

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

10 October 2003

Mr Simon Watkin
Covert Investigation Policy Team
Intelligence and Security Liaison Unit
The Home Office
7th Floor,
50 Queen Anne's Gate
LONDON.
SW1H 9AT

Dear Mr Watkin

I am replying to your undated letter that arrived yesterday morning. I have divided this letter into two sections. If pushed for time, please just address the major points. These are the points that are more likely to crop up in any radio interview.

THE MAJOR POINTS

I wrote to the Prime Minister on behalf of this group on 9 June. This group would like the present British government to take the following three numbered actions.

- 1 To become the first of the world's national governments to declare in its own domestic legislation that the technological monitoring or influence of human thought non-consensually amounts to a crime against humanity.
- 2 To strive to persuade other governments to adopt and to implement legislatively in their own jurisdictions the same view, and to persuade them to enter into an international treaty that would eventually make it the common view of most of the world that the technological monitoring or influence of human thought non-consensually amounted to a crime against humanity.
- 3 To provide information, and thus the chance to seek compensation (ECHR Article 13), to victims of the actus reus of the proposed new crime against humanity, perpetrated before it became defined in law as a crime against humanity, even if that necessitated disclosing classified information to victims who would not ordinarily be eligible for the required level of security vetting.

Eventually, Number Ten promised me a substantive response to our suggestions, but from the Home Office, albeit on the Prime Minister's behalf, rather than from Number Ten directly.

In your earlier letter, in the context of thought monitoring, you appeared to refer to RIPA as adequate protection for citizens. You declined to comment upon thought influencing capabilities altogether. You remained silent on the plea made to the Prime Minister on 9 June to adopt our policy, the creation of a new crime against humanity. I drew certain inferences from this content.

In view of your denial in your latest letter that you had intended to imply in your previous letter the allegedly "sweeping" statements of mine that I had inferred, which you kindly bullet pointed, I find that I am back to square one. Despite the brief illusory appearance to the contrary, I once more find that neither you nor anybody else working for the government has at any time provided the substantiative response I have been promised to the specific suggestions put forward.

Please now give the government's considered response to the suggestions numbered 1 to 3 above.

MINOR POINTS

Applications

For some reason, you have invited me to describe how I envisage the overt deployment of surveillance that monitors human thought technologically and the purpose for which I envisage that being done.

Consider an operation that sought to influence human behaviour, by influencing in the first instance human thought, by the inducing (for example) auditory quasi-hallucinations (ACQs) of human voice in targeted individuals (e.g. by exploiting the microwave hearing effect). Such an operation would be overt if as the ACQs were intended to be detectable, or covert if their effect was intended to be subliminal.

Thought monitoring in either such context would serve a purpose that was essential for making the entire enterprise worthwhile in the first place. It would enable the effect that the ACQs were having upon the subject to be gauged, and the content of subsequent ACQs to be adjusted in order to maximise the effectiveness of the overall "treatment".

If the enterprise were intently overt, the thought monitoring could be made to serve a second purpose. Content could be inserted into subsequent ACQs that compelled the demoralising recognition on the part of the subject that the operation included the *monitoring* of his thoughts.

The overall effect of any operation of this type would be to cause distress, and probably abnormal behaviour. Any complaint would likely result in the discrediting of the target by psychiatric stigmatisation.

You might have wanted me to speculate regarding to what *end* anyone would embark upon such an enterprise. Unfortunately, I have to date interviewed personally far too few alleged victims to enable statistically significant inferences.

I will say that it has often been suggested that the perpetrator's ambition must surely be to learn from the experience of deploying the technique against persons selected almost

randomly for targeting, who are not well connected enough to fight back effectively. What the perpetrators would be trying to learn would likely include how to use the general technique with increasing sophistication, and perhaps ever less detectably, so that it might eventually become safe to risk attempting the deployment of the technique against (for example) (1) internal political dissidents and (2) foreign heads of state, their ministers, their generals and their diplomatic staff.

