Subject: M-I,5-P ersecution . M I5 ar e Afra id to Ad mit Th eyre Behin d the Persecutio n
Posted by mefifivi on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 08:51:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MI5 are Afraid to. Admit They're Behind the Persecution

MI5 have issued a. formal denial of any involvement in my life to the Security Service Tribunal, as. you might expect them to; but, more importantly, the persecutors have never denied that theyre. from the Security Service,. despite several years of accusations from my corner on usenet and in faxed articles. I am not surprised. that the Security Service Tribunal found "no determination in. your favour". I am however a little surprised that the persecutors have. refused to confirm my identification of them; by doing. so, they implicitly admit that my guess was right.

"No determination in your favour" says. the Security Service Tribunal

In 1997,. I made a complaint to the Security Service Tribunal, giving only the bare outlines of my case. I do not think it would have made very. much difference if Id made a. much more detailed complaint, since the Tribunal has. no ability to perform investigatory functions. It can only ask MI5 if they. have an interest in a subject, to which MI5 are of course free to be "economical with the truth". A couple of months after my complaint. the Tribunal replied. that;

The Security Service Tribunal have now. investigated your complaint and have asked me to inform you that. no determination in your favour has been made on. your complaint.

Needless to say this. reply didnt surprise me in the slightest. It is a well established fact that the secret service are a. den of liars and the Tribunal a toothless watchdog, so to. see them conforming to these stereotypes. might be disappointing but unsurprising.

It is noteworthy that the Tribunal. never gives the plaintiff information on whether the "no determination. in your favour" is because MI5 claims to have no interest in him, or whether they claim. their interest is "justified".. In the 1997 report of the Security Service Commissioner he writes that "The ambiguity. of the terms in which the notification of the Tribunals. decision is expressed is intentional", since a less ambiguous answer would indicate to the plaintiff whether he were indeed under. MI5 surveillance. But I. note that the ambiguity also allows MI5 to get away with lying to the question of their interest. in me; they can claim to the Tribunal that they have no interest, but at. a future date, when it becomes clear that. they did indeed place me under surveillance and harassment, they can claim their interest was "justified" - and the. Tribunal will presumably not admit that. in their previous reply MI5 claimed to have no

interest.

"He. doesnt know who we are"

In early January 1996 I flew on a British Airways. jet from London to Montreal; also present on the plane, about three or four rows. behind me, were two young men,. one of them fat and voluble, the other silent. It was quite clear. that these two had been planted on the aircraft to "wind me up". The fat youth described the town in Poland where. I had spent Christmas, and made some unpleasant personal slurs. against me. Most interestingly, he said the words, "he. doesnt know who we are".

Now I find this particular form of. words very interesting, because while it is not a clear admission, it is only a half-hearted attempt. at denial of my guess that "they" = "MI5".. Had my guess been wrong, the fat youth would surely have said so more clearly. What he was trying to do was. to half-deny. something he knew to be true, and he was limited to making statements which he knew to be not false; so he. made a lukewarm denial which on the face of it means. nothing, but in fact acts as a confirmation of my guess of who "they". are.

On. one of the other occasions when I saw the persecutors in person, on the BA flight to Toronto in. June 1993, one of the group of four men said, "if he tries to run away well find him".. But the other three stayed totally quiet and avoided eye. contact. They did so to avoid being apprehended and identified. - since if they were identified, their employers would have been revealed, and it would become. known that it was the secret services who were behind. the persecution.

Why are MI5 So Afraid to admit their. involvement?

If you think about it, what has been going on in Britain for the last. nine years is simply beyond belief. The British declare. themselves to be "decent" by definition, so when they engage in indecent activities. such as the persecution of a mentally ill person, their decency "because. were British" is still. in the forefront of their minds, and a process of mental doublethink kicks in,. where their antisocial and indecent activities are blamed on the victim "because its his fault. were persecuting him", and their self-regard and self-image of decency remains untarnished.. As remarked in another article some time ago,. this process is basically the same as. a large number of Germans employed fifty years ago against Slavic "untermenschen" and the Jewish "threat" - the Germans. declared, "Germans are known to. be decent and the minorities are at fault for what we do to them" - so they were able to. retain the view of themselves as being "decent".

