

Summary of how social emotional learning (SEL) is wrong

Oliver Perry

If you print this double-sided you've a one-sheet summary.

SEL increases “anti-racist” racism

- **SEL is a “tool for anti-racism,” but it really asks for “more and more racism”**
SEL advocates are all-in for anti-racism, as though it were a good thing. But anti-racism actually means having official government discrimination against the racial groups of your opponents.

<https://highlights.sawyerh.com/highlights/Wc3cIP436n60JRoYYTVe>

Ibram Kendi, perhaps the inventor of “anti-racism,” said this about it:

The only remedy to racist discrimination is antiracist discrimination. The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination. The only remedy to present discrimination is future discrimination.

- **SEL advocates think that racially color-blind policies are evil**
They say that you must always take race into consideration. Doesn't that make *them* racist?
- **SEL anti-racism will encourage black vs. white conflicts**
SEL advocates want to create angry activists, not good citizens. They teach racial conflict, not cultural assimilation.

SEL evangelizes students to think in Marxist ways

- **Transformative SEL teaches Marxist thinking, not American culture**
SEL, also called Transformative SEL, teaches students to be activists, looking at life through a Marxist worldview. Their teachers act as religious evangelists for Marxism.

<https://newdiscourses.com/tftw-sel/>

Transformative SEL is wholly (neo)-Marxist. Its primary agenda is, in fact, to use the five competency areas to raise and foster a critical consciousness through social and emotional education.

...

The goal of Transformative SEL is to program children to see their world through the lenses provided by those Critical Theories and train them to be “change agents” (that is, activists) on their behalf.

- **SEL teaches students to view people by their race, not as individuals**
If race is everything, then colorblind policies are a crime against humanity.
- **The “lens of equity” doesn't see equality and justice, only equitable outcomes**
Equity doesn't mean equal justice for all. It means revenge for past inequities.

SEL seeks control of students' emotional and spiritual states

- **SEL schools snoop on students' emotional and mental health**
In the name of teaching the “whole child,” SEL wants to make sure that students properly absorb the SEL indoctrination.
- **SEL schools use smartphones to collect sensitive student medical data**
These apps are is medically intrusive, and share personal data with vendors.
- **SEL advocates aim at guiding student spiritual lives**
SEL advocates “show their hand,” telling all that SEL will expand into monitoring and guiding students' spiritual growth.

<https://thefederalist.com/2023/04/07/leftists-violate-separation-of-church-and-state-with-spiritual-sel-in-public-schools/>

Recently, there has been an influx of SEL programs in the market that incorporate spirituality into their lessons.

...

“What Makes Me” seeks to teach spirituality through SEL as “a more active and engaged process in which some persons choose to shape and create a way of knowing and living that may or may not draw on religion” and as something that involves the conscious choice to explore life’s “big questions.

SEL wants teachers to become replacement parents

- **SEL advocates regard parents merely as “first teachers”**
Parents provide the school with young children. They’re then expected to step aside for the “actual” teacher, becoming merely cheerleaders for their children.
- **SEL schools intervene in student emotional crises**
Under “whole child” concepts, the SEL school staff become agents for social workers. They’re also judging if the parents meet the school’s standards.
- **Who is the true guardian – the parent or the school?**
When the school takes control of the student’s education, counseling, and moral guidance, that is a revolutionary act against our society.

<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1167&context=facpubs>

James Dwyer specializes in anti-parent research.

Through this analysis, it becomes apparent that the claim that parents should have child-rearing rights – rather than simply being permitted to perform parental duties and to make certain decisions on a child’s behalf in accordance with the child’s rights – is inconsistent with principles deeply embedded in our law and morality.

...

I propose further that the law confer on parents simply a child-rearing privilege, limited in its scope to actions and decisions not inconsistent with the child’s temporal interests. Such a privilege, coupled with a broader set of children’s rights, is sufficient to satisfy parents’ legitimate interests in child-rearing.