

The Mind Control Police: The Government's War on Thought Crimes and Truth-Tellers

[The Mind Control Police: The Government's War on Thought Crimes and Truth-Tellers](#)

by [John W. Whitehead & Nisha Whitehead](#), [The Rutherford Institute](#)

February 15, 2022

"In a time of deceit telling the truth is a revolutionary act."— George Orwell

The U.S. government, which speaks in a language of force, is afraid of its citizenry.

What we are dealing with is a government so power-hungry, paranoid and afraid of losing its stranglehold on power that it is conspiring to wage war on anyone who dares to challenge its authority.

All of us are in danger.

In recent years, the government has used the phrase "domestic terrorist" [interchangeably](#) with "anti-government," "extremist" and "terrorist" to describe anyone who might fall somewhere on a very broad spectrum of viewpoints that could be considered "dangerous." The ramifications are so far-reaching as to render almost every American an extremist in word, deed, thought or by association.

In the government's latest assault on those who criticize the

government—whether that criticism manifests itself in word, deed or thought—the Biden Administration has likened those who share “[false or misleading narratives and conspiracy theories, and other forms of mis- dis- and mal-information](#)” to terrorists.

The next part is the kicker.

According to the Department of Homeland Security’s latest terrorism bulletin, “These threat actors seek to exacerbate societal friction to *sow discord and undermine public trust in government institutions* to encourage unrest, which [could potentially inspire acts of violence.](#)”

You see, the government doesn’t care if what you’re sharing is fact or fiction or something in between. What it cares about is whether what you’re sharing has the potential to make people think for themselves and, in the process, question the government’s propaganda.

Get ready for the next phase of the government’s war on thought crimes and truth-tellers.

For years now, the government has used all of the weapons in its vast arsenal—surveillance, threat assessments, fusion centers, pre-crime programs, hate crime laws, militarized police, lockdowns, martial law, etc.—to target *potential* enemies of the state based on their ideologies, behaviors, affiliations and other characteristics that might be deemed suspicious or dangerous.

For instance, if you believe in and exercise your rights under the Constitution (namely, your right to speak freely, worship freely, associate with like-minded individuals who share your political views, criticize the government, own a weapon, demand a warrant before being questioned or searched, or any other activity viewed as potentially anti-government, racist, bigoted, anarchic or sovereign), you could be [at the top of the government’s terrorism watch list.](#)

Moreover, as a *New York Times* editorial warns, you may be an anti-government extremist (a.k.a. [domestic terrorist](#)) in the eyes of the police if you are afraid that the [government is plotting to confiscate your firearms](#), if you believe the [economy is about to collapse](#) and the [government will soon declare martial law](#), or if you display an unusual number of [political and/or ideological bumper stickers](#) on your car.

According to one FBI latest report, you might also be classified as a domestic terrorism threat if you espouse conspiracy theories, especially if you “[attempt to explain events or circumstances as the result of a group of actors working in secret to benefit themselves at the expense of others](#)” and are “usually at odds with official or prevailing explanations of events.”

In other words, if you dare to subscribe to any views that are contrary to the government's, you may well be suspected of being a domestic terrorist and treated accordingly.

This latest government salvo against consumers and spreaders of “mis- dis- and mal-information” widens the net to potentially include anyone who is exposed to ideas that run counter to the official government narrative.

You don't have to be a [Joe Rogan questioning COVID-19](#) to get called out, cancelled and classified as an extremist.

There's a whole spectrum of behaviors ranging from thought crimes and hate speech to whistleblowing that qualifies for persecution (and prosecution) by the Deep State.

[Simply liking or sharing this article on Facebook, retweeting it on Twitter](#), or merely reading it or any other articles related to government wrongdoing, surveillance, police misconduct or civil liberties might be enough to get you categorized as a particular kind of person with particular kinds of interests that reflect a particular kind of mindset that *might* just lead you to engage in a particular kinds of

activities and, therefore, puts you in the crosshairs of a government investigation as a potential troublemaker a.k.a. domestic extremist.

Chances are, as the *Washington Post* reports, you have already been assigned a [color-coded threat score](#)—green, yellow or red—so police are forewarned about your potential inclination to be a troublemaker depending on whether you've had a career in the military, posted a comment perceived as threatening on Facebook, suffer from a particular medical condition, or know someone who knows someone who might have committed a crime.

In other words, you might already be flagged as potentially anti-government in a government database somewhere—[Main Core](#), for example—that identifies and tracks individuals who aren't inclined to march in lockstep to the police state's dictates.

As *The Intercept* [reported](#), the FBI, CIA, NSA and other government agencies have increasingly invested in corporate surveillance technologies that can mine constitutionally protected speech on social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram in order to identify potential extremists and predict who might engage in future acts of anti-government behavior.

Where many Americans go wrong is in naively assuming that you have to be doing something illegal or harmful in order to be flagged and targeted for some form of intervention or detention.

In fact, all you need to do these days to end up on a government watch list or be subjected to heightened scrutiny is [use certain trigger words](#) (like cloud, pork and pirates), surf the internet, communicate using a cell phone, [limp or stutter](#), [drive a car](#), stay at a hotel, attend a political rally, [express yourself on social media](#), [appear mentally ill](#), serve in the [military](#), [disagree with a law enforcement official](#), [call in sick to work](#), purchase materials at a

hardware store, take flying or boating lessons, [appear suspicious](#), appear confused or nervous, fidget or whistle or smell bad, be seen in public waving a toy gun or anything remotely resembling a gun (such as a water nozzle or a remote control or a walking cane), [stare at a police officer](#), question government authority, or [appear to be pro-gun or pro-freedom](#).

And then at the other end of the spectrum there are those such as Julian Assange, for example, who blow the whistle on government misconduct that is within the public's right to know.

