

Ebola Quarantines? Your Fear and Safety Doesn't Trump Anyone's Rights

By [Joe Wright](#)

Global Research, November 05, 2014

[Activist Post](#) 4 November 2014

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

Is it legal to lock people up against their will for mere “suspicion” of something? It’s not a difficult question. The correct answer is NO, it’s not legal. But fear of Ebola seems to make the answer not so simple for many Americans.

Many otherwise logical and liberty-minded folks have quickly dumped their principles over Ebola fears; a crisis which they believe to be real, demanding draconian actions from the government to protect the public.

This same group of people, and you know who you are, claim to rise above the fear of terrorism to demand an end to invasive government spying, indefinite detention and torture, and extrajudicial killing. The argument being that, genuine crisis or not, fear and safety don’t trump individual rights.

But fear of Ebola, which is not yet a genuine threat in any measurable way, has infected these people enough to support government tyranny.

Calling for blanket travel bans and mandatory detention for those suspected of coming in contact with Ebola is just the start of what the establishment hopes you’ll demand.

The rebel quarantined nurse story in Maine reeks of pre-controlled opposition, but we’ll pretend it’s genuine. Kaci Hickox, a nurse who treated Ebola patients in Africa, had been screened extensively and she tested negative for Ebola. She was quarantined under an emergency political decree, challenged it in court and the judge ruled despite her good health, there was still reasonable suspicion to keep her movements restricted.

Although the judge eventually lifted the mandatory quarantine, at one point Hickox was ordered to stay 3 feet away from all people, and was banned from public places and from using public transportation. In other words, still house arrest by a different name – all for *suspicion* of an illness, not even suspicion of a crime.

Despite media chaos and a poll which revealed that roughly 3/4 of Americans were happy with quarantines and restricted movements, Maine has settled with the nurse:

Maine has reached a settlement with a nurse who was briefly quarantined in her home after treating victims of Ebola in West Africa, allowing her to travel freely in public but requiring her to monitor her health closely and report any symptoms.

The settlement, filed in nurse Kaci Hickox's home town of Fort Kent, in Maine's far north, keeps in effect through Nov. 10 the terms of an order issued by a Maine judge on Friday. ([Source](#))

So after suggesting a mandated hospital quarantine, then house arrest, then restricted movements, the State has backed off (for now) by demanding monitoring and reporting of symptoms. The "compromise" is full-spectrum surveillance. What a win for liberty, eh? Sadly, it is still not adequate for some of you terrified citizens.

Must everyone have to prove to society that they're perfectly healthy before they can leave their homes? What proof would be good enough amid a range of symptoms that could be anything? If a negative test isn't enough evidence, who decides the details of reasonable suspicion - the State? You? Or are we all just guilty until proven innocent whenever an outbreak of fear-mongering takes place?

And you know government can't discriminate, right? Maybe forcing mandatory vaccines into everyone will be the only "equal" way to finally calm your fears sufficiently? Oh, wait . . . that might be viewed as tyrannical.

The original source of this article is [Activist Post](#)
Copyright © [Joe Wright](#), [Activist Post](#), 2014

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Joe Wright](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca