educators interested in addressing a school, department, division, or classroom issue driven by the consideration of student learning needs. Teams work together to narrow the question, gather and analyze evidence, determine action steps, and share their findings and recommendations.<sup>43</sup>

On the surface, what this sounds like is something that ought to be embraced and that clearly no one would object to. Who could argue with teachers or schools cooperating and researching for self-examination purposes? No one would object to addressing a "classroom issue" or the "consideration of student learning needs" would they? If one objects to this, they might seem arrogant or self-absorbed and uncaring about student or self-improvement.<sup>44</sup>

Yet, the quoted pitch above is not an accurate assessment of what collaborative inquiry is. It is a smoke screen for a progressive model of education in which instead of discussion leading to truth, collaboration leads to consensus. The progressive model seeks to turn teachers into change agents, and to do so secretly. Dr. Marlene McMillian, in her article on [Bloom's Contribution To One World Government](#) states, "A change agent is 'a person, organization, or institution that changes or helps to change the beliefs, values, attitudes, or behavior of people without their knowledge or consent.'" <sup>45</sup> The change agents are recruited initially based on local administrative compulsion, but more so, they are convinced, through deceptive language, that new teacher methods will improve student learning and performance. But in the end, "methods either enforce or negate content," <sup>46</sup> and bad methods negate good content.

---

<sup>42</sup> Here is an important quote from Bloom in reference to his Taxonomy method (Bloom's Taxonomy): "The significant thing to remember in this very ambitious project is that the major impact of the new program is to develop attitudes and values toward learning which are not shared by the parents and guardians or the peer group in the neighborhood." Dr. Marlene McMillian (author of Mountains of Deceit) rightly assesses Bloom's goal stating, "the goal [of Bloom] was to destroy the family – not just remake it" ([Bloom's Contribution To One World Government Through Use Of The Dialectic Process in Education](#)). Pp. 1 – 2.

<sup>43</sup> <http://thelearningexchange.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/limestoneCollaborativeInquiryFacilitatorsGuide.pdf>

<sup>44</sup> This person would definitely be in danger of being labeled a Nazi according to [Theodore Adorno](#).

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. 2

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 3

The teachers are convinced that they are doing well, because the new methods are “research” and/or “evidence-based”. But who’s research, and by what standard?<sup>47</sup> The Bible? Certainly, and for any basic investigation into the historical development of education, it is easy to demonstrate that modern educational everything is based on many men (remember “collaboration”) who could only be described, not as godless men, but God-hating men.<sup>48</sup> According to Bloom, “In fact, a large part of what we call ‘good teaching’ is the teacher’s ability to attain affective objectives through challenging the student’s fixed beliefs [i.e., in God] and getting them to discuss the issues” [through “collaboration,” not discussion]<sup>49</sup> (emphasis mine).

Consistent with her article: Social Engineering: Verbal Engineering precedes Social Engineering (as published in Political Correctness: A Dangerous and Deceptive Worldview - by Lind and Hawkins), Dr. Marlene McMillian rightly states, “Whoever controls the definitions controls the outcomes. Outcome-based education could never have gained traction without a common language.”<sup>50</sup> To the main point, the words “collaborative inquiry” (et. al.) are deceptive words that seek to control outcomes by changing the form of teaching. Then, the form alone negates much, if not most, of the good content a Christian teacher might share.

In short, what is truly a progressive (and thus relativistic) philosophy is pitched to unsuspecting teachers<sup>51</sup> as something good when in fact, it is anything but good. “Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil. . . ( [Isa. 5:20](#)). This is a classic example of the synthesis portion of Hegel’s Dialectic (i.e., the Hegelian Dialectic).<sup>52</sup>

## Discussion

It has been said that in real estate, the name of the game is location: location, location, location. So too in understanding the meaning of words in the Bible, the issue is context: context, context, context. Likewise with collaboration and inquiry. Understanding the context is critical. The word collaborate, just like many English words, can have many meanings. Consider the question that a driver asks his passenger, “I’m turning right, right at the light, right?” The first “right” is a direction opposite of left. The second “right” means immediately, or exactly at. The last “right” seeks for correctness, it is the opposite of wrong. No one fluent in English would misunderstand this,<sup>53</sup> so too with the word collaboration.

