

**CHRISTIANS AGAINST  MENTAL SLAVERY**

98 High Street Knaresborough N Yorks HG5 0HN

info@slavery.org.uk

07930 519793

28 August 2003

Your ref: T3628/3

Miss Simeem Al-Ayash  
The Home Office  
7th Floor  
50 Queen Anne's Gate  
LONDON  
SW1H 9AT

Dear Miss Al-Ayash

Thank you for your undated letter, received here late last week.

I am pleased that you have been asked to respond on behalf of the Home Secretary, to the correspondence to the Prime Minister and his staff, to which I was assured in an apologetic letter that the Home Office would respond to, on the Prime Minister's behalf.

So, *when* may I expect you to respond to the backlog of correspondence which was addressed to the Prime Minister on 9 June, 28 June and 7 July?

To deal with an incidental matter that you appear to be raising yourself, you apparently refer to the Home Secretary as "the Minister responsible for this area of law". Which particular "law" is it, for which the Home Office is said to be "responsible", to which you are referring in this sentence? You see, because our group has been concerned about a matter that we had thought was *not yet covered*, by *any* legislation. If we were mistaken, and there is *already* legislation we didn't know about in place, outlawing the non-consensual technological monitoring or influence of human thought, please tell me what that legislation is.

We are also advocating an international treaty banning the relevant technology's non-consensual use worldwide. (In this respect, we are in sympathy with paragraph 27 of the European Parliament resolution A4-0005/1999, calling for a worldwide ban on weapons that are capable of the manipulation of human beings.) I would have thought that the Foreign Secretary and, since some of the the technology is likely to have been developed using Defence budget, the Defence Secretary too, would have wished to give a view, alongside anything relevant that the Home Secretary might eventually instruct you to say to us.

There again, since in time of peace it is the intelligence services that would be the most likely to be tempted to abuse the relevent technology non-consensually, I would have thought that the Prime Minister's *personal* view was also essential, after all, if we are to receive the promised response.

Of course it will take a long time to get together people, who are all adequately security cleared to know the factual background to the issue raised, from each interested department, and to thrash out a mutually acceptable response to our very clearly stated

position. What I would like you to tell me, for the time being, is that definite measures (such as I think you must now see are necessary) are *actually being taken* in order to thrash out a collective response, and *how long* the government thinks it will take before we will *receive* that response.

Yours sincerely,

John Allman