

**RONALD REAGAN LIBRARY DOCUMENTATION REGARDING
PRESIDENT REAGAN'S DESIRE TO MEET WITH CHARLOTTE
THOMSON ISERBYT, FORMER SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR, U.S. DEPT.
OF EDUCATION, 1981-1982.**

(1) Text of handwritten note from President Ronald Reagan to Edwin Meese, III, White House Chief of Staff, dated August 2, 1982, regarding Charlotte Thomson Iserbyt's July 2, 1982 letter to President Reagan. Charlotte's letter requested a private meeting with the President related to need to abolish the U.S. Dept. of Education and includes valuable information regarding funding, development, and dissemination nationwide and internationally of Marxist educational research and programs. Such a meeting never took place.

(2) Related documents are included in this packet.

Charlotte Thomson Iserbyt served as Sr. Policy Advisor, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Dept. of Education from 1981-1982 when she was relieved of her duties due to leaking Project BEST, an important computer technology grant, to *Human Events*. This grant was designed to control curriculum in all schools of the nation.

This packet dated March 17, 2016, contains documents provided by the Reagan Library in response to a Freedom of Information request made by Charlotte Iserbyt November 6, 2015.

VERBATIM TEXT

"Dear Ed,

I can't check this with Dept. of Ed. for reasons that will be clear when you read it. I feel though that maybe I should see this lady regarding the things she has brought up.

Let's talk about this when I get back from this junket.

Ron"

[Edwin Meese - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia](#)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edwin_Meese

Ed Meese

Dear Ed

I cant check this with Dept. of Pd. for reasons that will be clear when you read it. I feel though that maybe I should see the lady regarding the things she has brought up.

Let's talk about this when I get back from this junket.

Ran

C. F. 09260555

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

FE026
FA005
PE005
PK
PR005-02
FE006-01

Date: August 2, 1982

NOTE FOR: EDWIN MEESE III

The President has

- seen
- acted upon
- commented upon

the attached; and it is forwarded to you for your:

- information
- action

Richard G. Darman
Assistant to the President
(x-2702)

cc:

*Note to Ed Meese from the President
regarding letter from Charlotte
Thomson Insryt on the Dept.
of Education*

CHARLOTTE THOMSON ISERBYT
2324 19th Street, Washington, D.C. 20009
202-462-5153

July 7, 1982

President Ronald Reagan
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear President Reagan:

I understand that the White House has received many letters and petitions requesting that the Department of Education (DOE) be abolished, that Secretary Terrel Bell be asked to resign and replaced by a Secretary more in tune with your philosophy, and that grants and contracts relative to the Secretary's Technology Initiative be cancelled or broken. Friends of mine across the country inform me that they have either received no reply to their letters or that they are receiving replies from the Department of Education which do not even address their concerns.

Leading conservative organizations and media (national and state) are concerned that the Reagan agenda for education is hardly distinguishable from that of President Carter and the NEA. Your promise to abolish the NEA/Carter Department of Education did not include a promise to replace it with a foundation for education. Your publicly stated concerns over the issues of manipulation of school children and declining test scores were not couched in terms that would allow for the present continuation of federal support for the development, evaluation, and dissemination of behavior modification/values clarification/social change curriculum and/or basic skills computer-based courseware (curriculum).

Why is it that scarce tax dollars continue to flow to education associations that publicly oppose and sneer at everything you stand for? The most recent example of this is the DOE's award of a contract to the Association for Educational Communications (AECT) to carry out Project BEST - Basic Education Skills through Technology. Are you aware that the Advisory Board of Project BEST includes education associations which have for years opposed any position or policy to the right of President Carter or Senator Kennedy. In fact, one of the prime beneficiaries of Project BEST (which will be strengthened by its significant role in the Project), and a member of the Advisory Board, is the Council of Chief State School Officers (CSSO) which in a joint statement with the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), dated April 7, 1982, came out against many of your education proposals. The concluding paragraph of the joint statement released to the press follows:

"Briefly stated...CSSO and NASBE Joint Legislative Conference speaker Haynes Johnson, a well-respected Washington Post commentator, mentioned that it appears that there is almost absolute consensus that we are headed down the wrong economic path ... the one major dissenter, however, is the President, and he remains firm in his convictions. Johnson also predicted that President Reagan would be a one-term President."

As one of your long-time supporters (founder of the Maine Conservative Union in 1973, which is affiliated with the American Conservative Union), and as a former (recently resigned) political appointee in the Department of Education (served as Senior Policy Advisor to the Asst. Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement, which is the office handling the Secretary's Technology Initiative), I am infuriated that precious tax dollars are going to an organization (AECT) which includes on its Project BEST Advisory Board associations which have played a significant role in the decline of student test scores, which have been deeply involved in the controversy over humanistic education programs, and whose memberships include

a good number of educators who supported the creation of the Department of Education and who worked to elect President Carter in 1976 and 1980. It is unlikely President Carter would have rewarded conservative organizations that opposed his election with million dollar contracts.