An average definition of collaboration is to work together, or jointly, with others on some problem, often of an intellectual nature, with the goal of producing some outcome from it. This definition or idea can be applied broadly and so various collaborations of different contexts will have markedly different outcomes. Based on context then, some collaboration is for good, and some for evil. For example, in a court of law, in a case of proving the guilt or innocence of a person accused of theft, a jury will collaborate. They do so to arrive at the

---

<sup>47</sup> See authors book, Truth Is Fallen In The Street: Examining the Pedagogy of Christian Teachers in Public Schools.

<sup>48</sup> [Piaget](#), [Dewey](#), [Vygotsky](#), [Freire](#), [Jean-Jacques Rousseau](#), [Joseph J. Schwab](#), [Hegel](#), etc.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 4

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> In the case chosen as an example above, from their own school board.

<sup>52</sup> [Too expansive](#) to get into here, but simply, it is the intentional conflation of a thesis with an anti-thesis to arrive at synthesis – i.e., a new “truth” which combines incompatible aspects of opposing views into a happy and acceptable contradiction. Again, collaborative consensus.

<sup>53</sup> The same logic is rightly applied to the word day, Hebrew – *yom*, it Genesis 1. The context demands a literal 24 hour day for each.

exact truth of the matter as an extension of righteousness and justice, clearly a good use of collaboration. Conversely, many scientists, politicians, and/or corporate leaders will collaborate regarding issues of the day to arrive at consensus. Consensus may or may not be true, but regardless, it is consensus that is the goal.<sup>54</sup> This is constructivist in nature, that is, truth is not arrived at from a discovery of, or discernment of reality, but “truth” becomes what the group decides, or rather, what the group **constructs**<sup>55</sup> or builds, based upon their collaboration. This is the goal Dewey was after in the classroom. Collaboration is for the purpose of redefining core truths into what the group says it is. This is literally group-think which is relativism (“truth is relative”) on the social level. The phrase group-think is one many people have heard and/or recognized, but most do not know its modern origin and purpose.<sup>56</sup>

In the same manner as collaboration, Dewey’s inquiry is not the common-sense approach to scientific or general investigation that has spanned the centuries and united the great minds of the past. God has bestowed upon men a natural curiosity that has spurred them on toward ever increasing advancement through experimentation, discovery, and invention. This innate sense of curiosity has propelled man toward the goal of ruling and subduing the creation for the glory of God.<sup>57</sup> But by his own words (quoted above), this is not what Dewey meant by inquiry. Modern inquiry, originating from Dewey and Humanist Manifest I, is the process of taking one thing, be it a problem to solve, a truth to grapple with, or a principle to work out, and then radically changing it into something else possessing a different solution than would be consistent with historically and biblically accepted norms.

This new thing that has been transformed and converted from the previous thing (inquiry) is founded on the collaboration participants (and their ideas, beliefs, and practices) and the collaboration process. In the end, a new purpose is now “clearly in view,” having come from a base of, that is, a standard of, collaborative consensus. Thus the shift from the standard of God’s Word to the standard of social consensus (collaboration) requires a shift in purpose and goals (inquiry). A change in the starting line will force an adjustment of the finish line. This is basic logic. In a word, Dewey was all about social change.<sup>58, 59</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Jerry Bergman contributes a great article called, Why Consensus Science is Anti-Science. Read it here - <https://creation.com/why-consensus-science-is-anti-science>

<sup>55</sup> The core of constructivism is for the student learner to “construct” or build “truth” according to his or her own individual fancy. This as opposed to students seeking, discovering, and understanding the actual, or pre-existing (real) truth; i.e., finding out the way things are or how they work in reality – the way it really is. While Dewey’s own personal flavor of “truth” was religious humanism, his collaborative inquiry method need not produce exact replicas of his beliefs. As long as the real truth is obscured and replaced by the student’s own feelings, wishes, or opinions, the ultimate collapse of society to humanistic utopianism would be sure to eventually follow. Unfortunately, but predictably, we are now seeing the disastrous fruit of decades of constructivism in the classrooms across America. If Dewey were alive today, he would be tickled-pink as to the massive “success” of his work.

