

CHRISTIANS AGAINST MENTAL SLAVERY

98 High Street Knaresborough N Yorks HG5 0HN info@slavery.org.uk 07930 519793

An international group that wants the non-consensual technological monitoring or influence of human thought to be declared a crime against humanity worldwide

www.slavery.org.uk

11 January 2004

The Rt Hon Tony Blair
Prime Minister
10 Downing Street
LONDON
SW1 2AA

Dear Prime Minister

I wrote to you on behalf of this group on 9 June 2003. You referred the correspondence to the Home Office, asserting their competence to reply on your behalf. From the outset, I was skeptical as to whether the Home Office would be competent to deliver a proper response. At least twenty letters having travelled back and forth, I cannot help but think with even greater conviction than at first that you should have dealt with the matter yourself, instead of delegating it to the Home Office for them to deal with it on your behalf, because, as I feared, they haven't done so, as promised both by both your own staff when sending the correspondence on, and by the Home Office itself, in their first letter to me acknowledging receipt.

The Home Office asserted during the correspondence that insufficient information was available for policy decision such as was counselled in the 9 June letter, or informed debate. This was rather ambiguous, so I sought the clarification that could enable progress, by asking the following simple question, which was, in the circumstances the Home Office had created, both an obvious question and a necessary one.

Regarding technology that enables human thought to be monitored or influenced, please would you clarify whether the British government as a whole admits or denies being aware that such technology has already been invented, or declines either to admit or to deny having such awareness?

I'm sorry that it has come to this, but after repeating the above question in two further letters and receiving three letters in all from the Home Office that didn't answer the question, I have decided that it is only sensible for me to bring the matter back to *your* attention. I suggest that you now retrieve the file from Dr Elizabeth Fitton-Higgins at the Home Office and deal with the matter at Number Ten instead, which is where I always thought the matter belonged.

It is perhaps worth mentioning here that besides leaving us in the dark as to in what sense information necessary for informed debate is claimed not to be "available", the present lack of frankness would appear to leave those who claim to be the victims of the relevant human rights abuses without access to an effective remedy, in apparent violation of the UK's obligations under European Convention on Human Rights, Article 13.

I did manage to establish *one* useful fact from the Home Office, which was that the Investigatory Powers Tribunal (IPT) doesn't uphold complaints of any kind, ever. It doesn't even uphold complaints in cases of the very opposite of "covert" surveillance, what I suggest we call *overt* surveillance, during which the perpetrator *deliberately ensures* that the victim knows the surveillance is taking place, because the purpose isn't catching villains red-handed, but rather intimidating dissidents.

The IPT is so obviously incapable of providing, other than *in theory*, what Article 13 terms an "effective remedy" that your co-operation now might therefore save everyone a future trek to Strasbourg.

It would get us off on the right foot if I could have (straight away please) the Prime Minister's answer to the unanswered question that I have highlighted above, the question which the Home Office won't answer, but contrarily won't explicitly say that it won't answer either.

To make it clear from the outset what sort of technology we are asking about when referring to "technology that enables human thought to be monitored or influenced" (because there have been some fairly silly or perverse attempts made in the past at feigned misinterpretation), I would encourage you please to consult European Parliament Resolution **A4-0005/1999** Paragraph **27**, and to read our member's paper, **Remote Behavioral Influence Technology Evidence** by John McMurtrey, to which you can link from our website.

Yours sincerely,

John Allman