What ever happened to the Reagan Revolution? Reagan appointees, who stood on principle and backed your philosophy to the hilt, have been asked to resign or have voluntarily resigned in disgust over the present policies of the Department of Education. How can your revolution take place without principled Reaganaut soldiers? The educationist philosophy of the past thirty years, now cleverly couched in terms such as the "New Federalism", "Partnerships with the Private Sector", etc., proceeds apace, and a strengthening of the very establishment you pledged to reduce, which has little or nothing to do with what actually goes on in our children's classrooms, continues without a hitch or a peep from the White House.

Cosmetic changes in the Department, i.e., the replacement of Carter liberals by Reagan conservatives on Advisory Boards, and the removal of a few controversial programs from the National Diffusion Network (NDN), etc., temporary changes which will disappear should there be a change in administrations, are of little or no significance. The abolition of the NDN, the federal government's transmission belt for federally-funded (developed) and evaluated programs, many of which deal with social change, and the abolition of the National Institute of Education (NIE), the left-wing education think tank (I know since I carefully went through many of its project files while on a 2-month detail to NIE), were essential steps for your administration to take. Why was this not done? Not only is the NDN securely in place, its federal control over curriculum (federal bureaucrats evaluate programs before they can go into the NDN), has been strengthened by moving it into the Regional Offices where it is in an even better position to compete with the private sector in the business of selling its federally-supported products. Why is it that the highly-principled and respected NIE Director, Edward Curran, was forced to resign due to his courageous letter to you recommending that NIE be abolished, when you, Mr. President promised the voters you would abolish the whole Department of Education, in which case NIE would have disappeared? I am sure that if you could see how NIE wastes taxpayers' money on silly and controversial social change projects that support the growth of the very educational establishment you pledged to cut back (most of which includes organizations which lobbied against your proposed education cuts), you would be very upset over the decision, taken while you were in Europe, to request Mr. Curran's resignation. You would undoubtedly initiate an investigation of exactly what Secretary Bell is up to in "his" Department of Education, as opposed to what he leads the public to believe as a result of his speeches, etc. Plans for education in the eighties, to which I have access, could not possibly please the Ronald Reagan I have come to admire, support, and believe in over the years.

Grassroots citizens, who worked day and night to get you elected, ask me "What is going on?" Since I am loyal to you all I can say is "I guess the President isn't allowed to know what is really going on. If he were, he would certainly take steps to reverse the present course in the Department of Education."

I would like to meet with you to discuss the concerns of your constituency. I feel that nothing less than a personal, private meeting with you will allow you to know what is really going on. I look forward to a reply from the White House to this letter and to my request for a private meeting. I trust, since I have recently resigned from the Department, that your staff will not refer my letter to the Department for a reply. Thank you so much for everything you are trying to do for our great nation.

Sincerely,

Charlotte T. Iserby
Charlotte Thomson Iserby

Continued from page 1

organizations, and publishing firms that are specifically invited to participate in Project BEST will "mine which "experts" and computer "ware" (i.e., curricula) should be promoted through the various data banks, and which should be dismissed as unacceptable.

What should such fears of "Big Brother"-type control be chalked up to mere right-wing paranoia? The chart on page 3.3 of the report is in itself—even recklessly—explicit. Under the heading, "Project DESIGN FEATURES (What is in control or manipulate?)," the chart lists 25 factors. These include "State participation/selection process," "role of Advisors," "content of program," "production elements involved in materials development," "training of leaders," "resource people utilized," "planned use of project's products and services," and "institutionalization: professional groups and States involved."

Who are these favored groups, which are to be given such extraordinary power to "control or manipulate" the future direction of American education, all courtesy of tax monies made available by Bell's Education Department? Don't hold your breath looking for any Reaganites among them. As already noted, the project is being run by an organization that was formerly a division of the NEA, a group that has been vociferously opposed to everything Reagan stands

for. Participating in Project BEST as members of the Advisory Board are some 18 NEA think-alike groups, including the American Association of School Administrators, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the National Association of State Education Media Professionals, and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

As an indication of what these groups are like, the CCSSO board voted recently to take stands on issues such as the "New Federalism," the federal role in education, tuition tax credits, the Department of Education, and federal budget cuts. With one exception, the CCSSO disagreed with the Reagan Administration policy in each of these

areas. The draft outline of Project BEST is quite open to the possibility that a major goal of the program is to give the future clout of its own participants,

that ought to worry us, it's the lean-

ing, including "the U.S. Department of Education and the professional associations that are cooperating in the project." The Department will benefit, says the report, because it "will have a practical example of... a functional State-Federal partnership." And the participating organizations "will benefit in the eyes of their dues-paying constituents if they can provide appropriate and relevant" information on the role of technology in education.

In addition, the report notes that the centralized information network "will be continuable without Federal support after the Project ends," through the cooperation of state education agencies and the professional associations at the national level "with a vested interest in maintaining these resources."

