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In June 1995, the economist Milton Friedman wrote an article for the Washington Post promoting the use of public education funds for private schools as a way to transfer the nation's public school systems to the private sector. "Vouchers," he wrote, "are not an end in themselves; they are a means to make a transition from a government to a market system." The article was republished by "free market" think tanks, including the Cato Institute and the Hoover Institution, with the title "Public Schools: Make Them Private."¹

While Friedman has promoted vouchers for decades, most famously in his masterwork Free to Choose, the story of how public funds are actually being transferred to private, often religious, schools is a study in the ability of a few wealthy families, along with a network of right-wing think tanks, to create one of the most successful "astroturf" campaigns money could buy.² Rather than openly championing dismantling the public school system, they promote bringing market incentives and competition into education as a way to fix failing schools, particularly in low-income Black and Latino communities.

Even before the U.S. Supreme Court's Citizens United ruling deregulated campaign finance and unleashed millions in political donations, concentrated wealth has played a role in politics. Now in the limelight for its attacks on unions and the exposure of 800 model bills and documents, the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) has produced model bills favorable to its corporate and right-wing funders behind closed doors for decades—including school vouchers and tax credit bills.³

http://www.politicalresearch.org/the-rights-school-choice-scheme/#
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Types of School Choice Programs

Private school choice programs—school vouchers, scholarship tax credits, and education savings accounts—are designed to allow parents to choose the best education for their children. The strongest private school choice programs are specifically designed for disadvantaged children who, without these educational options, would be stuck in a school that does not meet their individual educational needs. School choice programs are often designed to help children from low- or medium-income families, children stuck in poorly performing public schools, or children with special learning needs.

Means-Tested Programs

Means-tested programs are designed to serve students from low-income families to attend the school of their parents’ choice. These programs provide access to quality educational options that low-income families would not otherwise have. Means-preferenced programs give preference to students from low-income families when granting scholarships through these programs. The following programs help students from low-income families and students from middle-income families. Eighteen of the nation’s 32 private school choice programs are means tested or means preferred.

www.alliancelforschooolchoice.org/yearbook
VOUCHER Programs

Indiana’s Choice Scholarship Program
Louisiana’s Student Scholarships for Educational Excellence Program*
Ohio’s Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program
Ohio’s Educational Choice Scholarship Program*
Washington, D.C.’s D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program
Wisconsin’s Milwaukee Parental Choice Program
Wisconsin’s Racine Parental Choice Program

www.allianceforschoolchoice.org/yearbook
SCHOLARSHIP
Tax Credit Programs

Arizona’s Corporate School Tuition Organization Tax Credit
Florida Tax Credit Scholarship
Indiana’s Corporate and Individual Scholarship Tax Credit Program
Iowa’s Individual and Corporate Scholarship Tax Credit
Louisiana’s Tuition Donation Rebate Program*
New Hampshire Education Tax Credit
Oklahoma’s Equal Opportunity Education Scholarships*
Pennsylvania’s Educational Improvement Tax Credit
Pennsylvania’s Educational Opportunity Scholarship Tax Credit*
Rhode Island Corporate Scholarship Tax Credits
Virginia Education Improvement Scholarships Tax Credits

www.allianceforschoolchoice.org/yearbook
States with School Choice Programs

At least one program in the state is designed to serve students with special needs.

www.allianceforschoolchoice.org/yearbook
## 2012-13 Data

### AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL: States with Private School Choice Programs</th>
<th>16 + D.C. and Douglas County, CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States with Voucher Programs</td>
<td>9 + D.C. and Douglas County, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States with Scholarship Tax Credit Programs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States with Education Savings Account Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States with Special Needs Scholarship Programs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL: Number of Private School Choice Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Voucher Programs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Scholarship Tax Credit Programs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Education Savings Account Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special Needs Scholarship Programs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL: Funds Expended for Private School Choice Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$963 million</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expended for Voucher Programs</td>
<td>$533 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expended for Scholarship Tax Credit Programs</td>
<td>$405 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expended for Education Savings Account Programs</td>
<td>$5.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expended for Special Needs Scholarship Programs</td>
<td>$233 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL: Average Scholarship Amount in Private School Choice Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,798</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Scholarship Amount in Voucher Programs</td>
<td>$5,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Scholarship Amount in Scholarship Tax Credit Programs</td>
<td>$2,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Scholarship Amount in Education Savings Account Programs</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Scholarship Amount in Special Needs Scholarship Programs</td>
<td>$7,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.allianceforschoolchoice.org/yearbook
2012-13 Scholarship

