

I made the following transcript from a tape recording of a broadcast
by Pacifica Radio Network station WBAI-FM (99.5) 505 Eighth Ave., 19th
Fl. New York, NY 10018 (212) 279-0707

* * * * *

GARY NULL: There's a lot in our educational system that we're not
teaching that should be a part of the curricula. I've invited someone
who is now on the line. My guest is Beverly Eckman. She's an author.
She's an educator. She is a person concerned in the areas of
politics, education and public affairs. She has served as the chief
speech writer for such figures as Richard Carlson, the Director of the
Voice of America, and Chief Justice Warren Burger, and for groups.

She has also written for various publications. Welcome to the program,
Bev. Let's go to some allegations. And I'd like you to address them in
detail, with documentation for each allegation.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Alright. The allegations on educating for the New
World Order, first and foremost, are that the Federal Government is
developing and establishing curriculum in violation of Federal law.
The state governments have the right to establish curriculum, but not
the Federal Government.

Secondly, that testing and curriculum are connected to each other, and
that both are coordinated and funded using Federal dollars (and that

is what took four years to uncover) in such a way that the Federal Government would pick up on it.

Thirdly, that the U.S. Department of Education is in collusion with the Carnegie organization -- primarily with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (There are others and they all trade money back and forth. But mainly, it's the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching); and that they are also in collusion with state education agencies, which they have revamped and restructured, so that they could help turn around the educational system in a completely different fashion, dedicating it to totally different ends, which we can talk about in just a moment.

That brings me right into the fourth allegation: Privacy Act violations are rampant, particularly with regard to the computerization of testing and survey devices in conjunction with the use of social security numbers and other identifiers which permit data to be linked with the Federal and state computer systems. And, of course, that does lead to this dossier-building capability that we can also talk about in just a moment.

The fifth allegation is that state and Federal education agencies are fraudulently passing off attitudinal, psychological and behavioral surveys, studies, tests and curricula as academics and substantive learning. In fact, Bob Gray of the Privacy Office up there in Washington said that our best case probably was fraud. He had the fraud hotline, as a matter of fact. And he said that it was one of the

best cases of fraud he'd ever heard.

The sixth allegation -- and this is from the professional literature associated with the testing and survey devices that we found via computer. Those learning programs -- when you get the administrative literature and the interpretive literature -- state plainly what the thrust of the materials are. But this information is kept from parents and the casual investigator. In other words, when they came out of the computer, if they were psychological therapy, it said so. But nothing like that is stamped on the material once the teacher has it in hand or when the parents get hold of it.

The seventh allegation is that in the process of refining these attitudinal, psychological and behavioral strategies that are being used in the classroom, the Government, through its tax-supported labs and centers (which is where a lot of this stuff comes out of) is supporting a policy of irresponsible scientific experimentation. That is, the Government is subsidizing the practice of medicine without a license, in effect. The experiments are poorly controlled, the repercussions are not fully understood, and the strategies themselves are often not fully accepted by professionals in the field.

And finally, the last thing: the book alleges that a political weapon is being created, wittingly or unwittingly, as the result of computerization, which allows personal information to be linked in such a way as to generate dossiers on individuals and families, demographic, religious and ethnic groups.

The way I weave the story together is through a Pennsylvania woman named Anita Hoag who basically uncovered it because of the complaint that she lodged back in 1986. And what we found is that the state bureaucracies, the state education agencies, the way they are configured today, are serving as the fall-guys. They are really taking the heat off the Federal Government by making it look like these are decentralized policies -- that these are state initiatives, when they're really not.

These initiatives, for instance, to do testings and to set goals according to behavioral objectives these are Federal mandates, and you have to go very far into it to find that and really hold that over their heads. And then finally they will admit, yes these were Federal mandates. Yes, we had to do this.