<sup>56</sup> Of course, Dewey is not the only actor here, but his is a significant one, especially as it tangents education and teacher methods.

<sup>57</sup> This is called the Creation, or Dominion Mandate. It is found in Genesis 1:28.

<sup>58</sup> In other words, Dewey was a social change agent. This is the same thing that Saul Alinsky advocated in his Rules for Radicals and is what Barak Obama adopted and used in the U.S. culture war. Alinsky and his followers (H. Clinton, B. Obama, etc.) just applied Dewey’s academic theory and put into practice.

<sup>59</sup> [Prov. 24:21](#) warns not to associate with those given to change. Also, we see in [Jer. 6:16](#) that it is the old ways and ancient paths that provide the good way to walk in. Change of course can be good, but only if it is toward God and His Word, not away from it.

All of this is how we have come to the place in society that rejects the historically accepted and scientifically proven fact/reality that there are only two unalterable genders, male and female. It has transformed into the new socially derived position of there being dozens and dozens of possible genders, all in flux, based on the whims of the individual who supposedly decided to possess them. We have moved from creation, to evolution, from a preborn baby being human, to being a fish;<sup>60</sup> from humans being the pinnacle of God's creation,<sup>61</sup> to them being a cancer or plague on the earth;<sup>62</sup> from plants and animals being a provision for people, to plants and animals being elevated above people; from carbon dioxide being a good thing for people (used to grow better plants by greenhouse food growers) to the place that it is now essentially a poison to be avoided, so much so that it requires grand efforts to reduce earth's human population.<sup>63</sup> From a society that understood that masks do not prevent the spread of viral, air-borne pathogens<sup>64</sup> to a society that is now being told that we may have to wear three of them at a time.<sup>65</sup> This is the goal of the Deweyian classroom and modernity's "best practices" for "instructional strategies," the total transformation from truth to error.

One might reason that the Christian teacher knows that truth is absolute, both biblically and in earthly matters (like  $1 + 1 = 2$ , male and female, etc.), and so if they were trained to use constructive inquiry,<sup>66</sup> they would be able to prevent false ideas from disrupting their student's understanding. Oh really? Many self-proclaimed Christians and even whole denominations support the above new consensus-derived "ideals."<sup>67, 68</sup> Also, Jesus stated that a time of lawlessness and wickedness would come that, if it were possible, even the elect would be deceived ([Matt. 24:24](#), cf. [Dan. 8:23-25](#)). It is a grave error to assume we as Christians, followers of Christ, can't be deceived. Just ask Peter, whom Jesus called "Satan" upon Peter's insistence that Jesus not be killed ([Matt. 16:23](#)). Unfortunately, Dewey has crept into even the Christian school classroom virtually unnoticed ([Jude, v. 4](#)) by the vast majority of well-meaning educators who themselves have been trained through the government mandating of public collegiate teacher certifications.<sup>69</sup> Teachers are literally trained (by Dewey)

---

<sup>60</sup> [Evolution vs. God](#), Dr. PZ Myers (min. 6:27ff), ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, etc. These ideas came about non necessarily themselves by or through collaboration. Many of these ideas came about from the minds of individual people (e.g., Earnst Hackel, Charles Darwin, Charles Lyell, etc.). Nevertheless, it is the collaboration/inquiry process that have made these deviant ideas popular and now, even the norm.

<sup>61</sup> [Ps. 8:5](#)

<sup>62</sup> David Attenborough, *et. al.* - <https://www.sciencealert.com/the-time-david-attenborough-said-humans-are-a-plague>

<sup>63</sup> See min. 3 – 6 for [Bill Gates plan](#) to reduce population. Also, see [James Corbett's excellent expose](#) of Dr. Paul Ehrlich and his book, Population Bomb, used essentially as a "bible" for the UN and it depopulation agenda.

