WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE LIBERALS' DEVOTION TO PRlvACY?

October 20, 1994 *by: Phyllis Sch/a.fly*

The liberals love to talk about the value of privacy - when it supports their political agenda, that is. But when it comes to the privacy of our personal thoughts, the liberals don't object to the grossest violations.

The most pervasive offenses against personal privacy rights are the nosy questionnaires administered to captive groups of people who are required to reveal their attitudes. These nosy questionnaires pretend to be just for the purpose of compiling data, but a fair reading of them shows that the questions themselves constitute psychological manipulation to promote a definite agenda.

Schoolchildren are a captive audience of minors subject to compulsory attendance laws and expected to obey their teachers. Many public schools have administered to middle school students an offensive privacy-invading questionnaire developed by the Centers for Disease Control.

It was given for several years before anyone in authority bothered to read it. This year, Fairfax, Virginia, School Superintendent Robert Spillane canceled the questionnaire, saying, quite properly, that the questions are "too suggestive in nature" for seventh and eighth grade students.

Judge for yourself the propriety of these questions. "How old were you when you had 'sex' for the first time?" Multiple-choice answers include "less than 9 years old" and "9 or 10 years old."

Other questions (no doubt embarrassing to seventh graders) include, "If you have ever had 'sex,' did you or your partner ever use a condom?" and "With how many people have you had 'sex'?" Answers include 1, 2, and 3 or more people.

Schoolchildren aren't the only audience targeted for nosy questionnaires. Servicemen and women at the Twenty-Nine Palms Marine Corps base in California were subjected to a revealing interrogation in May of this year.

Called "Combat Arms Survey," this nosy questionnaire was frankly designed to probe "attitudes of combat trained personnel with regards to nontraditional missions." The survey starts out by identifying those who served in our recent combat theaters (Desert Storm and Somalia), and then proceeds with customary and innocuous inquiries about demographics.

This is followed by 39 questions about attitudes. The political bias and purpose of the questionnaire should be obvious from the text of the questions.

The first group of questions about attitudes asks "do you feel that U.S. combat troops should be used within the United States for any of the following missions?"

The options given include drug enforcement, disaster relief, security at national sports events, environmental disaster clean-up, substitute teachers in public schools, community assistance (e.g., landscaping, road repair, animal control), prison guards, and national emergency police force.

Next there is a set of questions asking "Do you feel that U.S. combat troops under U.S. command should be used in other countries for any of the following United Nations missions?" The options given include most of the above plus peacekeeping, nation building (reconstruct civil government, develop public school system, develop public transportation system, etc.), and humanitarian relief.

Stay tuned. The questions get nosier. The next bunch of questions asks "Do you feel that U.S. combat troops should be used in other countries under command of non-U.S. officers appointed by the United Nations for any of the following missions?" These missions include most of the previous options, plus "police action serving under non-U.S. officers."

Finally, the nosy questionnaire asks the serviceperson to state whether he or she agrees or disagrees with this series of statements:

"U.S. combat troops should serve under U.N. command and control during U.N. field training exercises. U.S. combat troops should participate in U.N. missions under United Nations command and control.

"U.S. combat troops should be commanded by U.N . officers and non commissioned officers at battalion and company levels while performing U.N. missions. It would make no difference to me to take orders from a U.N. company commander.

"I feel the President of the United States has the authority to pass his responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief to the U.N. Secretary General. I feel there is no conflict between my oath of office and serving as a U.N. soldier."

"I feel a designated unit of U.S. combat soldiers should be permanently assigned to the command and control of the United Nations. I would swear to the following code: 'I am a United Nations fighting person. I serve in the forces which maintain world peace and every nation's way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense.'"

The last item on the survey is a real shocker: "I would fire upon U.S. citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the U.S. government."

If you are not worried about what kinds of missions our U.S. Armed Services will be sent on in Clinton's New World Order, you should be.