

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

18 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

The opening paragraph of my letter of 10 October 2003 read as follows.

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.

Your letter of 14 October does not address the major points, to which I specifically asked you to give priority. You seem to be trying to entice me into become embroiled in a discussion about the minutiae of one of the minor points I raised myself, the potential usefulness of the legal doctrine of implied consent, which I raised as a *concession*, in order to quiesce any concern about the security services being able *in extremis* to use all available measures with proportionality. Joining you in such a discussion is not something I intend to spend any time on whilst I am still awaiting statements of the government's responses to the major points, which you have, to all practical intents and purposes, ignored.

The article itself, "*Thought Police*" *victims denied information* (which I hope you enjoyed), was written before the formation of Christians Against Mental Slavery. The account itself, and even the *title*, make it clear that, whatever minor details of that account I might be able to substantiate with documents is neither here nor there as regards the main thrust of the account, that information has been withheld, other than deniably, that would enable an injunction to be sought, or a judicial review application made, by a single plaintiff.

In any event, to supplement, for example, actual correspondence from the GMC and Prof Feldman, I haven't the time to run around after all this time obtaining affidavits, which I would then feel obliged to send to you with the names of the deponents obliterated, in order to protect sources. I have learnt a great deal since I wrote that article, about the broader picture, and am no longer convinced that the paedophile cover story itself was deniable *information*, so much as deliberate (and equally deniable) *misinformation*.

Furthermore, the policy of the Christians Against Mental Slavery group is to from refrain from trying to argue a case that is founded upon any one individual's allegations which could no more be proved beyond doubt than that the death from cancer of any individual asbestos worker was caused by his earlier exposure to asbestos. We have a strong moral and scientific case without resort to such a dead end tactic.

For these reasons, I suggest that we make no further reference to the Thought Police article, except in the context of future litigation, or sincere "without prejudice" discussions in an attempt to prevent or curtail such litigation, which is certainly not yet the context which you have set for proposed discussion of that article.

We were often challenged in the early days to demonstrate the feasibility of monitoring and influencing human thought technologically. That we have done. If, despite your position as a person who is "subject to Section 1(1) of the Official Secrets Act 1989", you are not yet *personally aware* of technology with such capabilities (whether it works in the way that John McMurtrey documents or in some other way), then I respectfully suggest that you find some *else* to continue this correspondence who *is* aware of such technology, and persuade *him* to elicit and communicate the government's specific responses to the specific points in the section of my letter dated 10 October headed MAJOR POINTS.

Just in case there is any doubt about this I reiterate the main point of this letter:

I am not satisfied with your letter of 14 October, because it failed to address what I referred to explicitly as the MAJOR POINTS, which were the points I specifically asked you to address in any reply, even if that was all you had time to do.

Yours sincerely,

John Allman