<sup>64</sup> [https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/5/19-0994\\_article](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/5/19-0994_article);

<sup>65</sup> Fauci – CNN - <https://twitter.com/tomselliott/status/1356375808064053248?s=20>

<sup>66</sup> And they are!

<sup>67</sup> Just consider that there are entire denominations that support homosexuality and gay marriage even for pastors. The warm fuzzy "god of love" (alone) is an idol man has made in his own image. God's purpose for two genders is good and establishes God's first institution, the family, the husband and wife being a picture of Christ and the Church, and with procreation and parental nurturing being the primary avenue for the advancement of the knowledge of God to progress to the next generations. To destroy this is not loving. The most loving thing that can be done for homosexuals is to tell them these truths and urge them to repent. It is not to support their rebellion against God and His purpose in creation.

<sup>68</sup> The Stain of Al Mohler highlights the SBC's adoption of critical race theory and the main tenants of social justice via cultural Marxism. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MlInLU-vt\\_g](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MlInLU-vt_g)

<sup>69</sup> This was a key part of Dewey's plan of course, and the original teacher training concepts and principles were developed at Teachers College at Columbia University under Dewey and his cohorts. Supposed "academic evidence" for the need for such teacher training came from here.

to see collaborative inquiry as a good thing.<sup>70</sup> This is because when “a student [here, the future teacher] is fully trained, he will be like his teacher” ([Luke 6:40](#)). The goal of the left is to replicate Dewey turning teachers, by their unwitting adoption of collaborative inquiry through teacher certification and training under leftists, into social change agents. Simply put, in the end, all come to the place of embracing total transformation from biblical absolute standards to socially accepted standards.<sup>71</sup> These new “standards” being those of the radical fringe<sup>72</sup> of society advanced through the social justice and critical race theory narrative pushed by the far left media (i.e., virtually all of mainstream media). It is this radical and fringe voice that Dewey and the modern educational establishment seeks to insert into the classroom at every level with collaborative inquiry. The unsuspecting Christian teacher becomes part of this process, and thus, a social change agent. While the teacher is initially an innocent victim of this tactic, [James 3:1](#) is nevertheless a sobering text, “Let not many of you become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a stricter judgment.” Further, [James 4:4](#), “You adulteresses, do you not know that friendship with the world is hostility toward God? Therefore whoever wishes to be a friend of the world makes himself an enemy of God”.

The unsuspecting Christian teacher gets into a lot of trouble if they don’t follow the “evidence” regarding collaborative inquiry methods. They are relentlessly brow-beat into letting their students talk (collaborate) during class. That alone is a shift away from a traditional classroom where the teacher, who knew what the students needed to know, taught and the students listened. But it is not just about talking per se. The students are encouraged to talk (collaborate) about issues that they have no expertise in. Values Clarification (mentioned in chapter 3) is a classic example of this. The teacher may ask a class of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders<sup>73</sup> what they think about homosexuality and gay marriage. Then, to seal the deal, they let the students collaborate with their peers (of the same age/maturity level) in order to come up with a “solution” (think of Dewey’s “success” here). In the Leftist’s classroom, the teacher, by design, plays the “moral card”<sup>74</sup> in order to “guide” (a.k.a., guided instruction, or teacher facilitated instruction) the students into agreeing that what is kind and good ([Isa. 5:20](#)) is to allow the expression of, and then the acceptance of, people’s felt needs regarding them as all equally valid on the scales of truth. Thus, the consensus assured by the teacher is that gay-marriage is acceptable and that those who disagree are evil. This is consensus, relativism,<sup>75</sup> humanism,<sup>76</sup> postmodernism,<sup>77</sup> collectivism,<sup>78</sup> and critical theory<sup>79</sup> (incl. critical race theory)<sup>80</sup> all wrapped up into one nice,

---

<sup>70</sup> [Isaiah 5:20](#) comes to mind, “Woe to those who call evil good and good evil . . .”

