

## Outline of Ursula's Presentation for Omniwar4

### How & Why Corruption & Propaganda Infiltrates Teacher-Education (and what we can do about it)

I'm pleased to have this unique opportunity to present to the Omniwar 4 Symposium, in October 2026 which has the very timely theme of *'the Capture of Academia'*.

This is a topic I have studied and written about extensively in recent years, within many different contexts, including the 70 years history of the chemical poisoning of New Zealand's environment and, during the covid lockstep era, pharmaceutical interventions.

My contribution to this symposium is entitled ***"How and why corruption and propaganda infiltrates teacher education and what we can do about it."*** Thank you to the Study Group for Technology and Power - I deeply respect all the effort, time and ongoing commitment that has gone into the three previous symposia – all by volunteers like me, simply wanting to share knowledge and raise awareness of the dangers of this silent war of technocracy.

## Slide 2

My talk today is a kind of Root Cause Analysis of the constraints upon truth in universities. The next generation of indoctrinated citizens are currently the kids in the classrooms. If the schoolteachers themselves are often being taught by propagandised academics - some of whom are also addicted to Bigtech - should we be surprised about the end 'product' of this broken university system? That's why it's useful to go back to what is actually being taught at these universities' teacher-education programmes - who teaches what, what is missing from that teaching - and why?

The general strategies are the low-level admission criteria, the limited or skewed reading list, the biased lecture content etc. The seminars that are run by unqualified staff, and the dumbing down of the curriculum, and lots more. But how, exactly? **How have we got here?**

During the 1980s and 90s, the drive towards marketisation and commercialisation of our education systems became more explicit. In the UK, free markets and later, New Labour's Blair, called for modernisation, which led to neoliberal managerialism, becoming the dominant political approach in Western countries, including here in New Zealand – the *Phantom of the Five Eyes* as it's referred to. Quasi markets developed within and between educational institutions, and **learning for learning's sake evaporated** when pressures from international performance league tables forced us to comply with attempts to measure the immeasurable (Avis, 1996). **It was artificial and contrived.** Staff and students all knew it... Managerial bureaucracy drove cost efficiency measures and budgets came with new

buzzwords like 'value added', 'stakeholders' and 'key performance indicators' (KPIs). Importantly, my own PHD research (Edgington, 2016) investigated the oppressive surveillance policies on teaching staff that advanced this new public management....this is the past context that has led to the enormity of the educational problems we all face today.

The negative impact of new public management (NPM) - included rising inequalities. Universities were vulnerable to commercial exploitation because they had to remain financially sustainable. Understandably, some saw NPM as an 'opportunity' in a crisis. It was inevitable that largely unchecked, commercial and political conflicts of interest, interfered with, and *drastically reshaped* our academic roles, research outcomes, and eventually public policy, for instance the school curriculum.

In the UK, pressures on universities intensified in 2006 when teaching funds from Gov were reduced and high student fees were applied. During that decade, similar financial changes were gradually applied in NZ. Competition become intense. Students were redefines as 'customers' with rights to a service that must address their needs **or** financial and legal consequences might result. Hence, partnerships were created, globally, including **Sino foreign cooperative universities in China**, and that's particularly relevant for here in New Zealand, where our main economic partner is China. NPM expanded and embedded the existing surveillance and audit culture across all sectors of education. There is broad ranging evidence - suggested readings and references are included with this presentation.

These developments have dumbed-down teaching and learning by reducing the depth and the breadth of many courses, and therefore student-teacher's learning potential. In turn, children's learning in school classrooms suffers, and staff all across the sector are deprofessionalized and dehumanised. I've mentioned the general strategies - but how does this happen? How is the machinery of the technocracy silencing dissenting voices in teacher-education?

## Slide 3

In August 2023 I wrote an article published in *Propaganda in Focus* called "How Universities Control the Narrative" which sets out the Corporate Playbook - its strategies and its impact on Academia (Edgington, 2023). And in that article, my diagram provides a summary of all the institutional constraints I uncovered. Powerful censorship has led to academics within the system often being unaware of the ways that their own universities' teacher-education programmes suppress 'uncomfortable knowledge'.

The right hand side of the diagram was based on Emeritus Professor of Queen Mary University, London, Norman Fenton explanation of his [Five Stages of Censorship](#) – ways used to try to suppress his research AFTER it was completed. (you can find it YouTube) He experienced this only when he began to articulate discrepancies he observed in the way the UK Government presented the various public health data during covid, but of course these

strategies have a long history before the covid era. I want to look at these strategies in more detail.

## Slide 4

I've set out the five stages I mentioned as follows:

- **The first stage** of academic censorship happened after an article had already passed an anonymous academic journal peer-review process (which usually takes weeks if not months and is very rigorous). It was accepted for publication with minor amendments, but then unusually, the Editor of the journal then intervened. The *accepted* article was then sent to different peer-reviewers, without rationale, and predictably, after further delay, was subsequently rejected outright.
- **The second stage** of censorship that Prof Fenton experienced was when an article was submitted to a journal for academic peer-review, but was immediately rejected by the Editor, without peer-review, accompanied by what the authors interpreted as a bogus excuse.
- **The third stage** of censorship was an article being rejected at the online submission stage, even before it reached the journal's Editor, perhaps with Artificial Intelligence (AI) monitoring 'off limits' keywords and/or author(s) names.
- **The fourth stage** was an academic article being rejected even from pre-print platforms, where draft academic articles are often posted prior to submission to a journal for informal comment and peer-review. Fenton explained this was 'almost never heard of' prior to the covid era.
- And finally, **the fifth stage** of censorship, and perhaps the most concerning for us all, was a 1984-like attempt at re-writing history. Prof Fenton's previously-published peer-reviewed academic articles (unrelated to covid data) have now come 'under fire'. Complaints concerning bogus claims of conflicts of interest were sent to journal editors to try to discredit the validity of the Professor's published research and thereby get these articles retracted.

But there is also another way that universities control the narrative **after research is conducted that Prof Fenton didn't mention**. For example, Prof Kypri (RIP) published about these phenomena. It's University's finance departments sign the legal documents of funder's grant contracts – that could be a large Foundation or a commercial company. Research staff maybe unaware of strict legal criteria in that contract, controlling their work. Contract termination clauses, where no reason is required by the funders, provide strategies whereby 'uncomfortable knowledge' from research investigations can be effectively stopped and outcomes 'deleted'. Funder interference in research [is common](#), and includes nuanced tactics such as '[suppression clauses](#)' (McCrabb et al., 2021) which may only become

known to the researcher at the point of publication. BTW One common outcome from these clauses is a **title and abstract claiming the opposite** from the research outcomes detailed in the **body of the article**. Presumably, the institutional assumption being that publishers' paywalls (or sheer laziness) limit those reading and engaging in the author's content. Nowadays this also impacts on the results that Ais LLMs produce, which are so often inaccurate.

These non-negotiable contract clauses form part of the [regulatory capture](#) that ensure any research outcomes that *could* be interpreted as 'unfavourable' to the funder's objectives, [are withheld](#). This is a regular phenomenon in what is known as 'public-good' research, with as many as [one in five academics](#) admitting to conforming to suppression clauses. For instance, the risks to health from technology use are often prevented from inclusion in teacher-education curricula. Unfortunately, academics (esp early-career staff) reliant upon funding for job security are often unable to resist these pressures (Martin, 2025).

But in Professor Fenton's post, knowledgeable subscribers suggested legitimate further 'Stages of Censorship' such as **Stage six** where they get you fired by your university; **Stage seven** – when you get employment blacklisted; **Stage eight** where all your work and citations are memory-holed... And yes, these observations and comments are consistent themes within the many books, articles and [Open Letters](#), included in the field of **Critical University Studies**. Emeritus Prof Brian Martin of **Whistleblowers Australia** has published **about** *The Corporate Playbook* of censorship and suppression of dissent in academia, including 'groupthink' ... And during the covid era these strategies became much more ubiquitous.