RECIPIENTS BY STATE

- Florida: 76,187
- Pennsylvania: 42,149
- Arizona: 30,587
- Ohio: 27,182
- Wisconsin: 24,527
- Georgia: 14,519
- Indiana: 12,214
- Iowa: 10,446
- Louisiana: 5,160
- Washington, D.C.: 1,584
- Utah: 672
- Rhode Island: 382
- Oklahoma: 232
- Mississippi: 13
According to the Louisiana voucher guidelines, 380,000 students out of a total public school population of just over 700,000 students would be eligible.
NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK SPECIAL

WHISTLE-STOP TOUR

Today's students are tomorrow's leaders, and all parents should have the freedom to choose the schools that are right for their children. Help us spread the word that school choice works! Join parents, students, and community leaders at a special event on our historic cross-country, whistle-stop train and motor coach tour.

ATTEND AN EVENT

Newark, New Jersey

LEARN MORE

THE LATEST

Whistle-Stop Tour: Los Angeles

The National School Choice Week Whistle-Stop Tour stopped in Los Angeles on 1/30/14 to celebrate...

http://schoolchoiceweek.com/train
Short and Long Term Impact of Privatization
Exclusion
Georgia’s tax credit scholarship program has diverted more than $170 million in taxpayer funds to cover the tuition costs of students in private schools during the last four years. The program permits individual and corporate taxpayers to divert a portion of their state taxes — a dollar-for-dollar reduction in taxes — to provide public financing to private organizations called student scholarship organizations (SSOs). In turn, these SSOs provide funds to private schools for all or part of a student’s tuition.

This program of educational tax credits is providing public financing to a large number of private schools in Georgia that have draconian anti-gay policies and practices. Many of these private schools explicitly condemn homosexuality on religious grounds and have procedures in considering student admission, scholarships, and discipline that identify and exclude gay students. The schools’ policies often state that being gay or declaring oneself as gay constitutes grounds for suspension or expulsion. Some of Georgia’s private schools also have policies that suspend or expel any student who expresses direct or indirect support or tolerance of gay students or homosexuality.

At least 115 private schools participating in Georgia’s tax-funded scholarship program have explicit, severe anti-gay policies or belong to state and national private school associations that promote anti-gay policies and practices among their members. These schools constitute approximately one-fourth of all private schools that are currently affiliated with SSOs in Georgia’s tax-funded scholarship program. There is also a larger number of religious schools, many involved in the state tax credit program, that use

---

1 SEF identified a school as a participating private school by determining if the school has advertised its affiliation with an SSO or is listed on an SSO website. There is no public record of all schools participating in the state tax credits for private school scholarships. This is only one of many shortcomings in public reporting found in the state tax credit program that earned the state the 2012 Black Hole Award by the National Society of Professional Journalists, who deemed the program as having the nation’s “most heinous violations of the public’s right to know.”
“Each student of the school shall be of the highest moral character and be obedient to all biblical principles, including, but not limited to, prohibitions against fornication, drug use, and alcohol use, pornography and homosexuality.”
In accordance with the Statement of Faith and in recognition of Biblical principles, no "immoral act" or "identifying statements" concerning fornication, adultery, homosexuality, lesbianism, bisexuality, or pornography, will be tolerated. Such behavior will constitute grounds for expulsion...

