

Police State Targets Dissidents: Government To “Impose Extreme Disruption Orders On Individuals”

By [Mac Slavo](#)

Global Research, October 28, 2014

SHTFplan.com 27 October 2014

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

The battle for hearts and minds is on and the elite are getting fed up with citizen proles who believe it a right to speak freely and openly about their ideologies and criticisms of government policies.

Their attempts to control the agenda and conversation have repeatedly been met with protests, both online and off, as traditional mainstream audiences migrate by the millions to alternative media and citizen journalism.

But this obvious threat to the establishment’s status quo won’t be allowed to go on much longer. A recent interview with the head of England’s Ministry of Home Security, the British counterpart of America’s Department of Homeland Security, shows just how dangerous open thought and free speech are.

Home Secretary Theresa May explains what the freedom-loving people of the United Kingdom can come to expect in the very near future if their online commentary is deemed to be hatred or extremist thought by the government. And this, as you’ll see below, isn’t just about the UK, which has often been used as a petri dish for global regulators who want to see what does or doesn’t work on a smaller scale before introducing their policies and legalese in the United States.

The police would also be given new powers to apply to a court to impose extreme disruption orders on individuals, using the same criteria.

This could result in those targeted being stopped from taking part in public protests, from being present at all in certain public locations, from associating with named people, from using of conventional broadcast media and from “obtaining any position of authority in an institution where they would have influence over vulnerable individuals or children”.

Breach of the restrictions - which would be time limited - **would be a criminal offence.** ([BBC](#))

An interview of Theresa May discussing how these new policies will keep Brits “safe and secure” shows the Secretary repeating the same talking points over and over in defense of her position. When questioned about whether innocent people just speaking their minds could get caught up in the extremist web, May goes to her default answer:

What we are looking at is a situation where believe we need to take powers

necessary to be able to deal with those people who are preaching hatred on our streets and that is an extremism which can lead others into violent acts.

Of course not all extremists are violent and not all violence comes out of that extremism. But there is a link. There is a thread between this. And I believe we need to be able to deal with that if we are going to do the job we want to do, which is keeping people safe and secure.

(Video via [Steve Quayle](#) and [All News Pipeline](#))

But such things like supplanting political thought or the free expression of views only happens elsewhere. Such ludicrous ideas could never be introduced here in America.

Unless of course you consider that a bi-partisan Congressional panel is now looking to impose similar restrictions on free speech right here in the good ol' USA:

A key Democrat on the Federal Election Commission called for burdensome new rules on Internet-based campaigning, prompting the Republican chairman to warn that Democrats want to regulate online political sites and even news media like the Drudge Report.

Ravel's statement suggests that she **would regulate right-leaning groups** like America Rising that posts anti-Democrat YouTube videos on its website.

FEC Chairman Lee E. Goodman, a Republican, said if regulation extends that far, then **anybody who writes a political blog, runs a politically active news site or even chat room could be regulated**. He added that funny internet campaigns like "Obama Girl," and "Jib Jab" would also face regulations. ([Washington Examiner](#))

Make no mistake. Such regulatory and legislative policy would not only target conservative web sites. Every single American citizen would be subject to its rules.

Want to post a video with political undertones? Banned.

Did you mention a political candidate's name in your social media post? Banned.

Did you send an email to friends and family promoting a particular idea that runs contrary to the traditionally accepted government policy? Banned.

Are you wearing a T-shirt that upsets the politically correct crowd? Banned.

And not just banned. In the United Kingdom you would face criminal repercussions. In the United States, as noted in the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Acts, [you could literally be swept](#) up by militarized government SWAT teams and [held indefinitely](#) without charge or trial.

A person engages in domestic terrorism if they do an act ""dangerous to human life"" that is a violation of the criminal laws of a state or the United States, if the act appears to be intended to: (i) **intimidate or coerce a civilian population;** (ii) **influence the policy of a government by**

intimidation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination or kidnapping. Additionally, the acts have to occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States and if they do not, may be regarded as international terrorism.

Source: [USA Patriot Act](#)

We can see by the broad language how easily one can be accused of “intimidation” or “coercion.” In the end it really just boils down to be a matter of interpretation, and you could bet your bottom dollar that Federal prosecutors and secret terrorism courts will ensure that you fall well within the Patriot Act should you step out of line.

In a recent piece [penned by Paul Joseph Watson](#) we can see these new regulations already taking shape through a redefining of terms such as “suspicious activity.”

Purchasing train tickets with cash, exiting a train before or after other passengers, or appearing calm or nervous are all examples of behavior that Amtrak employees have been told to report as “suspicious activity.”

A document entitled [Guidelines for Amtrak Customer Service Employees](#), which was obtained by the ACLU after an FOIA request, lists a number of different behaviors that are “indicative of criminal activity” and should immediately be reported to law enforcement personnel by Amtrak ticket agents.

Are you calm when purchasing a ticket? That could mean you’re a terrorist.

What about nervous? Do you look a little nervous? Yup, that probably makes you a terrorist, too.

This is what the free people of the United States, the United Kingdom and the rest of the world are facing from entrenched elite financial, economic and geo-political organizations who mean to control every aspect of our lives.

And be assured, they’re not [war-gaming civil unrest scenarios](#) and stockpiling [billions of rounds of ammunition](#) just so they can play target practice.

Many Americans see what’s coming and are [taking steps to prepare for a completely different world](#). But most don’t even have a clue.

Your views and ideas make you an enemy of the state.

In fact, the United Nations Charter on Human Rights addresses people like you, and despite the fact that our founders forbade international treaties for this very purpose, our government is a long-time proponent of these ideals and policies. The Charter talks a big game with, among other things, freedom of expression, the right to live peacefully, and protections to ensure you can’t be detained indefinitely without trial until, that is, you reach [Article 29, Section 3](#):

These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

So, as long as you tow the party line you can enjoy your “freedom.”

For those that don't, one day soon these international and domestic legislative implements will give them the pretext to come looking for you, as well as those who, as Theresa May stated, have a “thread” that might be connected to you.

The original source of this article is SHTFplan.com

Copyright © Mac Slavo, SHTFplan.com, 2014

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mac Slavo](#)

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