## Slide 5

Here, I outline ways that even **before** research is conducted, the university can control the narrative. Whether this is rejecting initial PhD proposals that don't 'fit' the narrative, manipulating the recruitment of non-compliant staff (like me), restricted promotions, internal or external research grant funding to eventually, if the dissident academic hasn't already been forced to leave, **explicit bullying**, kangaroo court hearings followed by being 'managed out' of the institution, with, of course, **a gagging clause**. It's a well-rehearsed playbook that is not widely known in academic circles, which is why it's important to discuss it in public Symposia like this.

## Slide 6

So how is **teacher-education** dumbed down and become so unethical?

My analysis of the content of modules of teacher-education programmes indicates some of content of the lectures is out of date and/or biased... And looking at a profile of staff members now on a typical university, you'll see links to the UN SDGs and how their work is claimed to 'add value' to the institutional 'impact' because it's addressed one or one or more of the SDGs. And also, in the news at the moment with the Jason Arday controversy, the attention to the diversity, equity and inclusion policies. And the stakeholders are the priority – not the students - because of the way universities are run as businesses. And so that adds to reduced choice in the curriculum the drive towards commercialisation has increased competition for the same students, so it's inevitable how the arts have suffered and overall there's been consolidation of departments.

The flawed mechanisms of the marketing of international university league tables is concerning. These are based on PR - **skewed measurements** and **cherry-picked data** that is not relevant for genuine student-centred learning. For example, the KPIs are often based on ratios of intl staff, biased and subjective student feedback or unsubstantiated employment status after students have graduated. This has no relation to the quality of the teaching student-teachers obtained. Seminars are often run by unqualified staff on a zero hours contract. In NZ unqualified lecturers and postgrad students are often provided with seminar facilitation responsibilities. And they might be on a student/work visa from China for instance, which means they have to work so many hours in order to stay in the country. And so it's not necessarily about the **quality of the work**, it's more about the **quantity** and the students suffer. (Academic Quality Agency (AQA), various)

Students' assessments are often online. More than twenty years of BigTech in academia, and yet this remains a major problem for academic staff today. Why? Well maybe because, counter-intuitively to many academics stuck within, yet still fighting the system, these outcomes (the dumbing-down of teacher-education) is actually the goal.

If some academics cannot recognise AI easily, not having the tools or support needed, what is the universities' policy and how is this problem addressed? Arguably, it's **not** being addressed adequately...

Another issue in the dumbing-down of ethical education is the missing or ambiguous grading criteria. The moderation and the quality issues are a big part of the of the problem, but the PR machinery cleverly disguises any weaknesses and the corporate playbook silences dissent – as I explained a previously.

Finally for this slide, my personal expertise was about quality improvement through observation of teaching and learning in tertiary education, but is teachers' reflection also being hijacked by BigTech as surveillance in classrooms will be undertaken - not by qualified educationalists like me - but by AI. *Where will that lead?*

## Slide 7

My colleagues in this Omniwar Symposium 4 event, have researched and published extensively about the history of the capture of academia, so I refer you to their work and presentations for historical context. In this presentation, I am looking specifically at the modern-day consequences of that history - in particular the development of that early marketisation and neoliberalism into NPM that is stakeholder capitalism.

I illustrate how teacher-education programmes have been captured through **two case study examples** of actual resources for beginning-teachers in the UK and New Zealand. The question I am addressing here is HOW student-teachers' access to broad curricula, good quality teaching and unbiased learning resources is restricted. So, firstly, here is one from a UK teacher-education programme, the curriculum of which - no one should be surprised - is closely connected to another of the Five Eyes countries, Australia.

The University of Nottingham (one of my Alma Maters) is a classic example of a so called 'Top Ranking' institution. It goes without saying how its campus in China and its medical school are closely partnered with BigPharma. But what about its teacher-education dept ? For the purposes of this presentation, I asked them for copies of the latest reading lists, so I could compare these to the documents I kept from my time in the UK. Are you surprised to learn that not much has changed in >13 years? !

Here's one example from the teacher-education curriculum for primary and secondary teachers of **science**. The main 'handbook' for these student-teachers is published in **2009** and produced by **the Edith Cowan University (ECU) in Perth, Australia** with a Foreword by **Hannah Russell**. The ECU partners with (amongst corporates) Apple, IBM and The Wellcome Trust. And who is Hannah Russell? She is now senior in the **British Association** for the **Advancement of Science** a **Wellcome Trust** funded 'non-profit'.

The Wellcome Trust which, alongside the Gates Foundation partnered with the WHO 'Accelerator' project during covid and is one of the largest BigPharma funders of health research globally. As the BMJ investigation highlighted back in 2021, Wellcome Trust's conflicts of interest led to it profiting substantially from the covid era via its own products and its financial ties to Roche, Novartis, Abbott, Siemens, Johnson & Johnson, Merck and other pharma companies.

Incidentally, **Jeremy Farrar** – CEO of Wellcome Trust (image) – is a celebrity media 'expert' - you may remember seeing him as advisor to UK Gov eg through the infamous entity 'SAGE'. (BTW Investigative journalist Johnny Vedmore has published extensive contextual research about Farrar on Unlimited Hangout). Here I have shown, how teacher-education programmes in the UK, mirror those from Australia, in this case sharing literature that is – to be blunt – BigPharma propaganda.

And the situation is no better in another of the Five Eyes, New Zealand.

## Slide 8

The impact of the corporate funding has also skewed the learning resources for beginning-teachers - and limits the ability for dissident staff to be able to add context to the curriculum. Academics with dual roles with the WHO/UN/Gov/PPP grants etc have conflict of interest that are often ignored.

For instance, the limited & **skewed 'core' reading lists** are often due to 'celebrity' gatekeeper academics insisting students in the courses they deliver/oversee use the textbooks they themselves have authored.

The publishers' websites may also contain **flatteringly positive reviews' from these academics' senior management**. Here is an example of one 'Core' textbook from a Bachelor of Teaching from a NZ Uni, where Ass. Prof Wendy Fox-Turnbull [She/Her] is funded by NZ Min of Ed and promotes her own 'Guide for Teachers' in Tech. A scan of this book's contents reveals no meaningful information about Technocracy for beginning teachers (of course not).

Admissions criteria include personal statements and obviously these are sometimes written by AI (how often?) There's very little, if any training for recruitment staff in recognising this flaw, are there adequate control mechanisms in place? The committee which might interview student-teacher applicants face-to-face or over zoom could themselves have conflicts of interest. Certainly, in New Zealand there are close networks, including those of Freemasonry that might manipulate processes - plus we have the added pressures of DEI and Maori student number requirements for each cohort.

I explained earlier in this talk about the pressures of commercialisation in teacher-education. It is common to see in university's marketing materials the phrase: "In response to student feedback..." because acknowledging the 'needs' of paying students has become a priority, often over-ruling basic facts of educational theory. For instance, assessment types have been dumbed-down; rather than two or maybe three exam-condition essays that lectures can use to check levels of understanding, modules are reduced to quizzes that have multiple-choice answers, a groupwork exercise and a 'blog post reflection'. The latter sometimes has no formal assessment at all!

And finally, Bigtech has hijacked academia. Teacher-educators are struggling to keep up with the impact of fast-paced technology on research and classroom practice. But up-to-date, effective training for academic staff in terms of safe use the technology, data harvesting risks etc. is rare. Back in 2013, when I was still affiliated to an institution, some of my colleagues did not have sufficient IT skills for a valid online search, let alone understand the hidden dangers of technocracy. More than ten years later, has anything changed?

## Slide 9

And that leads me to the topic of the creation of the educational experts.

Alongside this new public management has been the creation of so-called experts, with a celebrity social media following. It is incredible how 'likes and shares' on social media of a particular article, apparently, adds to a university's KPIs and kudos to that academic's researching outputs. This is rather bizarre, especially now that some of those likes and shares can actually be as a result of trolls and AI algorithms that are completely synthetic (Carrigan, 2019, 2021).

