



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on December 22, 2021

Published in the January 17, 2022 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 38, No. 01

DOJ Declares War on Parents

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) uses counterterrorism tools to target parents opposing such policies in public schools as Marxist Critical Race Theory (CRT), LGBT issues, sexually explicit books in libraries, and face-mask requirements. That shocking revelation became public on November 16, when the House Judiciary Committee presented a leaked FBI e-mail provided by an anonymous whistleblower in the Biden administration.



AP Images

The bureau e-mail shows that the FBI had created a system to track so-called threats against school-board officials and administrators. Signed by Counterterrorism Division Assistant Director Timothy Langan and former Criminal Division Assistant Director Calvin Shivers, it reads:

The Counterterrorism and Criminal divisions created a threat tag, EDUOFFICIALS, to track instances of related threats.... The purpose of the threat tag is to help scope this threat on a national level and provide an opportunity for comprehensive analysis of the threat picture for effective engagement with law enforcement partners at all levels.

The e-mail says the move was made in response to Attorney General Merrick Garland's memorandum, issued on October 4, in which he expressed the department's commitment "to using its authority and resources to discourage these threats, identify them when they occur, and prosecute them when appropriate."

The disclosed FBI e-mail is dated October 20, just a day before Garland [testified](#) to the Judiciary Committee that he could not "imagine any circumstance in which the Patriot Act would be used in the circumstances of parents complaining about their children, nor ... a circumstance where they would be labeled as domestic terrorists."

During that hearing, Garland vehemently denied targeting parents speaking out against the policies of their local school boards as "terrorists" and stressed how he respects parents' First Amendment-protected rights:

I want to be clear. The Justice Department supports and defends the First Amendment right of parents to complain as vociferously as they wish about the education of their children, about the curriculum taught in the schools. That is not what the memorandum is about at all, nor does it use the words "domestic terrorism" or "PATRIOT Act."

However, even though the memorandum in question does not contain such words, it did not prevent Garland from assigning the National Security Division (NSD) — a part of the DOJ that is tasked with addressing *terrorist threats* and that was created by the PATRIOT Act — to the newly created task force aimed at addressing "the rise in criminal conduct directed toward school personnel."



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on December 22, 2021

Published in the January 17, 2022 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 38, No. 01

When asked about the involvement of the NSD, which has very specific anti-terrorism functions, Garland could not provide any direct answers, and only repeated that “it is only about the threats of violence” against the school-board members and educators. He said “this is not about what happens at the school boards’ meetings.”

But why would the DOJ even consider employing its anti-terrorism division against parents in the first place — especially when local law enforcement can handle any unruly parents perfectly well, as numerous incidents at school-board meetings have shown?

“Terrorist Threat”

It all started with a letter penned by the National School Boards Association (NSBA) to President Joe Biden on September 29. In that letter, the NSBA urged the president to “deal with the growing number of threats of violence and acts of intimidation occurring across the nation” carried out by “angry mobs” of “individuals.”

The organization opened the letter with the dramatic claim that America’s “educational leaders are under an immediate threat,” as it pleaded for “federal law enforcement and other assistance” to deal with that threat. Where did the threat come from?

The letter further explained that angry individuals — the word “parents” was never used in the letter — were engaged in numerous “violent” actions.

According to the NSBA, the activist parents disrupted school-board meetings and penned “threatening letters” to school-board members over such policies as masking and the teaching of CRT.

The NSBA complained, for example, about a letter from an Ohio parent sent to a school-board member:

“You are forcing them [children] to wear masks — for no reason in this world other than control. And for that you will pay dearly.” Among other incendiaries, this same threat also calls the school board member a “filthy traitor,” implies loss of pension funds, and labels the school board as Marxist.

In recent months, school districts across the nation have seen demonstrations of angry parents demanding that school boards drop what those parents view as harmful policies. There have been numerous confrontations between parents and education officials at school-board meetings, and the letter mentioned some of them explicitly.

As one illustration of “threatening” behavior, the NSBA letter mentioned that a [Michigan parent](#) gave a Nazi salute during a debate about masking, implying the school-board members were acting like Nazis for mandating that children wear masks at school.

The organization called on President Biden to issue an executive order that would serve to protect school officials and school-board members from parents by reviewing “appropriate enforceable actions against these crimes and acts of violence under the Gun-Free School Zones Act, the PATRIOT Act in regards to domestic terrorism, the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, the Violent Interference with Federally Protected Rights statute, [and] the Conspiracy Against Rights statute.”



