

CHRISTIANS AGAINST  MENTAL SLAVERY

98 High Street Knaresborough N Yorks HG5 0HN

info@slavery.org.uk

07930 519793

7 July 2003

Mr M Doyle
Direct Communications Unit
10 Downing Street
LONDON
SW1 2AA

Dear Mr Doyle

The inception of a Prime Ministerial "Direct Communications Unit" is potentially a bold and laudable abridgment of antiquated Parliamentary etiquette that would have every citizen's query of government routed through (and perhaps suppressed by) his own constituency MP. However, it is a *useless* innovation for our purposes unless the Direct Communication Unit staff will begin actually to *communicate* when that is so clearly what is required of them.

I have today received your letter dated 4 July 2003, in which you state (I quote, but with my own emphasis added), "[the Prime Minister] must delegate to his staff and Government Departments the responsibility for dealing with many [letters]. It was for this reason that *your letter was forwarded to the Department concerned*".

I see. Would you please now state *which* specific Department (e.g. Defence, Home Office, Health), the Prime Minister considered that my letter of 9 July on behalf of this group "concerned", with the result that he therefore forwarded that letter to that (unnamed) Government Department?

By the way, I had been under the impression that the government's *intelligence* services actually do report *directly* to the Prime Minister, rather than to any Departmental minister. That was why I wrote specifically to Mr Blair.

To remind you, our letter was a request to the Prime Minister that he should tell us that he would now make it his government's policy to pass domestic UK legislation and to seek an international treaty declaring it to be a crime against humanity for anyone to use, without continuing, informed consent, information technology that could monitor or influence human thought.

For your convenience, I enclose further copies of the original 9 June letter, and of the subsequent letter of 28 June to Miss Diana Chu, to which you replied. I also enclose a copy of the latest draft of a paper that one of members (John McMurtrey, a citizen of the USA) is still working on, which proves that information technology that can monitor and influence human thought nowadays exists. You should forward both my letters and John McMurtrey's draft paper to the same Government Department as you suggest presently has the 9 June letter, together of course with a copy of *this* letter.

Of course, the existence of the more advanced species of technology of the same general type as John McMurtrey's paper proves exists is likely to be classified as under the Official Secrets Act.

In the interests of drawing this tedious (and so far fruitless) correspondence speedily to a satisfactory conclusion, would you please try to ensure that John McMurtrey's report and both of the copies of earlier letters that I am enclosing afresh are therefore handled by someone (in whatever Department you think appropriate) with the required *security clearance* to be allowed to know *all about* information technology that can monitor or influence human thought, and any use being made of it nowadays on the part of the British public sector, including use by the intelligence services?

To be qualified to reply authoritatively and substantively to my letters, a person must be permitted to know both about the use of such *classified technology*, and any *classified use* of such technology that is not itself classified. He or she must also be privy to any classified or unclassified government policy, guidelines issued, orders made purportedly in exercise of the Royal Prerogative, or practice (etc) regarding the use of technology that can monitor or influence human thought.

If you do not do direct my enquiry appropriately, whoever is reading it will not have the foggiest idea what I am talking about, making it unlikely therefore that I will receive a meaningful substantive reply, thus leading to further wasted correspondence.

Remembering my own youthful days, working as an established civil servant in the MoD, might I suggest that your approach should be to *refer the enquiry to your superiors* if you do not understand the subject matter well enough to be able to give an authoritative, substantive reply (which certainly nobody has done so far). Your superiors in turn, if they find themselves equally bewildered, should then refer the correspondence to *their* superiors, and so on, until, eventually, the correspondence reaches somebody who is actually *qualified* to answer the enquiry.

I would also like to say that given the immense *importance* of the issue that I am raising on behalf of this group's members, and its essentially *moral* nature, the absence (after a whole month of prevarication) of a substantive and authoritative response, not only from the Prime Minister himself, but from *anyone at all*, is an insult to our declared religious position; in other words it is an insult to the God in whose name I claim to be writing.

I am writing to you about an ultra-modern ethical and political problem, which some of those in government must surely know about, even if you do not. I am not yet confident that my 9 June letter has been read by *any* of these suitably informed people.

I believe that those UK ministers who know about the problem, which quite possibly you yourself have not been told about, must now set about solving that problem themselves, justly, quickly and voluntarily, if they (or those who displace them in office) are to avoid enduring the national embarrassment of having to solve the problem under duress, at best in an atmosphere of the wrath of the international community and, at worst, at the hands of Almighty God, using some of His more direct (and sometimes punitive) means of curtailing the heyday of injustice, as exemplified in both scripture and history.

This is my third long letter to number ten. Please let it not receive in return yet another letter that fails actually to *reply*. I began with a simple question (which Department?) that I would like you to answer.

Of course, I could raise the matter through my constituency MP. However, my own constituency MP is a member of a party whose leader has recently made in writing, to me (and hence to this group), a policy commitment to the implementation, when elected, of paragraph 27 of the European Parliament resolution A4-0005/1099, so my quarrel is not with him or his party.

In any case, I am writing on behalf of a *group* that has four nationalities and six UK parliamentary constituencies represented amongst its membership. Moreover the nephew of the former *head of state* of another country is one of our members, and I am fairly hopeful that soon that former head of state will likely himself become a member, or at least a supporter.

The days are finished during which it might have been possible to deflect criticism of the perpetration of what is often called "mind control" (or, as we have chosen to call it, "mental slavery") by the discrediting of political opponents, by pretending that mind control technology was merely something that there was a risk that someone might invent one day in the distant future. I am raising an issue that is scientifically well founded today and that simply isn't going to go away. I would like the government please to assure my group that they have decided at last to address that issue, in an ethical manner, and to tell us *how* they intend to address it. I would have thought that any attempt to address this problem ethically would have to begin with the compensation of past victims, even if the press were not allowed to report that this had been necessary.

It may not yet be public knowledge that mankind now knows how to use information technology (broadly defined) in order to enable (for example) the intelligence services to monitor and to influence human thought. It might be in the public interest that for a while longer these appallingly threatening discoveries of science should remain discoveries of which the great mass of people are not constantly reminded, whilst the world's most responsible leaders ponder how to contain the problem. Nevertheless, I suggest that this problem cannot intelligently be contained by the world's most responsible leaders continuing to reserve the right to be the monopoly *perpetrators* of the problem, however much money might have been invested in the past with exactly such a heinous plan in mind. Nor can mankind as a whole safely continue indefinitely to refrain from addressing the ethical issues raised by these new technological discoveries.

If this it is not within your own remit to recognise the issues and to respond properly, for your country's sake, for God's sake, and for your *own* sake, please find someone else, somewhere in the government, within whose remit this task *does* fall, and get *them* to deal properly with my letters.

Yours sincerely,

John Allman