

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

22 November 2003

Dr Elizabeth Fitton-Higgins
Covert Investigation Policy Team
Intelligence and Security Liaison Unit
The Home Office
7th Floor
50 Queen Anne's Gate
LONDON
SW1H 9AT

Dear Dr Fitton-Higgins

Thank you for your letter dated 20 November, which appears to me to reveal some shifting on the government's part that necessitates a number of specific questions on my part if I am to understand your letter properly.

Question 1: Are you, like Simon Watkins, a person who is subject to section 1(1) of the Official Secrets Act?

Question 2: 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?

Question 3: Please would you also clarify whether the British government as a whole admits or denies being aware that such technology has already been used without the continuing, informed consent of those whose thoughts have technologically been monitored, or influenced, or both, or declines either to admit or to deny having such awareness?

I note that a position earlier implied, then denied, has now been implied afresh: that the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) provides adequate protection. I have been trying to ascertain whether an assertion made at a meeting I attended at the Commons was true, that the Investigatory Powers Tribunal (IPT) has never, ever upheld a complaint since it was formed, let alone awarded damages; in other words, that the tribunal has never found (in your words) "undue conduct, or a breach of human rights". Not even Viscount Colville, who visited the tribunal with my question, has succeeded in eliciting an answer, even though it is information that any voter would *need* in order to make a properly informed decision as to whether a party in government that asserted the adequacy of RIPA for present purposes was one that it was *safe* to re-elect.

Question 4: Is it *true* or *false* that the Investigatory Powers Tribunal has never actually thus upheld a complaint since it was formed?

Incidentally, surveillance is not nowadays always, or necessarily *mainly*, a covert, intelligence gathering activity, intended to catch common criminals red handed, or to provide evidence for a conspiracy charge. Sometimes, surveillance is conducted as an *overt* act of harrassment, intended on those occasions to intimidate dissident but, in the main, law-abiding political and human rights activists. It has come to my attention that even persons who have complained to the IPT of surveillance that is *overt*, with the effect that they *know* perfectly well that surveillance is underway, because the perpetrators *intend* them to know this, have nonetheless failed to have their complaints upheld.

Furthermore, as you are doubtless well aware, no matter how severely such overt surveillance might invade privacy, the perverse definition of "intrusive surveillance" in RIPA excludes all overt surveillance from recognition as "intrusive" for the purposes of the Act, thus excluding it from the scope of some of the provisions of RIPA. Surveillance that includes technological thought monitoring, which is about the most severe invasion of privacy imaginable, and which is also capable of provoking a complaint to the IPT, is bound to fall into this loophole in the Act's provisions, rendering the right that you observe in your letter that victims have to make complaints to the IPT a right that is *of no practical use to them*, even if your answer to question 4 reveals that, contrary to overt surveillance victims' suspicions, the tribunal has, after all, upheld other kinds of complaint occasionally in the past.

Question 5: In view of the likely *uselessness* of making a complaint to the IPT due to the above-mentioned loophole in RIPA (and perhaps also in the light of your answer to question 4), what revised advice, obviously different from that given in your letter, does the government *now* offer to those who are the victims of abuse of which they are made deliberately aware and which includes technological reading of their thoughts?

Question 6: *What* is the government intending to do, and *when* is it intending to do this, in order to exercise leadership internationally towards ensuring that the aspirations of the European Parliament expressed in resolution **A4-0005/1999** paragraph **27** are met? (The paragraph concerned calls for an international convention banning the development or deployment of weapons capable of any form of manipulation of human beings.)

It appears from your letter, the British government is making the following rather *puzzling* assertion: that, although there was apparently enough information available to the European Parliament four years or so ago for *that* parliament to make an "informed decision" to pass A4-0005/1999 para 27, nevertheless, despite the further research since undertaken by this group and other groups and individuals and an increase worldwide in the number of recorded complaints, sufficient information isn't available today to enable the British government to make (or rather to allow the British Parliament to make) an "informed decision" to take some action in response to, and consistent with, that clear expression of the European Parliament's aspirations, or even to let the matter be debated.

Question 7: If the British government does indeed make the above "puzzling" assertion which I have inferred from your letter that you were implying on the government's behalf, then what *reasoning* lies behind this surprising stance on the government's part? Alternatively, how, otherwise than I first interpreted it, should I now *re-interpret* the

passage of your letter which (abridged) reads, "Firstly, in order for the Government to consider ... informed decision ... in a democratic society"?

Question 8: Have I understood correctly, from your sentence that begins "Even then, the pros and cons", that the government envisages that there might actually be *non-consensual* applications of the relevant technology which it would nevertheless regard as "positive", so that such applications would merely need to be (as you put it) "regulated", rather than downright *outlawed*, as the members of this group would wish?

I look forward to receiving the clarification that I am seeking. Please focus in your reply upon on the specific questions I am asking, which I have numbered 1 to 8.

I leave you with some words from Proverbs 24:12 in the bible (New Living Translation), which I read this morning just after reading your letter. They might not carry a message for you personally, but I do feel they carry a message, if not for the Home Secretary, then at least for the Prime Minister, who diverted my correspondence to your department. **Don't try to avoid responsibility by saying you didn't know about it. For God knows all hearts, and he sees you. He keeps watch over your soul, and he knows you knew!**

Yours sincerely,

John Allman