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on December 22, 2021

Published in the January 17, 2022 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 38, No. 01

NSBA Disavows the Letter

While the bureaucratic machine is infamous for being slow, it worked surprisingly fast this time: Mere days after the NSBA sent its letter, the nation's top legal advisor vowed to take action.

Interestingly, while no evidence of actual violence was ever presented in the letter, which instead relied on media reports of “unruly behavior” of participants at the school-board meetings, that “data” was the primary source for Attorney General Garland's actions.

During the House Judiciary Committee hearings, Representative Jim Jordan (R-Ohio) asked Garland where he got the data regarding the so-called disturbing uptick of threats and intimidation directed at school-board members and teachers, to which Garland responded, “Well, I've read the letter.” He added that the NSBA is a large organization, and this, presumably, makes the letter credible.

Large though it may be — NSBA represents more than 90,000 school-board members and “educates” some 51 million students in the United States — it appeared that it failed to consult with local chapters and even its own board of directors when writing the letter. Instead, it was in touch with the Biden administration!



Get those masks off our kids: Parents across the country have shown up at school-board meetings and confronted board members over school mask mandates. For this, they have been labeled domestic terror threats. *(Photo credit: kevajefimija/iStock/GettyImagesPlus)*

A trove of NSBA e-mails, obtained by the nonprofit group Parents Defending Education (PDE) through a Freedom of Information Act request, showed that NSBA President Viola Garcia and CEO Chip Slaven had been consulting with the White House for “several weeks” on the details of the controversial letter before it was made public.

Slaven indicated that the White House had requested that specific information be included in the final version of the letter. Specifically, the White House requested information on the “specific threats, so the letter also details many of the incidents that were occurring.”

As a result of this apparent “back room” dealing with the Biden administration, NSBA chapters from 23 states have distanced themselves from the letter, arguing that the association's national leadership overstepped its bounds and violated the constitutional authority of local school boards to manage the



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on December 22, 2021

Published in the January 17, 2022 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 38, No. 01

public-school systems in their states. At least 17 state school-board associations have since withdrawn from the NSBA.

Facing such a backlash, the association disavowed the letter and issued an apology to its chapters. The board explained that while “the safety of school board members, other public school officials, and students is our top priority, and there remains important work to be done on this issue, there was no justification for some of the language included in the letter.”

So did the DOJ change its course of action following those developments? Of course not. On the contrary, it keeps insisting there is some kind of an evil terrorist plot that requires the toughest of government crackdowns.

It also appears that Attorney General Merrick Garland could have lied under oath to Congress when testifying that the federal government did not treat parents like terrorists, when FBI e-mails show that this was indeed how parents were being treated.

Behind the War on Parents

America First Legal (AFL), a conservative nonprofit legal organization, has requested the Office of Inspector General (OIG) to investigate Attorney General Merrick Garland’s order. In its request, AFL argued that while parents’ opposition to such public school policies as the teaching of CRT and perverted gender-related ideology grew, the “Biden administration stakeholders,” such as the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and others, were trying to “oppress, threaten, and intimidate parents” to prevent them from speaking out.

Since these efforts, “though extensive, have generally proven ineffectual,” the powerful lobby decided to silence the parents by launching a “potential federal action” against them, for which it employed unnamed administration officials. Among those officials are “a key Biden Domestic Policy Council official” and a “White House staff” member. Senior DOJ officials, “including at least one political appointee in the department’s Civil Rights Division,” are also implicated in the unconstitutional targeting of parents, AFL stated.

If those allegations are true, then the whole “war on parents” and weaponization of the DOJ and FBI was orchestrated by the powerful teachers unions — major Democrat donors — in collaboration with top Biden administration officials.

Leaving aside the fact that the federal government has absolutely no constitutional authority to get involved in the education of children in the first place, if the Biden administration really cared about resolving the situation, it would not criminalize parents, but would instead try to understand and address their legitimate concerns. But why would Biden do that, if, as many suspect, degrading, dividing, and dumbing-down a growing generation is the actual goal?

Veronika Kyrylenko, Ph.D. is a research associate at GeoStrategic Analysis (Arlington, Va.) and freelance writer whose work has appeared at the Western Journal, American Thinker, The Hill, and other publications.



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on December 22, 2021

Published in the January 17, 2022 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 38, No. 01

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.