For the purpose of this handbook, the following definitions apply:

Identifying Statement - A statement that a student is a homosexual, bisexual, or otherwise immoral, or words to that effect or language or behavior that a reasonable person would believe is intended to convey a propensity or intent to engage in an immoral and/or homosexual act.
...as well as any student who condones, supports, or otherwise promotes such practices.
The Hidden War Against Gay Teens

Private Christian schools are exploiting local laws to raise money while expelling kids for the crime of being not straight

By ALEX MORRIS

OCTOBER 10, 2013 2:40 PM ET

A strange thing happened to Tristan at the end of eighth grade: He received a Facebook message from someone he didn’t know who seemed, somehow, to understand him better than anyone. “The message was like, ‘Hey, I’m pretty sure you’re gay. I just wanted to let you know there’s some of us at this school. If you ever want to talk, let me know.’” Tristan was shocked that the message referred to his homosexuality, which he thought he’d thus far been keeping under wraps. In

Should Your Christian School Enroll the Child of a Same-Sex Couple?

By Ken Coley, EdD, Director of Doctor of Education Program, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

“Swimmers are warned about the twin dangers of powerful waves and the counter sweep of strong undertow. When one ignores these warnings and ventures out into treacherous surf without sufficient preparation, he does so at his own peril. And so it is with many Christian school leaders who are innocently frolicking in the currents of cultural change... oblivious to the growing number of requests by same-sex couples for the enrollment of their children in a local Christian school and unmindful of the potential for legal remedies if the school fails to meet their expectations. The lifeguards have put out the red pennants signifying rough surf. Consider yourself warned...

“I am sending you out like sheep among wolves. Therefore be as shrewd as snakes and as innocent as doves” (Matthew 10:16, NIV). What a compelling command! Jesus knew that His disciples then, and that we now, would face incredible dilemmas knotted with strains of complexity... and so it is as we consider the temporal and the eternal, the individual and the community, the short-term and the longer view of the issue at hand in this article—Should a Christian school enroll a student who comes from a household of a same-sex couple? One school made national news with its decision to deny a student admission... In Albuquerque, New Mexico, the Hope Christian School denied the admission of [a] three-year-old pre-school student, who has two fathers, and sent a letter to the parents explaining their reasoning. According to a local ABC affiliate (www.kaat.com), Hope Christian School... “Same gender couples are inconsistent with scriptural lifestyle and biblical teachings... Home life doesn’t reflect the school’s belief of what a biblical family lifestyle is.”

The school states that since they are private, they are excused from “government interference in matters of religion (www.examiner.com/religion).” While the Hope Christian School is a private school, they are also partially funded by taxpayer dollars. ABC notes (www.kaat.com) that the

(continued on next page)

- Accredited 94 private schools Georgia, 76 eligible to receive tax-funded scholarships
- 153 ACSI schools in Pennsylvania with more than 21,000 students
Curricula
Constitution to maintain a certain level of cooperation between themselves.

**Full Faith and Credit**—Article IV, Section 1 requires that each state respect the laws, official records, and judicial rulings of the other states.

Full faith and credit shall be given each state to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other state.

According to this section of the Constitution, each state must recognize the validity of the other states' sovereignty. The full faith and credit clause ensures that driver's licenses issued in Montana will be recognized in Florida. A vacationing family from Massachusetts does not need to obtain a license from each state it will travel through. Each state is required by the Constitution to recognize other states' licenses. Most often the full faith and credit clause relates to judicial matters. For instance, a man ordered by a North Dakota court to pay for damages in an accident cannot flee to South Dakota to escape the responsibility of payment. South Dakota must give “full faith and credit” to North Dakota's ruling.

**What About Homosexual ‘Unions’?**

In 2000 Vermont passed legislation making “civil unions” available to homosexuals. But what if two homosexuals were to acquire a civil union certificate in Vermont and then move to a different state? Would the “full faith and credit” clause require other states to acknowledge their union? As of 2000 thirty-seven states had passed “Defense of Marriage Acts” (DOMAs) that refuse to recognize homosexual marriage under the “full faith and credit” clause. But DOMAs have not been tested in federal court. Furthermore, state courts might rule that “civil unions” are not marriages and thus are not covered by the DOMAs.

