

## **1984 is Happening Now – Part Two**

*The yelling of slogans, the worship of Big Brother—it was all a sort of glorious game to them. All their ferocity was turned outwards, against the enemies of the State, against foreigners, traitors, saboteurs, thought-criminals.*

—1984 by George Orwell

Many of us who are Baby Boomers made glib cracks about Big Brother whenever we were confronted with a development during the 1960s and 70s that introduced a new encroachment on our privacy, be it strengthened and broadened eavesdropping or wiretap laws, the expanded use of our Social Security card, or cameras in the workplace.

Reasons were always given why these measures had to be implemented, but seldom were these reasons the “real” reasons. And, sadly, few of us asked questions about these rationales, choosing instead to accept these encroachments on our freedom as actions being undertaken for our own good.

Since 9-11 and the creation of Homeland Security and the Patriot Act, there has been an exponential increase in the modes of surveillance and control, which, we are told, are tools to fight terrorism.

And, as an aside, a listener to our radio show, an executive with a high-powered Midwestern public relations firm, stated that, while working on a project with members of the military think tank, the Rand Corporation, these individuals openly boasted about crafting Homeland Security during the 1990s.

I mean, did we actually believe that Congress could write a policy the size of a Manhattan phone book in 10 days? Are you serious? These slugs couldn't agree on and draft a take-out lunch order in 10 days.

Therefore, we should understand that this Nazi Homeland Security program and legislation were already prepared.

Why?

Why create a cure for a problem that is not known to exist?

Consider that some of the measures laid out in the Patriot Act (cute name, isn't it?) currently violate the Bill of Rights such as Section 213, which, according to the American Civil Liberties Union, “would take an extremely limited authority and expand it so that it would be available in any kind of search (physical or electronic) and in any kind of criminal case. The standard that law enforcement must show—that an investigation will be jeopardized—is a very low one. Law enforcement agents will seek to delay notification whenever it is to their advantage to do so. Over time, the delayed notice ‘exception’ would become the rule and would deal another serious blow to the privacy protections afforded by the Fourth Amendment.”

In these sneak-and-peak searches there are no limitations on what can or will be searched, giving the searching officer complete and unsupervised discretion as to what, when and where to search. The resident of the premises being searched does not have to be there nor told the search was ever conducted.

Section 216 of the Patriot Act subjects all to roving wire taps, which the ACLU accurately assesses does “more than allow the government to get a single order that follows the target of surveillance from telephone to telephone. The government can now issue ‘John Doe’ roving wiretaps that fail to specify a target or a telephone, and can use

wiretaps without checking that the conversations they are intercepting actually involve a target of the investigation.”

Other measures include spying undetected through your computer’s back door and even in library data bases to obtain patron reading lists.

In this latter case, especially, what is to be divined from the books one reads? Isn’t this a subjective judgment based on the interpretation of what the sum of the titles divulges about a person? Isn’t this an attempt to get in the mind of the patron? And, if so, is this not a prime example of Orwell’s “thought crime.”

*Come with us, comrade, we know what you’re thinking.*

Is that right? So now we are deprived of the freedom of thought?

In this sort of situation, a student who might be doing a report on terrorism could find himself a possible terror suspect.

And this is what is so treacherous about these new laws: they step way overboard to address the supposed problem.

An example of the inherent dangers of these sweeping laws can be found in the exchange between Sir Thomas More and firebrand son-in-law Will Roper in the 1966 film *A Man for All Seasons*.

The story, based on fact, recounts a moment when the More family suspect an individual in their inner circle, Richard, to be a spy for Henry VIII, who wishes to find More treasonous so that he can be removed from his post as Chancellor of England, which would clear the way for Henry’s divorce from Catherine of Aragon—who could not bear Henry an heir—and his subsequent marriage to Anne Boleyn, which More, according to doctrine, could not grant.

The traitor, Richard, at this point is only *suspected* of wrongdoing—and rightly so—but still has done anything that is actionable.

More and Roper bring their debate to a crescendo with the following repartee:

More, defending the suspect’s rights states, “And go [free] he should if he were the Devil himself until he broke the law.”

Roper replies: “So now you give the Devil the benefit of law?”

More: “Yes, what would you do? Cut a great road through the laws to get after the Devil?”

Roper: “Yes, I’d cut down every law in England to do that.”

More: “Oh, and when the last law was down and the Devil turned ‘round on you, where would you hide, Roper, the laws all being flat?”

“This country is planted thick with laws from coast to coast—man’s laws not God’s, and if you cut them down—and you’re just the man to do it—do you really think you could stand upright in the wind that would blow then?”

“Yes, I’d give the Devil the benefit of law for my own safety’s sake.”

Unfortunately, this position is not being upheld in our nation today. Instead, we are blindly accepting every governmental edict that constrains our freedom just because we are told it’s for our security, our protection, our own good.

Yeah, that’s all we need to hear, and then, like freaked-out, dumbed-down Chicken Littles, we drool and nod our approval.

Well—guess what?—Homeland Security and the Patriot Act are not about fighting terrorism.

Terrorism is the excuse that Homeland Security, the FBI, CIA, NSA rely on to usher in and act on Soviet-like laws that will forever change this Constitutional republic into a totalitarian state, the better to make our nation trudge compliantly into world government, the Ingsoc of Orwell's *1984*.

*Vyzygoth is a radio host persona. His identity is available by request at the news office. Send correspondence to [vyzygoth@ij.net](mailto:vyzygoth@ij.net) or [readznews@aol.com](mailto:readznews@aol.com). His radio show, "From The Grassy Knoll," streams Wednesday 5-7 pm on [pascoradio.org](http://pascoradio.org). Archived shows can be accessed at [vyzygoth.com](http://vyzygoth.com).*