<sup>71</sup> A great book here is [NOT Equal: Civil Rights Gone Wrong](#), by Ryan Bomberger of the Radiance Foundation. From their website: *This book is a journey through some of his most powerful published articles and visually creative memes about the fundamental Right to Life, abortion, adoption, fatherlessness, fake feminism, marriage, judicial activism, systemic racism, #BlackLivesMatter, free speech and religious liberty.* <https://www.theradiancefoundation.org/notequal/>

<sup>72</sup> According to [statista.com](#), only 1 – 2 % of Americans identify as homosexual with another 4% identifying as bisexual (total under 5%). Because of strong advocacy by leftist media, the average American believes that the percentage of the LGBT population is much higher, averaging around 25%. <https://www.statista.com/topics/1249/homosexuality/> <https://news.gallup.com/poll/259571/americans-greatly-overestimate-gay-population.aspx>

<sup>73</sup> It would not be much better and maybe worse to release the high schoolers on the same topic.

<sup>74</sup> Leftists are amazing in their ability to do this. They appeal to the inner ([Rom. 2:14-15](#)), and biblical sense of morality, specifically appealing to the Golden Rule and Matt. 7:1-2, “do not judge,” stirring up the feelings of compassion and desire to help others (a function of man being an image-bearer of God) thus **making people feel sorry for the people guilty of biblically deviant behavior.**

<sup>75</sup> The idea that truth is relative, not absolute.

<sup>76</sup> The idea that man, not God, is the center of all, and that man can save himself.

<sup>77</sup> A fancy word to say that there is no governing narrative that should be trusted as accurate and true. I.e., this is, or leads to, relativism.

neat, package. All, of course, leading to some form of utopian socialism/communism<sup>81</sup> (more on this below), the governing system of choice for most of the leading adherents to such ideals, Dewey being one of them.<sup>82</sup>

## Methods Negate Content

Of course, the Christian teacher, not being an intentional Leftist, may (and ought) to see through all this and disallow such things. And many do. But many do not.<sup>83</sup> For the Christian teacher who does recognize the danger in letting their students arrive at consensus using collaboration, there are other clear problems with students collaborating (which requires talking) as a standard method, i.e., the method of choice, both in and out of the classroom.

First, they simply waste a lot of time.<sup>84</sup> They become, and usually are, noisy. This alone derails a lot of classrooms and greatly disenfranchises parents, many of whom spend a lot of money to send their children to private and/or Christian schools only to be undermined by a noisy and chaotic (and unproductive) classroom. Through the collaborative process alone (i.e., merely by the form of it, even for a teacher that is not getting sucked into the changing of truth trap set by the process) students end up learning and getting comfortable with the idea that they can get to the truth, or just to the answer of a math problem,<sup>85</sup> by talking with their friends, and by incorporating their friends ideas into their own understanding of truth. Weak students learn to

---

<sup>78</sup> The idea that all real goods and assets are to be collective owned and managed. I.e., group-think with an authority at the top to do, supposedly, what the group thinks or wants.

<sup>79</sup> The grand idea that the people in society should be critical of everything, i.e., critical of really any narrative or metanarrative (i.e., big governing story or worldview). This especially focuses in on being critical of any Judeo-Christian conservative idea or practice.

<sup>80</sup> This developed from critical theory with the intent to divide the people of any nation [divided kingdoms can't stand - ], esp. the U.S., by teaching people everywhere (heavily in schools) that they should be critical of the very society because it once enslaved Africans. To do so pits one disadvantaged group (cunningly expanded to include ALL minorities – like gay people, Muslims who hold radically anti-biblical views, etc.) against an advantaged one, giving way to a total restructuring of society, historically, economically, and morally. This is what Karl Marx did in pitting the proletariat against the Bourgeois. It is what his follower, Saul Alinsky (*et. al.*), advocated in *Rules for Radicals* (1971) in pitting the haves against the have-nots.

