Subject: M I-5 Persec ution , th e BB C, televis ion a nd rad io
Posted by ivmivef on Tue, 01 Jan 2008 08:25:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=--=-=-=-=-=
-= the BBC, television and radio. -=
-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=--=-=-=-=-=

The first incident in June 1990 was when a BBC. newsreader made what seemed to be a reaction. to something which had happened in my home, and out of context of what. they were reading. My first reaction was disbelief; nothing of the sort had ever happened before, the idea. that such a thing could occur had not crossed my. mind, yet there was no doubt of what had just taken place. My. disbelief eroded as this recurred time after time. Besides the news, offenders included shows. such as Crimewatch (!), Newsnight, and "entertainment" shows. There. seems to be very little moral understanding among the people who make these programmes; they. just assume they will never be caught, so they carry on without a thought for. the illegality or amorality of what they do. The only time I ever heard. a word raised in doubt was. by Paxman being interviewed by someone else (I think by Clive Anderson) back in 1990; referring to the "watching". he said it troubled him, and when asked by the. host what you could do about it, replied "Well, you could just. switch it off" (meaning the surveillance monitor in the studio). He clearly didn't let his doubts stand in the. way of continued surreptitious spying from his own or other. people's shows, though.

Now you're convinced this is a. troll, aren't you? This story has been the subject of. much debate on the uk.* Usenet newsgroups for over a year, and some readers believe it to be an invention (it has. even been suggested that a group of psychology. students are responsible!), others think it symptomatic of a derangement of the author, and. a few give it credence. Quite. a few people do know part or all of the story already, so this text will fill in. the gaps in their knowledge. For the rest, what may persuade you of the. third possibility is that some of the incidents detailed are checkable against any archives of radio. and TV programmes that exist; that the incidents involve named people (even if. those hiding in the shadows have not made their identity or. affiliations evident), and those people may be persuaded to come out with. the truth; and that the campaign of harassment is continuing today both. in the UK and on the American continent,. in a none-too-secret fashion; by its nature the significant risk of exposure. increases with time.

On several. occasions people said to my face that harassment from the TV was happening. On the first day I worked in Oxford, I spent the. evening in the local pub with the company's technical director Ian, and. Phil, another employee. Ian made a. few references to me and said to Phil, as if in an aside, "Is he the bloke who's been. on TV?" to which Phil replied, "Yes, I think. so".

I made a number of efforts to find the bugs, without. success; last year we employed professional. counter-surveillance people to scan for bugs (see later) again without result. In. autumn 1990 I disposed of my TV and watched virtually. no television for the next three years. But harassment from TV stations has gone on for over six. years and continues to this day. This is something that many. people obviously know is happening; yet the TV staff have the morality. of paedophiles, that because they're getting away with it they. feel no wrong.

Other people who. were involved in the abuse in 1990 were DJs on BBC radio stations, notably disc jockeys from. Radio 1 and other stations (see the following section). Again, since they don't have sense in. the first place they can't. be expect to have the moral sense not to be part of criminal harassment.

340