So, the professional training aimed at creating experts in education has definitely evolved. I've witnessed it over the last 10 years in New Zealand where knowledge is seen as a business skill and reports that thinktanks and pseudo-academic 'centres' publish are not genuine academic work (but portrayed as that to the public), eg their methodology is often very poor quality or based on modelling.

It's worth breaking off briefly at this point to explain that in specialised disciplines like teacher-education curriculum development, even when text HAS undergone academic peer review, it rarely functions as an authentic or anonymous feedback strategy. This is acutely the case in sparse populations like New Zealand. For instance, academics maybe aware of current studies and recognise methods and writing styles of PhD students/colleagues. The complex power relationships within the competitive '[publish or perish](#)' environment can restrict professional dialogue. A university's Public Relations (PR) department can also accompany calls from managers for the suppression of certain research findings – as I explained above - and use spin to disguise unethical practices. When that doesn't work, lawyers are often called in to silence uncomfortable inquiry (as we saw with the case of Jason Arday at Cambridge University).

As I have published on my website, I've undertaken many investigations into both 'academic' and pseudo-academic outputs by these 'experts' and subsequently made formal complaints about them to the relevant authorities. Without success. For instance, the University of Canberra, funded by the **Google News Initiative** are pushing the use of **Wikipedia in their teacher-education departments** and marketing parents to encourage their kids to use Wikipedia as a "reliable and accurate knowledge resource". We know how skewed Wikipedia is. It's certainly not a reliable source of knowledge. But the University of Canberra's 'experts' were paid by the Google News Initiative to formulate a fake piece of research and to publish it as a PR exercise for them, this is what academia has become, an unethical puppet of BigTech. When asked to comment on any criticism, there is either no response at all, or a non-response from the institution's lawyers.

On the right hand side of this slide, are some images of the teacher-education entity NZ "Teach 1<sup>st</sup>" senior management team and just a brief look at these people's profiles tells us that they're not academically trained. Like many other NZ 'experts' perhaps aspects of their context (eg DEI) have promoted them into powerful educational gatekeeper positions.

## Slide 10

Before I draw my talk to a close with some recommendations for what we can do about all these problems with the capture of teacher-education, I want to present some evidence about another aspect of HOW the censorship gets so entrenched.

Research revealed that between 2017 and 2019, UK universities [spent nearly £90m paying-off staff](#) with non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) or “gagging orders”. But this is likely to have increased since then. Also, is this the tip of the iceberg? Some Freedom of Information Act requests are rejected if funding is connected to public/private partnerships. The rationale being the information is ‘commercially sensitive’. NDAs are strategies used by captured academia globally and have undoubtedly increased substantially in the context of Covid era censorship, propaganda and vaccine mandates.

NDAs are ubiquitous in New Zealand where employment law is ambiguous and unions are weak – trust between employer/ee is low, leading many toxic workplaces. I am a victim of bullying myself, so I do know a bit about NDAs and other strategies that are involved. And I did do some research into how much was spent by New Zealand universities during the covid era, in these gagging clauses. To give you one example, Auckland University of Technology (AUT) has a large teacher-training and nursing school. They appointed **356 academic staff members** over the last **5 years** and **58** staff left, probably more by now.

In 2020 before covid vaccine mandates were initiated in NZ, there was a drastic increase in NDAs from AUT from single figures to 22 per annum. And in 2021 it was 15. And in 2022, the levels returned to normal (3). So you can see the drastic impact this period had on this institution alone. The total costs were undisclosed, but I did discover what the other universities paid out to buy silence, so we can calculate a rough average of NZ\$50,000 per staff member. Extrapolating that data, over just 2 years (2021/2) a total of approximately, **NZ\$1.8m was paid by NZ Universities in NDAs.**

Many of those payouts would have been to those who were not toeing the line, not complying or in some way not adhering to the narrative. But this raises more questions than it answers. What happened to those individuals? How many were involved in teacher-education or similar qualifications? And what are the **actual costs of this censorship?** Financial and otherwise. What about the students in all this? We don't necessarily know the full extent of the financial costs, but the longer-term harm to teacher-education and subsequently to our classrooms is unknown.