In any event, this group would wish the technological monitoring and influencing of human thought to be regarded as a crime against humanity *whatever* the precise purpose might be, so although I have paid you the respect of attempting to answer your question, you must see that the question itself is an irrelevant question from our own standpoint, and that any perceived inadequacy in my answer does not detract from the strength of our moral argument.

"A complex area"

You say, "this is a complex area". Technically, there may be complexity, but ethically I'm afraid that I find it all very simple.

You speak of the science being "theoretical", whereas my view is that John McMurtrey's paper is rather *thorough* in its treatment of what it treats, and that there is a world of difference between science being merely "theoretical", and the best of it being classified, the result of clandestine research.

The question I need answered, preferably before any broadcast I might soon be asked to make to an American radio audience, is whether the UK wants to be the world's hero again, or to remain one of its villains. The area is (as you put it) "complex", not because amateurs like us, with some education, plenty of vision and lively consciences, have difficulty writing scientific papers that aren't inevitably decades behind those which could be written by those privy to classified research, even though they are (by all accounts) ahead of any that could be written by those engaged only in open research. Nor is the area complex because the *ethics* of the situation are complex.

The only complexity springs from the misguided adoption of an illiberal ethos, one that Dr Joseph Mengele would have accalimed, an ethos that does not regard all men as having been created equal. When the necessary glasnost and perestroika at last arrive on the scene in our homeland, it will be painful to realise how much money has been wasted upon the development of tools that those wedded to this doomed illiberal ethos have become addicted to using, but whose manufacture and use must now largely be abandoned, now that the hegemony of that illiberal ethos has been curtailed.

Implied consent

It is a well established principle that the Common Law sometimes recognises, and Statute can always define, situations in which consent may be inferred even when it is not expressed. It seems to me that this legal doctrine can be made to provide perfectly acceptable ways of dealing with the difficult cases, such as the following two classes of problem, hostage takers (which you raised) and airline passengers (which I am raising).

Hostage takers

It can be legislated that hostage takers can be deemed, by their conduct, to have consented to the technological monitoring and influencing of their thoughts whilst they continue to pose a risk to their hostages.

Airline passengers

Contractual consent, whereby every passenger agreed that his thoughts could be monitored temporarily, could be incorporated into the small print on the backs of airline tickets. As long as everybody knew the score (Lord Denning's famous "red hand" pointing to the controversial clause), this would be perfectly fair. This would allow to fall outside the scope of the proposed new crime against humanity proposals that have already been mooted to capture EEG data from all passengers boarding aircraft, in much the way that their hand luggage is presently X-rayed, so that the sinister *intentions* of would-be hijackers could be detected as just readily as can now be detected the weapons they try to smuggle into the cabin, for later retrieval and deployment during the flight.

Your request for further evidence

John's McMurtrey's paper, with its 149 references (have you checked them?), is backed up by every word and every diagram of every referenced source document, and by the *reproducibility* of the science thus referenced. That is all the evidence we need to prove a *potential* problem that needs addressing legislatively and by international diplomacy.

Yes, we *do* have anecdotal evidence a-plenty that abuse is already underway, but we still have far too much work to do in shaping this into a respectable presentation that will withstand scrutiny on the part of anyone who would prefer to discredit our work, rather than to acclaim it, so this is powder that we choose for now to keep dry.

That work is, in any case, *irrelevant* to a call that technological thought monitoring or influence without continuing informed consent should be made a crime against humanity *in all circumstances*.

RIPA

The consensus at a meeting I attended recently at the Commons was that RIPA is a sham. Since you have denied that I was right to infer that you were asserting RIPA's adequacy, my low opinion of RIPA and anyone else's high opinion of it are both rendered immaterial. I have therefore not bothered in this letter to defend further my view that RIPA is a sham.

Yours sincerely,

John Allman