GARY NULL: Alright. Let's look at this in a larger context. What you seem to be saying is that the Federal Government or certain agencies of the Federal Government have taken it upon themselves to have a special agenda in education; in effect, creating a curriculum that would allow a whole group of people to be educated based upon what they consider "right thinking", "right philosophy", "right attitudes." Now, of course, those are going to be "right" based upon the people who created them.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Exactly.

GARY NULL: And they are not taking into consideration individual, cultural and religious differences. They are simply saying: "We all should think the same way to serve a particular political agenda." In effect, we are creating a nation (in a lesser form) of a "Manchurian Candidate" attitude.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Yes, that's correct. That's a good way of putting it.

GARY NULL: In other words, we want everyone to be in line so that whoever may be in control economically and politically whatever they would suggest, whatever policies, programs, platforms or laws they would pass -- there would be no opposition to it because the educational system would have KEPT people on "THE RIGHT" side of the issue, which is THEIR side.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: That's correct. And another thing that they want to do is to choose the "RIGHT PEOPLE" to be in positions of authority. You don't want these kids coming out of school and having the "WRONG" attitudes, but then, to make matters worse, to go into the "WRONG" fields where they have a lot of influence.

It's sort of like how we choose our potential Olympic champions. We look for them among the young. And this is, more or less, what these people are doing too. They're scouting, in many ways, through these tests. And those are the ones who are going to get into the best colleges and universities.

They DO track this information on up to your college years and beyond. Now they can do it even beyond. They haven't, so far, but they can, as of the past couple of years.

GARY NULL: Alright. Let's look at some specifics. We can accept, then, that there is a hidden agenda at the national level where they're controlling curriculum, which, by law, they're not allowed to control.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: That's correct.

GARY NULL: We also know that there are a lot of political implications for these dossiers that they're keeping on children and their families, so they can hand-pick the ones who are of the "RIGHT" belief and exclude those who are of the "WRONG" belief. So, theoretically, if you were a Jewish Orthodox person, immediately you're going to be of the "WRONG" belief.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: That's right. In fact, they want to wipe out religion, it seems, as much as possible. They don't care what religion it is. All religion is fair game because that, apparently, does not go along with their agenda at all. But when you say "a political agenda", we're really saying that a political weapon is being created. No one knows who is going to be sitting at the helm of world affairs in another twenty years. We can't look into the crystal ball and predict that with real accuracy. And these people want to BE sitting at the head of world affairs in the next twenty years. This is what they have in mind. They want to be controlling world affairs, even if they are not

physically sitting in that seat. They want to be able to control that seat.

So this is one thing that I've found that political liberals and political conservatives, and various religious groups, and what-not can all agree on. They all hate the idea of this dossier-building.

While some people may think: "Well gee, if a kid's attitude is bad, change it." This sounds reasonable. And the political liberals, for example, can go along with this. Even some religious groups can go along with that part of it. But when you start getting into the dossier-building capability, then all of a sudden the eyebrows start going up.

GARY NULL: But let's back-track for a moment, Bev. Let's say that you are a conservative or you are liberal, and let's say for our argument's sake because about seventy-five percent of this audience is either Catholic or Jewish, and we have a high Orthodox listenership to this particular show. And this is the most listened-to [radio] show in America right now. So it's a good sampling [of people] for what we're going to deal with right now. THESE people -- let's say these people in this audience; these two particular religious groups and both conservatives and liberals Now I'm sure that most people would agree that if someone has an attitude that is dysfunctional to their values and beliefs which is anti-human --meaning it denies the quality and virtue of life or spirit or body -- that they want to take some remedial action. That's why they listen to this show. If someone is destroying their body with sugar or with

smoking or with alcohol or with over-eating, they want to correct it. But that's a big difference from someone who is told: We have an agenda that will take a "WRONG" belief system and correct it. Now suddenly, you're getting into the area of: What are you going to correct about our beliefs?