Two exceptions to this clause exist. First, this section deals only with civil law, not criminal; second, states are not required to give full faith and credit in every case of divorce. The first exception limits a state to enforcing only its own laws. Georgia cannot enforce an Oregon law requiring all passengers (including back seat passengers) to wear seat belts unless the law is also on Georgia's law books. The second exception prevents people from moving to a state with lenient divorce laws just long enough to obtain a divorce and then moving back to their home state. The United States Supreme Court set the precedent for this exception in its ruling in **Williams v. North Carolina** (1945). This case involved a man and woman from North Carolina who left their spouses in order to obtain divorces in Nevada. (Nevada required the shortest amount of time, six weeks, before a state resident could legally file for a divorce.) After waiting six weeks, the two obtained divorces, married one another, and returned to live in North Carolina. North Carolina refused to accept the divorces and prosecuted the couple for bigamy. North Carolina argued that the two had never intended to live in Nevada and, therefore, they were not under Nevada’s jurisdiction but North Carolina’s. The ruling in favor of North Carolina established that a state can refuse to honor a divorce granted by a state if the divorcees never proved their intent to become permanent residents of that state.

**Privileges and Immunities**—According to Article IV, Section 2—the privileges and immunities clause—privileges enjoyed by United States citizens must be respected in every state.

The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.

No state can lawfully restrict a nonresident’s activities. Nonresidents of a state can work, purchase merchandise, travel, and buy a house with the full privileges and immunities granted to residents of that state. This also ensures that nonresidents are guaranteed all legal rights as well. A state government may not set aside a person's rights because he is a nonresident. This does not, however, restrict the states from making reasonable distinctions between residents and nonresidents concerning activities.
What About Homosexual ‘Unions’?

In 2000 Vermont passed legislation making “civil unions” available to homosexuals. But what if two homosexuals were to acquire a civil union certificate in Vermont and then move to a different state? Would the “full faith and credit” clause require other states to acknowledge their union? As of 2000 thirty-seven states had passed “Defense of Marriage Acts” (DOMAs) that refuse to recognize homosexual marriage under the “full faith and credit” clause. But DOMAs have not been tested in federal court. Furthermore, state courts might rule that “civil unions” are not marriages and thus are not covered by the DOMAs.

Two exceptions to this clause exist. First, this section deals only with civil law, not criminal; sec-
Student Activity 2: Your State Constitution

The activity enables students to become familiar with their state’s constitution.

Homosexuality

Discuss with students the biblical position on homosexuality. Lead them to understand that opposition to homosexuality should not be based on personal feelings or popular opinion but on the Bible. Homosexual unions must be opposed because God opposes them.
The attempt to make evil appear good by giving it an agreeable name is nothing new. God warned in Isaiah 5:20, “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil.” When homosexuals call sin a “sexual preference” or abortionists describe destroying unborn life as a “choice,” they call evil good.
The “Gay Rights” Movement

When President Clinton suggested allowing open homosexuals to serve in the U.S. military and later when he signed the Defense of Marriage Act, he was reacting to a rising political force in America, the “gay rights” movement. Openly practicing homosexuals sought ways to secure legal recognition of their lifestyle and, by doing so, hoped to make themselves more accepted by the American public.

The term gay has been used in reference to homosexuality since the early 1900s, although that use was not widespread until the 1970s. Sometimes it is used just of male homosexuals and sometimes of homosexuals in general. The birth of the “gay rights” movement was the Stonewall riots of June 1969. When police in New York City raided a homosexual bar called Stonewall, the patrons resisted and violence broke out. For homosexuals, this event marked the beginning of a war for public acceptance.

The effort saw some success. In 1973 the American Psychiatric Association voted to stop considering homosexuality a disorder. In cities with large homosexual populations, such as San Francisco, pro-homosexual forces put through local ordinances banning discrimination against homosexuals. But the majority of the American people opposed these trends. Christians realized that the Bible expressly condemns homosexuality (e.g., Rom. 1:26-27). Even non-Christians could see that the behavior was unnatural and immoral.

Nonetheless, homosexual activists made strides. They enlisted the entertainment industry and news media to portray homosexuality as normal, seeking to change the public's view of it as “hate-mongers” and “homophobes” (people who irrationally fear homosexuality). Homosexual politicians began to win election to city councils, state legislatures, and even Congress. They labeled any criticism of the homosexual lifestyle as “gay-bashing,” putting sermons against the sin in the same class as brutal acts of violence against homosexuals.

