

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

9 December 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

I am replying to your letter of 28 November 2003.

I started out by writing to the Prime Minister on June 9, since when I estimate that twenty or so letters have gone to and fro. The PM referred the correspondence at an early stage to the Home Office, with a promise of a reply on his behalf.

Your letter of 28 November was a reply to mine to you of 22 November. In that letter, I posed certain questions of fact that appeared necessary in the light of earlier correspondence from various government officials to me.

I note that Simon Watkins, who, unlike yourself, is a person subject to the Official Secrets Act 1989 section 1(1) is no longer my correspondent. I foresee that this might cause problems, but I will leave it to you to address them.

To get to the point, the final paragraph of your letter of 28 November (abridged) read:

I hope this letter answers your questions ... there does not seem to be anything further to add ...

In contrast, I had asked on 22 November,

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?

The verbiage you offered in purported answer to this question did not use the word "admits", nor the word "denies", nor the word "declines", so, prima facie, your hope, expressed in the phrase, "I hope this letter answers your questions" is most obviously vain. Please now give one of the three straightforward, mutually exclusive and collectively comprehensive answers requested, that HMG admits the said knowledge, or denies it, or declines either to admit or to deny the said knowledge; for these are the only three ways of answering a question so worded.

My letter of 22 November also asked:

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 techologically been monitored, or influenced, or both, or declines either to admit or to deny having such awareness?

The same considerations apply to your purported reply to question 3 as apply in the case of the unanswered question 2. In addition, your purported reply alluded to the state of knowledge specifically of the Home Office, as perceived to boot by one with lower security clearance than an earlier correspondent. It was in order that the Home Office might deliver a response *on behalf of the Prime Minister*, i.e. on behalf of the government as a whole, that a chain of correspondence that began with a letter to the Prime Minister became referred to the "relevant department", the Home Office, in the first place.

I thank you for admitting that the Investigatory Powers Tribunal always clears the government of wrong-doing, and note with amusement your theory that this is because the government is never guilty of wrong-doing.

I would deride the assertion advanced in connection with European Parliament resolution **A4-0005/1999** paragraph **27**, to the effect that the passing of a European Parliament resolution antagonistic to the development or deployment of a particular class of weapons somehow "implies" that such weapons have not yet begun to be developed. For you to have attempted to argue thus is to have invited well deserved ridicule.

I note your appeal to an alleged lack of information as grounds for any failure to debate or to address the issues that concerned the European Parliament, let alone to respond positively to the above-mentioned resolution. I invite you to remedy the alleged defect of information by supplying the missing information requested so plainly by myself, by answering the simple questions 2 and 3, hitherto unanswered as you must now realise that they remain.

I look forward to receiving from you a letter about which it would not be so brazenly over-optimistic for you to assert that you hoped that you had answered my questions; i.e. I look forward to receiving from you a letter which does actually answer those questions, for a change.

I will leave you again with the words of scripture, primarily prophetic to the Prime Minister himself, with which I also ended my letter of 22 November. **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