## Slide 11

There are a number of formally-registered institutions and entities which CLAIM to be offering a space for freedom-loving, independent higher-education academics. Sounds

fantastic – liberal education, no Government or corporate interference, genuine academic freedom, intellectual rigour...But are they really what they claim? First, I need to pre-empt any critique with the acknowledgement that many of these entities do indeed do good work. Dissenting voices are (sometimes) heard, lawfare cases are sometimes won, bullying and harassment victims are sometimes vindicated. The recent successful case of Prof David Miller at the University of Bristol is a useful example of how justice for academic free speech can win in the end. But this can take years of commitment, emotional and financial difficulties - with no guarantees.

The main names in this space can be roughly divided into two types. First, the 'membership' groups of academics, and sometimes students, from multiple universities within a country or internationally. Often with a 'constitution' or Open Letter that binds members together in a memorandum of understanding.

AND secondly stand-alone online and/or physical spaces that house 'independent thinkers' with university-equivalent courses and/or qualifications.

The latter claims to offer an 'alternative' to the traditional university system, a type of 'parallel community' approach. The former takes the 'change from within' approach, claiming that academics in employment can help shape the system's future. Unfortunately, my opinion is that neither of these current options offer transparent, genuine academic freedom.

## Slide 12

I've listed some examples here. And discernment may lead to disappointment.

In the UK Dennis Hayes' Academics For Academic Freedom (AFAF) started life back in 2006, and he was well-ahead of the game when he co-authored a book with one of my past Professors at Nottingham, Kathryn Ecclestone about the *[Dangerous Rise of Therapeutic Education](#)*. AFAF has grown exponentially since covid. But this group is problematic for a number of reasons – their close partnership with what David A Hughes might describe as a "Camp 3" entity, Toby Young's 'Free Speech Union' is one. Last year, their conference hosted Claire Fox as a Keynote Speaker after having participated at the Jordan Peterson ARC conference – which investment bank Legatum funds (something I've researched, written about and discussed extensively).

Heterodox Academy was founded in 2015 by Jonathan Haidt famous co-author of the *Coddling of the American Mind* – which interestingly is along the same theme as Hayes & Ecclestone's book, I just mentioned) and billionaire lawyer Nicholas Rosenkranz. Based in the US, their partnerships with Yale, Stamford and Harvard alongside the usual corporate Foundations and *Hollywood* - pose inevitable questions as to its authenticity. Generally, the

themes from their articles and events about covid are 'lessons were learned from the Government's mistakes (for next time)'.

**Australians for Science and Freedom (ASF)** founded by UNSW Prof Gigi Foster and LSE Prof Paul Frijters (both behavioural economists). Fee-paying members of this group have regular virtual and face-to-face meetings within the institutions they critique. Frijters is an established 'expert' consultant for modelling quality of life data, with systems adopted across the world (including NZ) and an academic role in UAE. Foster is Deputy head of dept (Economics) and head of education at UNSW. Importantly, she is co-developer, coordinator and instructor (since 2021) of the elective Masters course '**Policy Applications of Behavioural Economics**'. She admits that this qualification supports the recruitment and training for the Australian Nudge Unit 'BETA'. More on these academics in a moment.

## Slide 13

It's worth noting that many of these academics inevitably cross-pollinate between these groups and their own institutions to promote their books, research and teaching. Interestingly, there seems to be a common denominator of economics, banking and business disciplines involved. The three physical institutions I want to mention at this point are Hillsdale College, the University of Austin in Texas (US) and Academia Libera Mentis (ALM) in Belgium.