<sup>81</sup> See footnote 26 for the relevant notes on communism. Note however that additionally, communism began to take its modern form in the years leading up to and following the French Revolution. Key distinguishing features are a virulent hatred of God, His people, and any system that functions under Him. This system then seeks to destroy any God-fearing society, if possible, by brute force. However, it was only through deception and the long-haul approach taken by many of the leftist visionaries (see Lind and Hawkins compilation – *Political Correctness: A Dangerous and Deceptive Philosophy* for a great treatment of this) of the early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century.

<sup>82</sup> Like Dewey, Julian Huxley was committed to the same ideals: “As first Director-General of UNESCO . . . formulated the principles of what he hoped would soon become the official religion of the world. ‘Thus the general philosophy of UNESCO should, it seems, be a scientific world humanism, global in extent and evolutionary in background.’ The unifying of traditions into a single common pool of experience, awareness and purpose is the necessary prerequisite for further major progress in human evolution. Accordingly, although political unification in some sort of world government will be required for the definitive attainment of this state, unification in the things of the mind is not only necessary also, but it can pave the way for other types of unification.”

[Evolution and the New Age | The Institute for Creation Research \(icr.org\)](#)

<sup>83</sup> There are, of course, whole “Christian” denominations that support gay marriage, etc..

<sup>84</sup> Eph. 5:16 states that we ought to make the most of our time because the days are evil. James states that not many should teach as they will be held to a stricter judgment. These ought to be sobering texts for the teacher enthralled with student collaboration. Wasting time is clearly biblically suspect but it is also disenfranchising for parents of students attending Christian (or other private) schools who pay a lot of money to send their kids to a place where their peers, not their teachers, consume the lion’s share of the “instructional” [time](#).

<sup>85</sup> This promotes personal academic sloth and predisposes one to cheating.

be codependent on their peers<sup>86, 87</sup> and the strong students are often happy to allow it as it boosts their own ego, yet some do resent being used. But above all, through the collaborative process, students learn to never offend those friends by expressing strong, dogmatic, or controversial opinions or truth claims that are contrary to the collective consensus. Offending is not nice.<sup>88</sup> Neither is it productive if one wants merely to get a good grade on a group project. Students learn that the process of arriving at truth, including answers to geometry problems, is social and often political. They learn that it is by and through the collaborative inquiry form, that rewards come. This begins to preclude the old traditional way of learning, namely that students should get to truth by working hard, by looking into, and diligently studying out, the facts of a matter while using God's Word as the foundation, the lens, and the goal of any issue (Rom. 11:36). After all, talking with friends in a classroom is rather enjoyable to most<sup>89</sup> and soon it becomes the standard *modus operandi* in the classroom. Teachers who don't allow talking (collaborating) are considered mean, even Nazi's.<sup>90</sup>

## Reality Check

Significantly, objections to the collaboration/inquiry methods do NOT mean that students are to avoid questions, or to avoid having a questioning mind about reality, processes, or really anything. Nor does it mean that one student can never talk to another – even in class, far from it. Nevertheless, the model and standard of the classroom ought to be teacher and content (i.e., truth regarding the discipline at hand) centered with quiet attentive students. Students may talk, but it is under the timing and guidance of the teacher and ought, generally, to be used as an ancillary and/or supporting mode, not the main one. The same is true of group work. There is a place for group work, yet it is best used sparingly and for specific purposes, not as the main method. Students ought to be questioning, but the answers are not to be arrived at by listening to peer speculation and conjecture. Peers may have input or other similar questions or experiences that need to be factored in to whatever discussion may be occurring between teacher and classroom students. But the teacher ought to be in control of the base, the process (including its timing), and the goal or end truth to be

---

<sup>86</sup> A clear predisposition toward the student accepting a socialistic nanny-state.

<sup>87</sup> This in no way states that students can never talk, or even help one-another in a classroom. One student helping another, legitimately, with teacher permission and supervision, is NOT collaboration, as Dewey envisioned it. Nevertheless, students working together ought to be less relied upon and be more of the exception, not the rule.

<sup>88</sup> Of course, as believers in Jesus Christ, we need to do all we can to live in peace with others ([Rom. 12:18](#)), but this does not mean we sacrifice truth. Paul wrote, "If possible, so far as it depends on you . . . be at peace with all men." If offense arises at a truth shared lovingly, the fault is with the one offended.