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Well you're also getting into one other thing too. And that is "informed consent." The person who wants to change the bad habit -- the smoking or whatever it happens to be -- he/she is doing this with full knowledge and understanding. I mean, if he wants to do this by hypnosis, that's his business. If she knows what she is going into or in the case of a parent doing it for the child, parents typically have control over their children. Some parents do what is wrong. That's true. But we cannot punish all parents for what a few might do. And so you get into this "informed consent problem," as well.

GARY NULL: Alright. Well let's go specifically to this one question: How are attitudes corrected? In other words, how do they change the so-called "WRONG" belief, and what do they change it into?

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Well, the way in which it is done is by what is called "strands". And those are I guess the best way to put it is mini-courses, mini-classes which are inter-disciplinary in nature. They are spread out through the subject areas; all subject areas: English, history, whatever. And they're brought in at opportune

moments. They consist of films sometimes. Sometimes it's just a social type of exercise, like a lifeboat exercise which I'm sure a lot of you have heard about. Various things like that. And they're brought in through what is called the "intermediate unit". At least that's what it's called in Pennsylvania. Some places call it the "educational special unit" or something like that. Other states call it by different names, but it all amounts to the same thing.

The "intermediate unit" is a van, and it carries these materials from one school district to another, and even to private schools that accept federal funds.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: And those materials do not go through the typical process of adoption, like text book adoption. They do not have to be passed by any watch-dog organization, local or otherwise. You can just take them on through. Now these strands are behavioral in nature. They are psychological in nature. And it is a way to undercut, in many cases, the value system.

For example ... I'm going to get real specific here. Take the value of individualism. Now that is really not a value, in itself. It is an attitude. The values that UNDERLIE individualism are what they're going to target. They're not going to come in taking individualism off the top, so to speak, or attacking individualism, off the top. What they'll do instead is to go after self-sufficiency, independence and ambition. Those are the values or the beliefs -- the sub-structure that supports the ethic of individualism.

If you have mini-courses scattered throughout all the other subjects -- hard-hitting, feeling types of exercises and films that unfailingly portray self-sufficiency, independence and ambition in an unfavorable light, eventually, you're going to weaken the sub-structure. And individualism will be history.

What we don't realize today is that the field of psychology HAS come far enough to be able to do that. Yes, in many cases, psychology is a quack science, or it's not a true science. BUT, the behaviorists DO know how to brain-wash selectively. And they ARE doing it.

If you don't believe it, look at the statistics on youth gangs. What is a gang? It's a group. And one of the goals that they say in their interpretive literature is the point of their testing and their curriculum is "WILLINGNESS TO CONFORM TO GROUP GOALS."

GARY NULL: That's a DANGEROUS concept!

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Yeah.

GARY NULL: My God, that means a rule by consensus. Think of all the things that an uneducated, non-individualistically-thinking society would agree to. That allows naziism -- that allows fascism to exist.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: You've got it.

GARY NULL: And look at Germany. Certainly there was no society in the last hundred years that was more regimented in its need to believe absolutely in a single principle, and NOT to challenge it. That was the German educational system. And that was created by a man named Spora in 1929 and carried forward right through the entire Third Reich, where you did not have an opportunity in curriculum to challenge the beliefs. You did not have individualism. You had complete authoritarianism.

And look at the Japanese. As a culture today, it is extremely rigidified, racist in the extreme. As a SOCIETY, it's racist. There are INDIVIDUALS who are not. But anyone who challenges the notion should go live there, and you'll see, very blatantly, this it's frequently understated; politically, it certainly is, for its own survival. But it has an extremely tenacious anger toward other cultures in its own elitism and its idea of being best. Women are kept in their place. They are not given equality; not respected for being multi-dimensional human beings.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: This is true. Of course, it's always under the cover of respecting diversity and all that kind of stuff. But when you really get into it, they want the homogenized man [person]. And it's very interesting now, with the demise of the former Soviet Union, that they're sticking to this in such a rigid way (I'm talking about the behaviorists, that is) -- the homogenized man [person]. You know, after all the things that Stalin tried to do, and that Hitler tried to do in order to get RID of differences and diversity, and what-not. And

it didn't really work because nationalism reared its ugly head worse than ever.