Now suppose this entire episode had happened in some. other country. The British have a poor view of the. French, so lets say it had all happened in

France. Suppose there was. a Frenchman, of non-French extraction, who was targeted by the French internal security. apparatus, for the dubious amusement of French television newscasters, and. tortured for 9 years with various sexual and other verbal abuse and taunts of. "suicide". Suppose this all came out into the open. Naturally,. the French authorities would try hard to place the blame on their victim - and. in their own country, through the same state-controlled media which the. authorities employ as instruments of torture, their view might prevail - but what on. earth would people overseas make of their actions? Where would. their "decency" be then?

This is why MI5 are. so afraid to admit theyre behind the persecution. Because if they did admit. responsibility, then they would be admitting that there. was an action against me - and if the truth came out, then the walls would. come tumbling down. And if the persecutors were to admit they were from MI5, then you can. be sure I would report the fact; and. the persecutors support would fall away, among the mass media as well as among the general public. When I started identifying MI5. as the persecutors in 1995 and 1996 there was a. sharp reduction in media harassment, since. people read my internet newsgroup posts and knew I was telling the truth. The persecutors cannot. deny my claim that theyre MI5, because then I. would report their denial and they would be seen as liars - but they cannot admit it. either, as that would puncture their campaign against. me. So they are forced to maintain a ridiculous silence on the issue of their identity, in the face of vociferous. accusations on internet newsgroups. and faxed articles.

Have MI5 lied to. the Home Secretary?

In order for the Security Services to bug my. home, they would either have needed a warrant from. the Home Secretary, or they might have instituted the bugging without a warrant. Personally I think it is more. likely that they didnt apply for a warrant. - I cannot see any Home Secretary giving MI5 authority to bug a residence to. allow television newscasters to satisfy their. rather voyeuristic needs vis-a-vis one of their audience. But it is possible that the. Security Service presented a warrant in some. form before a home secretary at some point in the last nine years, for telephone tapping or surveillance. of my residence, or interception of postal. service.

So the possibility. presents itself that a Home Secretary might have signed a warrant presented to him based on MI5 lies. Just as MI5 lie to. the Security Service Tribunal, so. they might have lied to a Home Secretray himself. MI5 and MI6 are naturally secretive services. former home secretary Roy Jenkins said, they have a. "secretive atmosphere ... secretive. vis-a-vis the government as well as [enemies]". Jenkins also. said he "did not form a very high regard for how they discharged their. duties".

It was only a few years ago. that MI5 was brought into any sot the extraordinary thing is that British. media organisations like the state- and taxpayer-funded BBC. take such an active part in the MI5-inspired campaign of harassment. We have after. all heard of MI5 trying to bribe broadcast journalists; but. surely there must be a substantial number who are not bought or blackmailed by the Security Services, and who take. part in the "abuse by newscasters" of their own volition?. The BBC is supposed to be. independent of the government of the day as well as the Establishment in general.. While perhaps it is childish to think that the BBC is anything other than. effectively state-controlled, the degree of collusion between the BBC. and the British Secret Police MI5 is something you would not find in many countries. Individual tele-journalists in. other countries would have enough self-esteem not to allow themselves. to be controlled by their secret police - seemingly, BBC broadcasters. like Martyn Lewis and Nicholas Witchell have such. a low opinion of their employing organisation that they see no wrong in. dragging the BBCs no-longer-good name through yet more mud, at the mere. request (whether supported by financial or. other inducements) of the British secret Police, MI5.

And when challenged, these broadcasters LIE about their. involvement, with just as little. shame as MI5 themselves. The BBCs Information dept have said. that;

"I can. assure you that the BBC would never engage in any form of surveillance activity. such as you describe"

which is. an out-and-out lie. Buerk and Lewis have themselves lied to their colleagues in the. BBCs Information department over the "newscaster watching",. but unsurprisingly they refuse to put these denials in writing. Doubtless if the "newscaster watching" ever. comes to light, Buerk and. Lewis will then continue to lie by lying about these denials. So much for. the "impartial" BBC, a nest of liars bought and paid for by the Security. Services!

It. is obvious that the persecution is at the instigation of MI5 themselves - they have read my post, and only they have. the surveillance technology and media/political access. Yet they. have lied outright to the Security Service Tribunal. Similarly, BBC. newscasters Michael Buerk and Martyn Lewis have lied to members. of their own organisation. The continuing harassment indicates they are all petrified. of this business coming out into the open. I will continue to. do everything possible to ensure that their. wrongdoing is exposed.

2676

--
Posted via NewsDemon.com - Premium Uncensored Newsgroup Service
------->>>>>>http://www.NewsDem