<sup>89</sup> Certainly not to all students, but the strong desire to conform in order to be accepted by the group [the same longing (a corrupted aspect of God's creating us to be in fellowship – resulting from being in His image – that is, a trinity, not an isolated singular), that drives young men to do counter-intuitive things to join gangs (and the reason boys thrive with a positive father or father-figure)] compels many, if not most, to join the process.

<sup>90</sup> This designation arising out of The Frankfurt Schools own Theodore Adorno, author of the vastly influential book, the *Authoritarian Personality* (1950), in which the Jewish socialists comprising most of the group's members, being enemies of Hitler, began to assert that anyone who exercised authority (forget whether or not it was just and well-dispensed authority) was like Hitler, a Nazi. Thus, the attack of Nazi, Hitler, and eventually, even a fascist, was liberally used to literally de-platform any individual trying to exercise proper (biblical) leadership, whether a teacher in the classroom, a political leader (e.g., President Trump), or a regular father, culturally eviscerated from his role as leader (authority) by many forces and factors (even cartoon's, a classic case-in-point being the Bernstein Bears – the father of which was portrayed as a complete doofus).



ascertained and then applied in life. Furthermore, that goal ought to be consistent with the principles of the Bible and if it is not, the teachers work is not done.<sup>91</sup>

Jesus asked many questions of many people, and the people asked Jesus many questions as well. They also talked much about many things. But this has *nothing to do with* Dewey's interest in collaborative inquiry.

### **Semantic Deception**

Dewey did choose his icon words carefully, just like the pro-choice (e.g., Planned Parenthood) people did (and do). After all, who could ever be anti "choice" ([2 Cor. 3:17](#))? Who could deny that planning as parents is good? Likewise, who could be against collaboration (talking to others) and who could be against inquiry (simply wanting to know something)? Certainly no one who is rational or sane. Hence, those who oppose these things are labeled as such, or worse: evil, Hitler, Nazi, fascist, white-supremacist,<sup>92</sup> pick your *ad hominem*. Pro-choice, Planned Parenthood, collaborative inquiry . . . all these words and phrases do not mean what they look or sound like. They are semantically deceptive terms. After all, the baby gets no choice. Planning to execute an unwanted baby pre-birth is not a good sort of planning. Feminists who abort their female babies are clearly not really pro-female as roughly half of all babies aborted are female. And neither is collaborative inquiry really questioning to seek the truth. No, it is quite the opposite. Even "critical thinking" is a product of critical theory. Most people believe that critical thinking is good as it implies that we should think analytically and deeply about matters and use our God-given brains to come up with sound solutions and conclusions. If that is what is meant by "critical thinking," it would not be so bad. However, the "critical" in the thinking was meant to have children be critical of their parents' teaching. The goal is to move the child away from the parent's care into the care of the state or peer group. This is best done by creating a suspicion in the child that their parents are fools.

Just like Henry Ford did not invent the automobile, but made it popular, and just like Darwin did not invent evolution, but made it a social and household conversation piece through publishing On The Origins of Species, so too Dewey did not invent group-think (consensus, social relativism), but he did *systematize it and inject* it into the fabric of society *through training teachers, both wittingly or unwittingly*, in its tenants. That systematized methodology was one of collaboration and inquiry, sharpened and honed at Teachers College at Columbia University, with the goal of it being disseminated across the country through government teacher training mandates and standardization of pedagogical methods and concepts.

Dewey wanted to re-make truth into something new (inquiry) and he did it through working with others of various non-Christian philosophies (collaboration). In a Christian or post-Christian society, by overemphasizing the love of Jesus to the detriment of His other attributes (like holiness, truth, justice, the One who holds the keys of death and Hades, etc.), the average Christian (teachers included) did not pick up Dewey's rebellion on

---

<sup>91</sup> Prov. 1:7 – The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge . . .

