

The Seamless Web: *Minnesota's New Education System*

17 The Master Plan

Minnesota's new system of education was outlined by the National Center for Education and the Economy (NCEE), Marc Tucker President, back in 1989. (See chapter 1 of this manual). The architects of the plan, however, knew they were facing two formidable obstacles. First of all, they knew their plan was unconstitutional. Secondly, they knew that the citizens would reject the new system if they realized that it was being orchestrated out of Washington D.C. In a briefing paper called, "The New Standards Project: An Overview," the NCEE described its plan to overcome these obstacles. It said:

We are also sensitive to the resistance that the idea (nationalizing education) is likely to encounter if it is perceived (correctly) as led by the federal government. But it is equally important that the development program be perceived to have the kind of legitimacy that comes from strong participation on the part of key officials from general government and education. [Emphasis added].¹⁴¹

That is, the NCEE realized that it would have to create the impression that the new system of education was being developed by the state and local levels of government. How could it create that false perception? NCEE described its plans for doing so as follows:

For all these reasons, our plan, on which we are now embarked, calls for assembling a volunteer group of states and school districts to guide the initial development effort. All the members will be required, as a condition of participation, to commit themselves to the general principles just outlined in (the new system of education). [Emphasis added].¹⁴²

In other words, the NCEE planned to create the perception that the radical changes in education were being conceptualized and developed at the state and local level, when the whole system was actually being orchestrated by the NCEE. What would be the result of this deception? NCEE said that its scheme would give the appearance of being "a model that is neither bottom up nor top down, but rather both at once."¹⁴³

As is blatantly stated in the above quotations, NCEE embarked in this master plan – to sell the new system to the public by creating the false impression that it was a local system – when everything was actually being managed from Washington D.C. by the NCEE. Since Marc Tucker is a close associate of Bill and Hillary Clinton, making the federal government the primary change-agent for the revolution was a forgone conclusion. (See the Tucker letter to Hillary Clinton in the Appendix.) As a consequence, the new system of education was written into Goals 2000 and School-to-Work which then became the vehicles for carrying out the master plan.

The NCEE, in turn, coached the states on how to control their own citizens by using the same strategy.¹⁴⁴ In Minnesota this plan meant creating various citizen advisory boards and committees to supposedly help develop the state plan. These committees were a façade. That is why they all came up with the same proposals. *They existed for one reason – to manipulate the citizens of Minnesota into thinking they had a voice in the*

new system when they actually were being denied their rightful voice. The whole program was actually being orchestrated out of St. Paul and Washington D.C.

This deceit is a microcosm of the new system of education. It is deliberately designed to manipulate the citizens of our state and nation into thinking they are involved in real decisions, when they are actually being used. The citizens' proper role in a free society is being denied while they are being manipulated by elitist revolutionaries in Washington.

¹⁴¹ Learning Research and Development Center and the National Center on Education and the Economy, "The New Standards Project: An Overview," August 1992, no page numbers given.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ National Center on Education and the Economy, "Workforce Skills Program," no page numbers given.