But still, they're sticking to this idea. And it's very interesting.

GARY NULL: Well do you see how much there is of that mindset again today in Germany?

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Yes. It didn't die out. Did it?

GARY NULL: No. And the consensus vote recently on the skinheads brutalizing, hurting and killing these poor and homeless immigrants was that they SUPPORTED this nationalistic fervor. It shows you how regressive people can be.

And also, think of it this way. Going back to this 60 MINUTES show last night on the environment. Being in the environmental movement for twenty-nine years; being with the original Citizens for Clean Air and all the work and the really tough go we had back then, just trying to make people aware that they have some responsibility to their environment, and being looked upon as if you were a nut. Now it's gotten to the point where collectively, EN MASSE, anything that is not of the "RIGHT" thinking, meaning that if you are going to change the environment, you're going to cause job-loss. That's their knee-jerk reaction. Nothing else. If there is anything that is not of the "RIGHT" thinking, destroy that which challenges it. And so, they're willing to burn the homes of their own friends, their own neighbors.

There's a danger that can be created from a mass socio-pathic

BEVERLY ECKMAN: ... a mass mindset. Yes. I think this is the worst part of this. And, of course, these behaviorists ... they KNOW what they're doing. They know EXACTLY what they're doing. That's their business.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: And it is to create a mindset that is a mob -- mob temper tantrums, so to speak, mob rule. Now they call it something else. They call it "the delphi" technique, or they call it "consensus", but it comes down to the same thing.

GARY NULL: Give us an example of how these educators or the behavioral scientists are doing this.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Okay. Do you mean in curriculum or in testing?

GARY NULL: In both.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Okay. Well let's look at our testing first because I think this will give us a kind of a hint of what's going on. You know, these tests are kept very, very secret. A parent can't get hold of them. A TEACHER can't see them. A United States senator can't even see them. This is what really tipped us off, in the first place, that something very peculiar was going on. So let's talk about some of these tough questions: the ones that they're exempting from freedom of information and hiding from parents so that the kids, supposedly,

won't know the answers, and so that the validity of their precious tests won't be compromised.

Well, here's a real toughy:

"Morton has been playing hard all afternoon with his friends. He comes home a few minutes before supper. If I were Morton, I would take a shower or a bath before supper when I knew: A) I had already taken a shower that morning. B) I didn't smell too bad. (Notice the grammar on that one.) C) I would miss my favorite TV show."

Or how about this one:

"Norma is home alone. She gets a headache. She goes to the medicine cabinet and finds her mother's headache pills. If I were Norma, I would take one of my mother's pills when I thought: A) it was the same kind of headache my mother gets. B) the pill might stop my headache quickly. C) my parents might not like me to take it."

You have to think about that one, but you don't have to think about it too hard if you understand what they're looking for in all this. And what they're looking for is There are six things:

- 1) Locus of Control: In other words, who controls you? Is it your parents, yourself or your peers? Basically, these are the three choices.

2) Willingness to Receive Stimuli: Do you take it all in or do you shut some of it out?

3) Amenability to Change: Are you flexible, in other words. Will you change easily or are you going to be a hard-liner?

4) Level of Group Conformity: The way they put it is, "willingness to conform to group goals and willingness to obey authority," which sounds good (the "obey authority" part) until you realize that the authority they're talking about is not necessarily an authority figure who is recognized, such as parents or the police or something of that nature. They're talking about any figure that passes itself off as an authority figure.

So these are the things they're looking for. And if you look at these questions IN THAT LIGHT, then you see something totally different in them.

Here is another one:

"I was elected class president. I came home to tell my parents the good news. They told me that my dad had taken a job out of the state and we were going to move in two weeks. So I had to withdraw from school and move. If this happened to you, how much time would you spend on each thing below?

