Controlling the Ability of People and Organizations to Access the Internet

Under the guise of "protecting Americans" and choosing itself in so-called "national security," the current Obama administration wants to be able to control the ability of people and organizations to access the Internet.

This concept on its face seems very harmless and in the best interest of the country, however, having the ability to "turn the Internet off or shutting down sites that Obama considers "dangerous" including particular political groups, individuals or organizations who espouse differing views has far reaching political, financial, moral and legal implications.

Such a policy imposed under Executive Order to control what enters Internet sites and what is shared daily would stifle free speech in direct violation of the First Amendment rights of all Americans.

During the elections in Iran, its citizens using Facebook and Twitter got out 95% of the news from Iran. In America would our social sites be shut down if enough people using them "dared" to question the current political regime in power at any given time? Sitting ominously in the Senate is the Rockefeller Bill S. 773 to takeover the Internet in emergencies. As we all know, once taken over, we will never get it back the way it was before. This is what elitists have in mind for us.

America's brightest minds and taxpayers funds made the Internet happen, and now there are indications that the Obama administration is moving quietly to allow control of the web to move from the US to foreign powers. Such a transfer of power and control would change the future of mankind. This would be affected via our Department of Commerce.

America controls the Internet via the Domain name System (DNS), and the servers that serve the Internet. They are managed by IANA, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority, which operates via the Department of Commerce, being responsible for global cooperation and coordination of the DNS, IP addressing, and other Internet protocol sources. Without these elements one would not have access to the Internet.

Over the years, the UN and others internationally have been pressing the US to give away control and management to an international body. Those thirsting for this power are the UN and the International Telecommunications Union, which coordinates international telephone communications. Their argument is that the Internet has become a powerful and dependent form of communications, that is dangerous and inequitable for one nation to control and manage.

Our President has agreed to relinquish some control over IANA and its governance. Foreign companies and countries would have a greater say in what goes on in the Internet. This is the foot in the door. Before you know it the UN will have control and censorship will begin. No control should be given to any other country or body. It is not only our Internet; it is a matter of national security, which our government is up too. The world has been allowed to share this miracle free and without censorship or restriction. Do we want to end up like the Chinese, where their communist government recently told Google to censor the Internet? Do we want the UN to use the Internet as a source of funding? Do we want the UN or any participant country to restrict what we can say or do on the net? Do we want limitations on free speech? That is what the UN has planned for us. The Internet will no longer be a vehicle of free speech. Why would we want to give away one of our most precious and greatest assets for nothing to a group that is bent on enslaving us via one-world government? Once our control is gone we will never get it back.

The Council on Foreign Relations, literary house organ that we have subscribed to for 50 years, Foreign Affairs, tells us that many governments feel that, like the telephone network, the Internet should be administered under a multilateral treaty. They view ICANN as an instrument of American hegemony over cyberspace and that its private-sector approach favors the US and gives it oversight authority, and that other nations have no say as to what goes on in the Internet. Then again, we did invent it and do own it. Its private construction was deliberately implemented to keep government out of the net, not for the US or any other government or body to control it. South Africa, Brazil and China as stooges for one-world interests are demanding an international treaty, so the UN can control it. Adding to the demands are the intellectually void countries of Zimbabwe, Cuba and Syria. These three paragons of peace and prosperity want the UN to tell us how to run our Internet.

UN bureaucrats and ministers from under-developed nations in particular say the US has undue influence over how things run on line. They want a treaty under which their regimes cannot be criticized. They want Internet surveillance and the power to tax domain names to pay for universal access and, of course, to fund their regimes. They in their protestations have no intention of stopping spam because much of it emanates from their countries. They want all kinds of censorship. Can you imagine what China or Cuba's demands would be? China and Cuba are both dictatorships. Why would such one-party states be allowed in the UN, never mind telling us how censorship would work? Both jail people for political decent and sometimes execute them. We can also throw Iran in for good measure. This is a nation with one political party that in 2003 jailed 80 journalists and activists. Then Iran wants UN control so that thousands of immoral websites can be banned. This war by the internationalists to control the Internet is not new. It began in 1999. That is when the UN proposed taxing all e-mail messages to pay for development aid.

You cannot legislate morals. That is reflected in our unsuccessful ventures into legislation of alcohol, drugs, sex and tobacco and now the UN wants to legislate all kinds of content. Are we to allow the curtailment of our First Amendment rights? We do not think so. Are we to tolerate Cyber Patrols or Net Nannies?

In addition we now have cyber crime investigators pushing for the creation of a national web interface linking police computers. 89% of police say they want to look into e-mail accounts in a broad push by law enforcement agencies to alter the ground rules of online investigations. They want laws requiring Internet companies to store data for up to five years and they want instant access to police inquiries instead of waiting hours or days for

responses from Internet companies. They want emergency access like the FBI had and terribly abused that privilege to get phone numbers. In the Internet the police want information now not after a review of whether the request is appropriate.

This is where the President wants to take us and we do not like it. Be sure to contract your house and Senate representatives and let them know how you feel about this abridgment of your privacy and your rights. If you do not act now, it may be too late later.

Related Links

http://www.prisonplanet.com/frightening-taste-of-internet-censorship-as-major-free-speech-websites-blocked.html/print

The Alex Jones Show with Jason Bermas 1/3: Cybersecurity Act-Government Takeover of The Internet

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8mFyZB0lDBU&feature=email

"The War on Internet Censorship" w/ Alex Jones & Infowars.com (STOP S.773)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KFVW_lCDztE&feature=related

Internet Censorship Must Be Stopped!

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S8DdcVxq9hg&feature=related

The original source of this article is The International Forecaster
Copyright © Bob Chapman, The International Forecaster, 2010

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Bob Chapman