By the 1990s homosexuals had succeeded in normalizing their behavior to a large segment of the American people. Doing so allowed them to present legislative favors as simply their “rights.” Attempts to redefine marriage to recognize homosexual “unions” was such an effort, which activists likened to the African American civil rights movement. When critics pointed out that homosexuality is a behavior, not an inherited characteristic like race, the pro-homosexual lobby contended that everyone is born with a “sexual orientation” about which the individual has no choice.

The “gay rights” movement challenges Christians to think biblically. They must not allow public opinion, no matter how strong, to reshape their view of sin. It is true that because of their sinful nature, humans are born bent to sin, and for some that bent is toward the sin of homosexuality. But Jesus Christ died to redeem people from sin—from its penalty and from its power. At the same time, Christians cannot condone violence against homosexuals or any other group and must not allow their abhorrence of the sin of homosexuality to quench compassion for the sinner. Paul’s admonition to be “speaking the truth in love” (Eph. 4:15) means that believers must hold to both truth and love in their dealings with others.
to the African-American civil rights movement. When critics pointed out that homosexuality is a behavior, not an inherited characteristic like race, the pro-homosexual lobby contended that everyone is born with a “sexual orientation” about which the individual has no choice.

The “gay rights” movement challenges Christians to think biblically. They must not allow public opinion, no matter how strong, to reshape their view of sin. It is true that because of their sinful nature, humans are born bent to sin, and for some that bent is toward the sin of homosexuality. But Jesus Christ died to redeem people from sin—from its penalty and from its power. At the same time, Christians cannot condone violence against homosexuals or any other group and must not allow their abhorrence of the sin of homosexuality to quench compassion for the sinner. Paul’s admonition to be “speaking the truth in love” (Eph. 4:15)
The 90s Inherit the Legacy of the 60s

President Bill Clinton (1993–)  
As socialism seemed to be weakening its grip on Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, it strengthened its grasp on the American people when Democrat Bill Clinton won the election of 1992. Only 43% of the votes were cast for Clinton; the remaining 57% of the vote was divided between President George Bush and the independent candidate Ross Perot, who campaigned as a conservative. When the election results came in, telecasts showed Perot and his staff celebrating Clinton’s victory. By splitting the conservative vote, Perot put Clinton, a strong liberal, into the White House.

Hillary Rodham Clinton, who had campaigned with her husband, declared that she intended to share the responsibilities of the Presidency with him. She promised to be as influential as Eleanor Roosevelt, who helped bring about Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal.

With the election of Bill Clinton, the children of the rebellious ‘60s came to political power, and their values began to influence the lives of many Americans. Clinton represented the youth of the ‘60s in many ways. Like a few other young men during the Vietnam War, he had dodged military service and participated in anti-war demonstrations in Great Britain.

Rumors plague the White House.  
Before and after President Clinton’s election, rumors circulated of scandalous behavior, including an adulterous affair and illegal business dealings. In particular, some accused Bill Clinton of using his position as governor of Arkansas to grant special, illegal favors to a real estate firm called the Whitewater Land Development Company. The Whitewater affair was assigned a special investigator and scheduled for a Congressional hearing.

The Liberal Agenda  
Presidential promises. During the election, Bill Clinton made many promises to liberal groups—homosexuals, feminists, radical environmentalists, and others. Within days of his inauguration, President Clinton issued several executive orders. The first order removed restrictions imposed on abortion under Reagan and Bush. Clinton also supported an amendment to make abortion a constitutional right. Meanwhile, the Department of Justice began to take legal action against pro-life demonstrators. As Commander-in-Chief, the President urged Congress to lift the ban on homosexuals in the U.S. military, despite objections by Pentagon officials that such a move would destroy the morale and effectiveness of the armed forces. Widespread opposition from Congress and the public forced President Clinton to compromise on the issue, however, with a “don’t ask don’t tell” policy that left both homosexuals and conservative Americans dissatisfied.

Socialized medicine. As she had promised during the election, Hillary Clinton campaigned heavily for a national health care plan (socialized medicine).
demonstrators. As Commander-in-Chief, the President urged Congress to *lift the ban on homosexuals in the U.S. military*, despite objections by Pentagon officials that such a move would destroy the morale and effectiveness of the armed forces. Widespread
Questions and Answers

Answer the following questions using the textbook and reference materials.

