



NONE
UNDER
CCTV

1984 IS HERE:
THE STOCKHOLM
PROGRAMME

The Stockholm Programme, Terrorist Legislation and George Orwell's 1984 or

"1984 is here, no really, this time we're not lying , honest."

Yep. A favourite and overused cry from lefties ever since 1984 was published in 1949. I remember in 1984 (I was 13 at the time) a Television Program discussing whether 1984 was really like 1984 . The consensus was a firm "No". There was no mass surveillance at the time. CCTV was in its infancy, cash was still king - so no being tracked through your consumerism. Passports were just bits of paper and leather with your photo in - no barcode or chip. No mobile phones. Your personal details were collected on random bits of paper, distributed across a number of gunmetal-grey filing cabinets, scattered across the country.

Clearly, unless you were a belonged to subversive organisation like the NUM or CND you probably were not being surveilled at the time by the security services, half of whom seemed to have been Oxbridge-educated Soviet agents anyway. The technology didn't exist for them to casually observe you, well maybe you - but not all of you- they had to "bug" you - physically putting a listening device in your receiver (how quaint) or actually follow you about, or sitting outside your house in a British Telecom van, continuously smoking Embassy No.1's in skin tight jeans with some headphones on over their permed hair. Or at least that's how it was done in the 1980's Thames Television program "The Professionals".



*Thames Televisions 1980's fictional Spy's:
"The Professionals" - disadvantaged by
both available technology and dress sense*



Of course, it's not one piece of legislation, or advance in technology that has suddenly heralded the Orwellian 1984. It's been a gradual, insidious process - allowing us to get used to more intrusive state and commercial monitoring a bit at a time. It's the ease with which they can do it now. The all seeing-ness of the technology.

Some, however, would date the start of slippery slope to 1497 when a registration of Baptisms, and soon after deaths and marriages began to be kept. Others would point further back to Doomsday, but unless you were a land owner, you would only be recorded as someone's property, as you would if you were a pig, or a field. Whatever your starting point, the slope has got a lot steeper and a lot slipperier recently.

2009 is much more like 1984 than 1984

Two stories in the press recently has seemed to have highlighted the surveillance society, but have in reality only only touched the surface of what they have in store for us.


The first being the collection and retention of "innocent" people's DNA. The government announced that it will dispose of them after 6 years, unless of course your lucky enough to get a conviction before then. The defence of the retention of such data has only be defended by the Home Office and Chief Constables, with even the right-wing press lead by The Telegraph spluttering into their gins that British Citizens, especially Telegraph readers could be treated in this way. Of course, for "foreigners" of various descriptions, the same universal outrage obviously should not apply.



Indeed, for foreign read "black" :

as it has been revealed by a recent report that 75% of black males between 18 and 35 have their DNA stored by the Police, with an accompanying allegation that the Police are arresting people solely to widen the database." (1) However, while it may seem that the Police and Home Office are isolated in their stance from the majority of the population, it's clear from what's on the table during EU-wide discussions of what is known as "The Stockholm Programme" that the difference seems to be between the Government and the governed across Europe, rather than between different nationalities. Thus, while we fuss about DNA being retained, the discussion they are currently having across the 'high table' in Europe is whether it is technically feasible to take a baby's fingerprints at birth, or whether they have to wait until the child is 6 years-old . (2)

The second case that has been in the British media recently is the plan to "compel communications service providers [CSPs] to retain electronic data beyond that required for commercial purposes, and make it available to the security services, police and other public authorities, despite substantial opposition. The Home Office admitted a tiny majority - just 53 per cent - of those consulted back the approach and a large minority - 38 per cent - are opposed to any enhancement of surveillance powers. The plan will see CSPs retaining details of all emails, phone calls, texts and other electronic communications - but not their content." (3) As others have pointed out, it's (now delayed) proposal coincided with the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin wall - and the demise of the Stasi.





The retired personnel of that

organisation must be jealous of the current technology, though I am sure former KGB chief Vladimir Putin will be taking full advantage. (Incidentally, Alan Johnson, The Home Secretary, recently told The Guardian that one of his dream dinner guests would be George Orwell. Maybe someone should tell him that 1984 was a novel not a policy proposal.) As has already been suggested above, behind the headlines, worse is going on. Much worse. The sinisterly named "Stockholm Programme" is the name of the "five year plan" to make the EU both a fortress both inside and out. Which brings us back the differences on the different levels of liberty conferred on us to us as "British Citizens", by those institutes of middle England, The Mail and The Telegraph, as contrasted with that accorded to Asylum Seekers, Migrant Workers and Gypsies. I.D. Cards, now not being made compulsory for the good UK citizen are now legally required for a range of non-citizens (un-citizens?) - this legislation was passed without any protest from the political right, and to be fair not a great deal of fuss from organisations like Liberty who also unwisely divide between the proverbial "Law Abiding Citizens" and the rest of us - those without citizenship, with criminal records, with a history of political activism (which actually is quite a lot of people). The reason why this is unwise (even for those holier-than-thou British passport holding-law abiding citizens) is spelled out in the European Civil Liberties Network statement on The Stockholm Programme :



**Turn off the
Stockholm Programme!**

<http://stockholm.noblogs.org/>



"Since the late 90s, external

border controls were stepped up and militarised, followed by the gradual externalisation of migration control, with third country readmission agreements and detention centres surrounding the EU and FRONTEX patrolling the Mediterranean Sea. It is a selective war against migration, because the EU's restrictive measures specifically target those fleeing from poverty and persecution: whilst industrialised countries remain 'white-listed', poor countries are relegated to the EU's visa 'black-list', and restrictive control measures are deployed against their citizens. Whilst a rapidly developing and military-oriented EU Border Police (FRONTEX) and a series of central databases (SIS, SIS II, Eurodac, VIS) are being deployed to 'combat' undocumented or irregular migration at a global level." (4)