Assange, the founder of WikiLeaks—a website that published secret information, news leaks, and classified media from anonymous sources—was arrested on April 11, 2019, on charges of helping U.S. Army intelligence analyst Chelsea Manning access and leak more than 700,000 classified [military documents that portray the U.S. government and its military as reckless, irresponsible and responsible for thousands of civilian deaths](#).

Included among the [leaked Manning material](#) were the [Collateral Murder video](#) (April 2010), the Afghanistan war logs (July 2010), the Iraq war logs (October 2010), a quarter of a million diplomatic cables (November 2010), and the Guantánamo files (April 2011).

The [Collateral Murder leak included gunsight video footage from two U.S. AH-64 Apache helicopters](#) engaged in a series of air-to-ground attacks while air crew laughed at some of the casualties. Among the casualties were two Reuters correspondents who were gunned down after their cameras were mistaken for weapons and a driver who stopped to help one of the journalists. The driver's two children, who happened to be in the van at the time it was fired upon by U.S. forces, suffered serious injuries.

In true Orwellian fashion, the government would have us believe that it is Assange and Manning who are the real criminals for daring to expose the war machine's seedy underbelly.

Since his April 2019 arrest, Assange has been locked up in a maximum-security British prison—[in solitary confinement for up to 23 hours a day](#)—pending extradition to the U.S., where if convicted, he could be sentenced to [175 years in prison](#).

This is how the police state deals with those who challenge its chokehold on power.

This is why the government fears a citizenry that thinks for itself. Because a citizenry that thinks for itself is a citizenry that is informed, engaged and prepared to hold the government accountable to abiding by the rule of law, which translates to government transparency and accountability.

After all, we're citizens, not subjects. For those who don't fully understand the distinction between the two and why transparency is so vital to a healthy constitutional government, Manning explains it well:

When freedom of information and transparency are stifled, then bad decisions are often made and heartbreaking tragedies occur – too often on a breathtaking scale that can leave societies wondering: how did this happen? ... I believe that when the public lacks even the most fundamental access to what its governments and militaries are doing in their names, then they cease to be involved in the act of citizenship. [There is a bright distinction between citizens, who have rights and privileges protected by the state, and subjects, who are under the complete control and authority of the state.](#)

This is why the First Amendment is so critical. It gives the citizenry the right to speak freely, protest peacefully,

expose government wrongdoing, and criticize the government without fear of arrest, isolation or any of the other punishments that have been meted out to whistleblowers such as Edwards Snowden, Assange and Manning.

The challenge is holding the government accountable to obeying the law.

A little over 50 years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6-3 in *United States v. Washington Post Co.* to block the Nixon Administration's attempts to use claims of national security to prevent The Washington Post and The New York Times from [publishing secret Pentagon papers on how America went to war in Vietnam](#).

As Justice William O. Douglas remarked on the ruling, "The press was protected so that it could bare the secrets of government and inform the people. [Only a free and unrestrained press can effectively expose deception in government.](#) And paramount among the responsibilities of a free press is the duty to prevent any part of the government from deceiving the people and sending them off to distant lands to die of foreign fevers and foreign shot and shell."

Fast forward to the present day, and we're witnessing yet another showdown, this time between Assange and the Deep State, which pits the people's right to know about government misconduct against the might of the military industrial complex.

Yet this isn't merely about whether whistleblowers and journalists are part of a protected class under the Constitution. It's a debate over how long "we the people" will remain a protected class under the Constitution.

Following the current trajectory, it won't be long before *anyone* who believes in holding the government accountable is [labeled an "extremist,"](#) relegated to an underclass that doesn't fit in, [watched all the time](#), and

rounded up when the government deems it necessary.

We're almost at that point now.

Eventually, we will all be potential suspects, terrorists and lawbreakers in the eyes of the government.

Partisan politics have no place in this debate: Americans of all stripes would do well to remember that those who question the motives of government provide a necessary counterpoint to those who would blindly follow where politicians choose to lead.

We don't have to agree with every criticism of the government, but we must defend the rights of *all* individuals to speak freely without fear of punishment or threat of banishment.

Never forget: what the architects of the police state want are submissive, compliant, cooperative, obedient, meek citizens who don't talk back, don't challenge government authority, don't speak out against government misconduct, and don't step out of line.

What the First Amendment protects—and a healthy constitutional republic requires—are citizens who routinely exercise their right to speak truth to power.

The right to speak out against government wrongdoing is the quintessential freedom.

As I make clear in my book [*Battlefield America: The War on the American People*](#) and in its fictional counterpart [*The Erik Blair Diaries*](#), once again, we find ourselves reliving [George Orwell's 1984](#), which portrayed in chilling detail how totalitarian governments employ the power of language to manipulate the masses.

In Orwell's dystopian vision of the future, Big Brother does away with all undesirable and unnecessary words and meanings, even going so far as to routinely rewrite history and punish

“thoughtcrimes.”

Much like today’s social media censors and pre-crime police departments, Orwell’s Thought Police serve as the eyes and ears of Big Brother, while the other government agencies peddle in economic affairs (rationing and starvation), law and order (torture and brainwashing), and news, entertainment, education and art (propaganda).

Orwell’s Big Brother relies on Newspeak to eliminate undesirable words, strip such words as remained of unorthodox meanings and make independent, non-government-approved thought altogether unnecessary.

Where we stand now is at the juncture of OldSpeak (where words have meanings, and ideas can be dangerous) and Newspeak (where only that which is “safe” and “accepted” by the majority is permitted). The power elite has made their intentions clear: they will pursue and prosecute any and all words, thoughts and expressions that challenge their authority.

[Connect with The Rutherford Institute](#)

cover image credit: [geralt](#) / pixabay