Due diligence on these institutions' founders, funding and structures reveals problematic issues. **Hillsdale College** is a well-established US non-profit, with a complicated history that began in 1850. I have a soft spot for Hillsdale; it has a strong Christian ethos and I undertook some of its free, online courses during covid - a positive learning experience. Hillsdale's claims of being totally independent from US Gov funding are not strictly true – US veterans receive educational re-training 'credits' which are donated - funding which forms its main declared income.

University of Austin at Texas - UATX – a new institution (2024) again claims to be formed from commitments to academic freedom and critical thinking, yet it conforms to the US educational framework and policies. In its favour, it promotes meritocracy for admissions criteria. But it's board of trustees is full of international corporate names from Bigtech names like PayPal and Palantir to prominent Trump administration members. Peter Thiel features prominently on their list of donors.

ALM – a chateau in Belgium, not too far from Brussels EU HQ was apparently bought by the Frijters 'life savings' – his prominent intl academic career, his wife, Erika had a career in BigPharma. The target audience is stated as Oxbridge's 'elite of the elite', apparently a reference to the founders' own adult children's attendance there. It is independent in terms of its qualifications are not endorsed by any external body. But access to an academic library – perhaps the biggest hurdle for any truly independent study - is not provided. The courses

seem to be based on an informal guidance schemes, with students benefitting from resources provided by their academic mentors. Overall then, discernment in seeking authentic 'academic freedom' from the censorship and corporate playbook that is so well embedded in the university systems worldwide, often leads to disappointment. **Teacher-education programmes** in particular, appear to be completely absent from these entities and institutions.

## Slide 14

What are some ways to overcome these well-established strategies of capture and seek true academic freedom?

So, for the last few minutes, I'm going to suggest practical ways we can fight back against this capture of academia and overcome these challenges - esp for younger people and children in today's classrooms. I took this photo of some books that – in stark contrast to the reading lists in the existing captured university teacher-education programmes - I could recommend - in fact I would INSIST any new teachers read and digest *before* embarking on their career path. Maybe starting with Orwell's 1984. A question to our audience: **which books or other resources would you like to include on a new uncaptured reading list for beginning teachers?**

Learning about Propaganda Theory I consider a top priority, in current curricula it is usually dismissed as a topic belonging to history, particularly Nazi Germany – this is deliberately misleading. The MINDSPACE report to UK Gov, is a useful learning resource. Monetary theory is also a top priority – drawing from my own current teaching experience of assessing mature students' needs.

Alongside this, acquiring more hard copies of out-of-print and censored texts, and also older (vintage/pre-covid) books, independent library resources, dictionaries, thesaurus, maps, encyclopaedia(s) etc. is crucial.

Remember research has proven over and over again how the written word, read and written down by hand, is far more powerful at creating and retaining knowledge than anything seen online.

Maybe there are strategic ways that these hard copy texts can 'infiltrate' those captured seminar rooms within academia? Can we instigate a vigilante group of 'old-fashioned' debaters? **Learning by example is powerful**; show them. Become a role-model to others, especially young people at university. Learn and share how to find info from these hard copy books quickly and effectively and keep good records of discoveries.

Another good idea for researcher-educators is to make a list of 'reputable authors' in your discipline – compare their worldview with yours/others. Bookmark useful 'fact-checking'

websites: eg Charities Services, Companies Register, Wayback Machine, public library catalogue and online archive resources etc.

The homeschooling movement is growing enormously. We can all support homeschoolers, parents/guardians etc by sharing our knowledge and encouraging curiosity. IMHO Attempts at creating independent 'freedom' universities have so far fallen short of those academic's claims and our own expectations. We need a new, open conversation about what role university will play in our future of parallel communities... Maybe there is a need for a return to those ancient methods of scholarly knowledge transfer over time, with respected mentors and apprenticeship models?

Finally – one recommendation that is super easy for everyone to do to help - and free: Read & share research of independent academics like us!

## Slide 15 References

Will add these references to the show notes too. There are many more if needed.

Thank you for your attention, and I appreciate your support for the Omniwar 4 symposium. Please do let me know any questions, feedback or comments either on my website [ursulaedgington.com](http://ursulaedgington.com) or via this event contact details.