1. Why was President Clinton referred to as “the comeback kid”?
   In 1980 he was defeated in the Arkansas governor’s race, but came back to win the office. Defeated
   in the 1992 New Hampshire presidential primary after sexual immorality allegations, he went on
   to win the Democratic nomination. Despite defeats on health care plan and congressional elections,
   he began another comeback.

2. Why did one Democratic congressman say that if a person did not like President
   Clinton’s position on a particular issue, he needed only to wait a few weeks?
   Clinton would change policy according to public opinion. For example, when the public began
   to view Clinton as a liberal, he became a centrist.

3. How did signing the Defense of Marriage Act hurt Clinton’s endorsement of homo-
   sexual rights?
   It denied any status to homosexual “unions” by securing federal benefits, such as health insurance,
   for spouses in traditional marriages only.

4. When and how did President Clinton present himself as a New Democrat?
   In Clinton’s 1996 State of the Union Address, he stated his position as tough on crime, supportive
   of family values, and ready to reform welfare. He said, “The era of big government is over.”

5. Why did the Supreme Court strike down the line-item veto?
   It would give too much power to the executive branch. A Constitutional amendment would be
   required for an all-inclusive line-item veto. The line-item veto could be overridden by a two-third’s
   vote in both houses of Congress.

6. What negative character qualities do some of the previous questions’ answers illustrate
   about President Clinton?
   sexual immorality allegations—low morals; no commitment—changed with what was popular;
   endorsed homosexual rights in spite of signing Marriage Act—not trustworthy—supported a sinful
   way of life
6. What negative character qualities do some of the previous questions’ answers illustrate about President Clinton?

- sexual immorality allegations—low morals; no commitment—changed with what was popular;
- endorsed homosexual rights in spite of signing Marriage Act—not trustworthy—supported a sinful way of life
Some atmospheric scientists think that greenhouse gases work to maintain a relatively constant level of heat in the atmosphere. They say that although carbon dioxide does cause water vapor to condense, releasing heat energy to the atmosphere, the condensed water vapor forms clouds which reflect some of the sun’s heat energy back into space, so it cannot reach the earth’s surface. Carbon dioxide creates aerosols which produce a kind of cloud, enabling them to reflect some of the sun’s radiation away from the earth.

Environmentalists had previously thought the temperature would rise due to global warming. However, observed temperatures have not risen as predicted by their predictions were inaccurates.

Environmentalists claim that global warming could bring disasters to the earth’s environment, such as the melting of ice caps at the earth’s poles. The “extra” water from the melting ice would supposedly cause a rise in sea level and subsequent flooding of coastal areas. According to records kept over the past 100 years, however, there has been no significant change in the earth’s overall temperature—there has been no global warming.

While some environmentalists are quick to point out the supposed “devastation” that increased carbon-dioxide levels would result in a substantial increase in plant productivity; and since plants account for 95% of the earth’s food supply, a carbon-dioxide increase could be beneficial.

Because most environmental scientists see the universe and even life itself as mere products of chance, it is easy for them to visualize potentially catastrophic changes occurring on the earth. As Christians, however, we must remember that God provided certain “checks and balances” in creation to prevent many of the global upsets that have been predicted by environmentalists. We know from God’s promise in Genesis 8:22 that “while the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.”
• In 2003, A Beka reported 9,000 private schools purchased textbooks.

• In the most recent Florida report of it’s “scholarship” program (November 2013), 81% of the 61,123 students are in religious schools.

• In 2003, Palm Beach Post conducted survey and found that 43% of religious school responding to the survey used either A Beka or Bob Jones University curriculum.

• In 2012, when Louisiana posted its list of 118 eligible voucher program schools, only seven did not identify as religious.
Charter Schools?
Texas Public Schools Are Teaching Creationism

An investigation into charter schools’ dishonest and unconstitutional science, history, and “values” lessons.

By Zack Kopplin

Responsive Education Solutions

- Texas largest charter
- 17,000 students
- Accelerated Christian Education

http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2014/01/creationism_in_texas_public_schools_undermining_the_charter_movement.single.html