1. being upset 2. trying to find someone to stay with, so you could

remain in school 3. planning a going-away party 4. fighting with your parents 5. reading about the place you were going to move to"

"When I make a plan to do something, something usually goes wrong. Check one: very true of me, mostly true of me, mostly untrue of me, very untrue of me."

I mean, we're laughing, but it really isn't funny. And there is page-after-page of this stuff. Some of it is simply questions like:

"How many, or what kinds of books and magazines are in your house?"

and they give you choices.

"How many times a week do you eat breakfast?"

"Do your parents or guardians enjoy hearing about school?"

"Do they think the school is doing a good job?"

"A person is of a different religion than his or her church. In this situation I would feel either: very comfortable, comfortable, slightly uncomfortable or very uncomfortable."

It just goes on and on. In Texas, we got one that says:

"How many Christians are on your street?"

"What is your least favorite country?"

And that is a multiple-choice question, by the way. And this one you will really like -- especially your audience, I think. There is a list of nineteen nationalities here:

Irish-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Italian-Americans (so on and so forth), Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Eastern European-Americans, Japanese-Americans, (and so on).

Then the questions follow. And here are some of the questions:

"Which of the above do you think is responsible for the decline of the U.S. economy?"

"Which of the above do you think is more likely to raise a large family; that is, eight or more children?"

"Which of the above do you think is most subject to criminal activity?"

"Which of the above do you think would be most likely to eliminate an entire race?"

How about THAT one?

"Who most influences the way you feel about other races?"

"If you could eliminate an entire race, would you?" "If 'yes', which one?"

"Have you, or would you ever physically assault someone because of their sexual preference?"

..... and so on and so on.

GARY NULL: These are very, very dangerous things you're talking about because first, on several levels, what it does to the individual, what it does to a data bank to have that about the individual, and how you would use that to selectively eliminate or to incorporate people whom you want to support your position of power and dominance in a "new world order" -- or how you could target those people for elimination, as far as power goes, or even physical detention.

Keep in mind that we went through McCarthyism where over a hundred thousand Americans and their families were destroyed by this one completely psychopathic, deranged, mentally warped, perverted scum-bag. And those are the good things I could say about Joseph McCarthy. That man was one of the most evil men who ever lived. Yet, he had the FULL participation of many members [of Congress] because he said that he was speaking for the consensus, and for the "right" way of thinking. What about all the innocent people who he hurt and who committed suicide? And there are many instances of that. When I look

around at the people whose lives have been affected by this so-called "consensus thinking", or where they've had dossiers on people, and the moment they see that you don't support their particular economic, religious, political or social agenda, they're able to target you as (quote) "the enemies".

During Nixon's reign, they had the "enemies list". And also, it was during his reign that executive order 1140 was implemented. And there was another executive order later which allowed for detention camps to be created. That executive order is STILL in place. In fact, it was during the last administration, the Reagan Administration, where there was a contingency plan, if there was ever any major social upheaval, that some fifty-five thousand Americans, on whom they had dossiers (not so dissimilar from what you're discussing here), could be isolated. And, without trial, without conviction, without being formally charged, with no civil liberties and rights, without legal representation, these Americans could be indefinitely incarcerated in different U.S. Government facilities. They even had these facilities ... and during a major undercover story that I was doing, I've actually gone to some of these facilities to see if they actually existed. Fifty-five thousand Americans! And that was just the first batch.

Now, could you imagine, with the data systems that we have, people of all backgrounds, conservative and liberal -- if you didn't answer those questions correctly, and if they had a dossier on you which show that you legitimately hold certain views which they feel could be a

threat, then in all likelihood, your dossier is going to make you one of those people who are not on the "RIGHT" side of the issue. And, since you're not the one in power or control, you're the target. And it's not as if there is no precedent for this. There IS precedence for this, and there is precedence in virtually every country of the world, where they have harrassed or arrested or denigrated or used surreptitious and illegal means to discredit, to destroy, to defame people whom they felt threatened by.