For conservatives, the centralization of curriculum information and development under the aegis of such left-oriented groups would be outrageous at any time, let alone under the Reagan Administration. As the Republican platform noted, these are the very kind of groups that have severely harmed schooling in this country by indulging in "one fad after another," and by promoting the "manipulative and sometimes amoral indoctrination" of elementary and secondary pupils.

In an obvious attempt to dampen criticism, the technology initiative is concentrating in its early phase on promoting education in the so-called "basic" skills. But this is hardly reassuring to conservatives. The report on Project BEST notes, for example, that "Generalizations to other areas and technologies can be relatively easy, but only after the Project has been successful." The report adds that the same processes used for basic skills in the initial phase can be used in "other curriculum areas."

Also disquieting is the peculiar notion held by some as to just what constitutes improving "basic" skills. A summary of Secretary Bell's remarks before a July 14, 1981, meeting on information technology paraphrases him as listing the following among "[p]otential educational roles for technology":

"The sabre-toothed curriculum. Students have to be better educated and more competent than ever before. We don't want to use school time unnecessarily to teach students things that modern technology makes obsolete, e.g., accuracy in long-division." As many conservatives see it, it is precisely such dependence on technology at the expense of basic drill in the fundamentals that is chiefly responsible for the declining achievements of recent years. For Secretary Bell to promote

weapons."

such an approach in the name of "basic education" is mind boggling.

Veteran Reaganites in the government who have learned of Bell's technology initiative have reacted angrily and now believe he should be fired. They stress that this effort, which so thoroughly undercuts the President's goals, is not merely peripheral. Rather, it is the very cutting edge of Bell's program as secretary.

Bell is currently scheduled to participate in a special teleconference on the technology initiative to be held on June 22. An estimated 45 state education agencies will participate in the teleconference, which is being coordinated by the AECT at a cost of roughly \$75,000. And that figure is over and above the original \$855,000-plus grant received by AECT for Project BEST.

Also coming under fire from conservatives is Donald J. Senese, who, as assistant secretary in charge of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), is directly responsible for conducting the technology initiative. A former staff member of the House Republican Study Committee whose appointment as assistant secretary was originally applauded by conservatives, he is now being strongly criticized for meekly following Bell's bidding, with critics using such harsh terms as "sell-out" and "squish." In addition to his efforts on behalf of the highly questionable technology initiative, knowledgeable conservatives within the Education Department say he has been acquiescing in the installation of liberals in key departmental posts.

In a telephone interview with HUMAN EVENTS, Senese downplayed the significance of the technology initiative and of Project BEST that are being pushed by Bell. "There are some conservatives out there who just distrust anything new," he said. He indicated that he knew nothing about any plans for centralized data banks, adding that "What some people may describe as control, we would look upon as coordination. We believe there is a federal role in bringing together the states and the private sector."

However, a close reading of some of the Department of Education's own documents reveals that there is far more to Project BEST and the technology initiative than Senese's bland statements might suggest. That's why growing numbers of conservatives believe Bell must be replaced as secretary, and the sooner the better. Otherwise, the President's own plans for returning control of education to parents and local officials seem destined for total failure.



Ronald Reagan Library

40 Presidential Drive
Simi Valley, CA 93065-0699
800-410-8354
www.reagan.utexas.edu

March 17, 2016

In reply refer to:
Case # 2016-005/1

CHARLOTTE THOMSON ISERBYT
519 RIVER RD
DRESDEN ME 04342

Dear Charlotte Thomson Iserbyt:

This letter is in further response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated November 6, 2015, regarding Letter From Herself. We have processed and opened in whole approximately 6 pages of Presidential records responsive to your FOIA request. FOIA requests for Reagan Presidential records are processed and reviewed for access under provisions of the 1978 Presidential Records Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2207), which incorporates the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552) in substantial part.

Copies of these pages are enclosed.

At this time, you have the right to file an administrative appeal of any Reagan Presidential records responsive to your FOIA request that have been withheld under an exemption category of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). To appeal a FOIA exemption, the appeal must be submitted in writing to the attention of the Deputy Archivist of the United States, c/o the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, 40 Presidential Dr., Simi Valley, CA, 93065, by email to Reagan.library@nara.gov, or by facsimile to (805) 577-4074. You should also include a copy of your original request and our denial. Both your appeal letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "FOIA Appeal." You have 35 calendar days from the date of this letter to file your appeal. The Library will coordinate your appeal with the appropriate authority. Since these are Presidential records administered in accordance with 44 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2207, Executive Order 13489 and NARA regulations at 36 C.F.R. § 1270.46, NARA must notify the former and incumbent Presidents prior to the release of any information in response to an appeal. If an appeal is filed and a determination is made to release more information, once the provisions of E.O. 13489 have been met, we will contact you.

If you have any further questions regarding your FOIA request, please contact me, (shelly.williams@nara.gov or 1-800-410-8354, ext. 74012).

Sincerely,

SHELLY WILLIAMS
Archivist