<sup>92</sup> Again, thank you to the Frankfurt School for this default. Again, see Hawkins' and Lind's work, Political Correctness: A Dangerous and Deceptive Worldview.

their radars. Just like Charles Lyell<sup>93</sup> intended to “set down” the Mosaic geology (i.e., erase the Genesis flood) in order to set aside the gospel ([2 Peter 3:5](#)) by being very careful not to “irritate” and “without giving offense,” to the Christian academics of his day, so too did Dewey masterfully avoid raising the ire of Christians in his day by playing the moral card. That is, he appealed to the Christian through the well-known commands of Jesus to love enemies and to practice the Golden Rule . . . be nice, work together (talk to others), love enemies, listen, cooperate and compromise, etc. Again, this is playing the moral card. If a Christian objects to a false teaching in the academic setting, or if they resist a collaboration/inquiry method, they are deemed unloving hypocrites. As it turns out, Christians who learn the methods of collaboration and inquiry are working against the teachings of Jesus found in other verses in the Bible<sup>94</sup> that are less well-read and less well-known, and they are becoming friends of the world (again, [Ja. 4:4](#)). The command for us as teachers from [Eph. 5:11](#) is clear, “Do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead even expose them,” the latter part of this verse being the substance of this work.

## Conclusion

Germane to the thesis of this work, Dewey serves merely as one example, albeit a large and glaring one, showing that knowledge is standard based and that the purpose (or end goal) of knowledge is predicated upon that standard. In other words, the creator gets to dictate the purpose and goal of his creation. Dewey knew this. He knew that to change the goal, he must change the standard. He did this by appealing to the morality of a Judeo-Christian society and by creating his own semantically deceptive terminology, collaborative inquiry.

Failure of Christian teachers to grasp what he has done has had dire consequences. Knowledge is standard based and exists for a purpose. God is the ultimate standard and so it is His purposes that should stand. This forms then, the basis and purpose for education in the first place. Knowledge *starts* with God<sup>95</sup> and is *for* Him ([Col. 1:18](#), [Rom. 11:36](#)). To divorce academic education from Him, which has been done ubiquitously by Christian teachers within the public school system (and sadly, even in Christian schools), is to execute an academic, and biblical, *non-sequitur* and thus does not advance the young mind, but instead hinders it. This destroys the very purpose for which the teacher exists within his or her discipline. If we are to love God with all of our minds, and if we are to teach this also to the next generation, we must give up trying to do so using worldly methods.

---

<sup>93</sup> Strong influencer of Charles Darwin who led him down the path of uniformitarian geology (opposite that of Moses as set in Genesis). Darwin once said of Lyell, “I always feel as if my books came half out of Lyell’s brain.” [The Long War Against God: Henry Morris, 1989, p. 167]. The point being that Lyell wanted to dispense with the Bible, but **knew he needed the Christian academics on his side**. He got them there by not attacking the Bible directly and thus not offending these highly influential men, but by changing the age of the earth into a long and slow uniformitarian geological processes. Thus, the logical and necessary implication of such thinking was to accept that Moses, and thus the Bible, was wrong. **So also today, by not irritating the modern Christian teacher by directly attacking their biblical convictions, Dewey has carried them with him in his quest to undo the Bible.** The Christian teacher thus acts with a form of cognitive dissonance, or simply, in a contradictory fashion.

<sup>94</sup> [2 Tim. 4:3-5](#), [John 7:24](#), etc.

<sup>95</sup> Remember, God is omniscient (omni – *science*, Lit., “all knowledge”), God made everything. Hence, knowledge comes from Him.

Dewey's whole system and process, fundamental to "success" (the goal/purpose) as Dewey defined it, requires a change of base or standard from God and His Word to man and his musings (collaboration). Once that is accomplished, the purpose of man completely changes. For Dewey and his collaborators, their purpose was "the complete realization of human personality" being "the end of man's life . . . and fulfillment in the here and now." Elijah's question to the Jews remains poignant, "If the LORD is God, follow Him; but if Baal [man's consensus], follow him" (1 Kings 18:31). If there would be any hope for the future in education, we must stick with God, not with Dewey or Dewey's methods.