So, they have an opportunity to create a WHOLE generation of thinking based upon a curriculum, and a model of education that will eliminate people from any positions in the future people who would never have a chance -- never -- of getting into a position of being either a policy-maker or an opinion-leader. Why? Because they have been able to track these people. They're tracking their parents. They're tracking their friends. They know where they live. They know what they eat. They know which television shows they watch. They know everything about them because, during this whole teaching process, they've kept EXTENSIVE files on all of their results.

So, anyone who IS an individualist, who chooses to respect the autonomy of their own mind, who is capable of making assertive decisions, who wants to be an active participant in anything that is going to affect their lives Think of all the women who have decided to forego caesarian [operations], or who have challenged the radical mastectomy [operation]. Those women, in answering a questionnaire that they would be seeking a second opinion, or that

they would seek complementary therapy, etc., those women would not be accepted into anything where you had to have a woman who would simply accept what she was told to do. So, those women who finally have begun to free themselves would be excluded, and as a result, you would have two classes. You would have the ruling majority by consensus and the excluded minority that is left out of everything. And that is a very, very frightening thought. And it's not as if it is theoretical.

This, you're telling us, is being done NOW. This is being taught NOW. This is illegal. The Federal Government has been caught doing this illegal act NOW. We are not theorizing about the future. And I'm concerned about this. Is that a fair or an unfair summary of your statements, Bev?

BEVERLY ECKMAN: I'm not sure that the Federal Government deliberately got itself in this mess. Some people, some individuals did, but I think what happened was that they didn't realize how much footsy they were playing with the Carnegie Foundation, which is practically taken over Well, I'm not going to say "practically". It IS taken over by behaviorists. When you look at the credentials of the leadership ... and those are the people who are sitting on every important task force, who are making virtually all of the decisions about education. The problem is that they OWN most of the computer banks. They own the testing service. They own that National Assessment of Educational Progress. They own the Scholastic Aptitude Tests. They own the National Teaching[ers?] Exam. You can keep going on and on about all

the tests that they own, as well as many of the state assessments under separate contract, which is a slight conflict of interest, by the way. They own a lot of the computer systems. They are in the position right now that if they said: "We're going to take our computers and go home," the Federal Government would be in deep trouble. I mean, they would panic because they have traded so much money back and forth; given so much money, not just to the Carnegie Foundation, but the Carnegie Foundation has given money to the GOVERNMENT! Gobs and gobs of grants for them to establish these computer systems and what-not. And I think our Federal Government got in over their heads.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: So these are things that you can do [to resist]. Another thing that you can do is to strengthen the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment. Many states are writing what they call "baby Hatch" amendments. In fact, I believe New York (I don't have it here in front of me right now) but I believe New York did that to strengthen the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment. It's sometimes called the "Hatch Amendment" too, but Protection of Pupil Rights is a better way to allude to it because the other gets confusing. That really should be done as a stop-gap measure. What we're trying to do is to freeze the testing and the testing funds, pending investigation. And we have gotten an investigation started in Pennsylvania, in Oklahoma, in Texas and in a few other states which have really gone to the mat on this.

GARY NULL: Bev, we're out of time.

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Alright. I've sure enjoyed being on the show.

GARY NULL: You've been terrific. If people would like more information, could you give a number where they can reach you, please?

BEVERLY ECKMAN: Yes. A good place to call would be my publisher, and that's an 800 number. The publisher is Halcyon House, 1(800) 827-2499. Make sure you observe Pacific Time when you call, or else you won't get an answer.

GARY NULL: Okay. Thank you very much, Bev. I appreciate your being on. This has been a continuation of our series on Hidden Agendas, of which we'll be continuing with a different aspect tomorrow. * * * * *

* * * * *

(This file was found elsewhere on the Internet and uploaded to the Patriot FTP site by S.P.I.R.A.L., the Society for the Protection of Individual Rights and Liberties. E-mail alex@spiral.org)