

# 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

16 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 12 December 2003. I'm afraid that this new letter of yours gets us no further forward, because it *still* doesn't answer the following very easy to understand questions, which I am now asking for the third time, retaining the original numbering from two letters ago.

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

If your eventual truthful answers to these hitherto rather obviously *sidestepped* (some might even say *evaded*) questions happened to be that the government *admitted* having the relevant awareness in both cases, this would obviate at a stroke the need which you seem still to perceive for you to speculate repeatedly that a supposed lack of information might be a factor precluding for the time being the possibility of informed public debate.

If you are simply *unable* to answer these two key questions straightforwardly and authoritatively, I respectfully suggest that you please pass the correspondence on to someone who *can* answer them, even if that means that you have to send the entire set of needlessly lengthy correspondence back to Number Ten, informing the Prime Minister that he was mistaken in thinking that the Home Office was competent to respond to my enquiries, which is beginning to seem to be the case.

You might wish to argue that the above two explicit questions weren't specifically raised at first. That is true. Quite reasonably, the supplementary questions, in which I ask the government please to disclose what it knows about the subject, were raised subsequently because they were the most natural (and, surely, *predictable*) questions in the world for me to ask, in the light of the fact that your department had responded to a challenge over policy with an uninteresting and unenlightening discussion regarding what I may, or may not, be



able to prove, without the advantages of my having access to whatever inside information that the government might possess.

The first time that I asked the two questions which I have repeated above (**highlighted**) was on 22 November. Prompt and sincere answers to those questions then might easily have enabled a subsequent rather fruitless line of repetitive discussion to have been curtailed then and there. In a sense, therefore, your department itself *implicitly* raised these questions, by drafting unsatisfactory replies to my representations regarding policy that appeared not to be taking account of the fact that there would undoubtedly be true answers to those predictable, crux-of-the-matter questions, which might very well have enabled the drafting of a better formulated response to the initial policy representations, if only those factual answers to straight questions had been disclosed promptly and taken into account fully in your department's drafting, on the Prime Minister's behalf (as Number Ten put it), a response to the representations initially made as to what our group thought the most desirable future policy decision might be.

So, if it's not too much trouble, please simply answer, by return, the two (**highlighted**) questions above (for a change). Then we can review, in the light of the *truth* thus disclosed, whether all the rather uncommittal and vague material you have been sending me lately, at quite unnecessary expense, none of which I have appreciated much (save for the opportunities it afforded for widely appreciated humour, at your expense), was worth sending. In the light of the facts, as known to the government, expressed in the form of candid and authoritative answers to the *unanswered* questions, the sort of adequately informed public debate that you assert would be "far too premature", due to a postulated dearth of information to which you own reticence might well have been the prime contributor, could well have become instantly possible, not to say timely, if not long overdue.

In case you have forgotten, I would reiterate (but please don't feel obliged to respond to this secondary point, at the expense of answering belatedly the two **highlighted** and as yet *unanswered* questions) that the UK is obliged by Article 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights never to *classify* information which citizens whose human rights have been violated would need to have disclosed to them in order for them to be in a position seek legal redress. Such abuse of the Official Secrets Act amounts to nothing short of a *de facto* derogation from Article 13, since there isn't enough difference to "insert a cigarette paper" between (a) denying information needed by human rights potential plaintiffs because the violation of their rights itself, or any technology used for this purpose, is "officially secret" and (b) denying potential plaintiffs legal redress merely because, as Article 13 puts it, their human rights were being violated by "those acting in an official capacity".

I will leave you once again with the the previously quoted and increasingly apt words of scripture that I quoted before, which I perceive as being prophetic primarily to the Prime Minister himself, and with which I ended my letter of 22 November, in which I posed for the first time two as yet unanswered questions, which today I put to you again (**highlighted**), for the *third time*, still hopeful of a proper answer. **"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