The report continues:

"The apparatus and institutions that have been established to control immigration into the EU are rapidly expanding. Border controls are steadily developing into a much broader form of social control, concerned not just with migrants, but citizens as well." Indeed, some "...EU governments do not like limiting the use of data control [to those suspected of] terrorism and organised crime and want to extend the proposal's scope from just in and out of the EU to travel between EU states and even within each state". (5)

Phil Woolas, The British Immigration Minister, recently caused outrage (for all the wrong reasons) by seeking to justify the recent high number of British Military casualties in Afghanistan by saying they kept the number of Afghani migrants attempting to enter the UK down. However, Woolas' comments should be seen as reflecting both the aggressive nature (and exportation) of



Fortress Europe's border controls;

militarized border police FRONTEX already operating outside of the EU's borders, and proposed refugee camps set up and funded in the EU, but situated in third countries, like Morocco. So *why not* view the NATO presence in Afghanistan as some kind of anti-immigration expeditionary force ?

Indeed, the 10,000 plus ⁽⁶⁾ deaths of people trying to enter Fortress Europe since 1993 has hardly raised an bureaucratic eyebrow - indeed in some quarters the deaths seem to have been thought as a reasonable price to pay for securing our borders.

The broader picture, is a new policy emphasis on dealing with refugees fleeing war and famine based on a "Lockdown", rather than one based around the Human Rights Convention. Any kind of responsibility for any of these events, for instance people fleeing from Iraq or Afghanistan is not mentioned in The Stockholm Programme. A further clue to the path that the EU seems intent in going down is the amount of Israeli involvement ⁽⁷⁾ in many of the "research projects" - which are more less procurement programmes for Military, Security and Surveillance equipment. After all, who else would you go to for expertise in controlling/surveilling/repressing a large proportion of the population:

"Israel has been meeting the challenge of terror for decades before 9/11, and in those years of hands-on, real-time experience in overcoming terror lies our country's first competitive advantage."⁽⁸⁾

However, even if you are one of those who quakes at the fear of real or imaginary terrorists, does the Israeli approach strike you as a successful model? Do we want to move to a system of "Global Apartheid"⁽⁹⁾ :



"Global Apartheid":

"If the world's richest and most powerful countries all erect... barriers to keep out or otherwise control the planet's poorest and least powerful inhabitants, how else can such a system be described?"



I should come clean at this point and admit, that not only do I have a criminal record (as apparently 20% of the working population of the UK have) I am also a political activist not too keen on the idea of borders, or now you mention it, States. I was also been stopped under terrorist legislation leaving the UK to a meeting a few weeks ago - so clearly I am going to be against such things aren't I?

So I am worried, the question is should you be?

Perhaps, a brief description of my interview conducted by Kent Police would be a good illustration of why you should. I was stopped under Schedule 7 of the Terrorism Act (2000) ⁽¹⁰⁾. The powers under the act allow the Police to detain pretty much anyone for a period of up to 9 hours - they don't even need "reasonable suspicion". This is not being arrested. In fact, unlike being arrested, failure to answer the question is an offence itself - so even if you are subsequently released and not charged with an offence, you could be found guilty of the heinous crime of not answering questions - even though the Police made it perfectly clear to me that they did not consider me a terrorist - I guess that's more Kafkaesque than Orwellian. The point is that while the powers described above already exist, coupled with the prevalence of surveillance technology and the increasing use of it promoted by both domestic and EU legislation, it's likely those who are racially, religiously or politically profiled as likely suspects, those whose vehicle may have been seen at a anti-war demo, or even a pro-hunting rally will be increasingly subject to, if not death and jail, like those who are trying penetrate Fortress Europe from without, than a lack of privacy and sense of unease when going about your normal business, even if you are one of those of whom the government says "has nothing to fear".



R e s i s t a n c e

While there is sense of fatality, even in the reports from "Statewatch" that the bulk of the info in this rant is taken from, the fact that the once seemingly inevitable I.D. cards are still not universally compulsory is a sign that such things can be successfully resisted.

Anti-Surveillance groups, a recent mobilisation around the beginning of the Stockholm Programme in Brussels and the on-going work of the European Wide "No Borders" network suggest that the fight has just begun.

Organisations of Resistance:

UK:

www.noborders.org.uk

Europe:

www.statewatch.org/

www.noborders.org

www.stockholm.noblogs.org/



References:

(1) "Nothing to Hide, Nothing to Fear" Human Genetics Commission. Published 24/11/09:

www.hgc.gov.uk/Client/document.asp?DocId=226&CategoryId=8

(2) www.statewatch.org/news/2006/jul/08fingerprinting-children.htm

(3) www.computing.co.uk/computing/news/2252775/government-proceed-internet

(4) www.ecln.org/ECLN-statement-on-Stockholm-Programme-April-2009-eng.pdf -

(5) www.unitedagainstracism.org/pdfs/actual_listofdeath.pdf

(6) Statewatch: The Shape of Things to Come- EU Future Group

(7) The Neoconopticon by Bern Hayes viewed at:

www.tni.org/sites/tniclone.test.koumbit.net/files/download/neoconopticon_0

(8) Ministry of Industry, Trade and Labor, Israel Homeland Security, p. 14 italics

added. Quoted in The Political Economy of Israel's HomelandSecurity/Surveillance Industry by Neve Gordon

(9) The Neoconopticon by Bern Hayes viewed at:

http://www.tni.org/sites/tniclone.test.koumbit.net/files/download/neoconopticon_0.pdf

(10) www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/ukpga_2000011_en_19