

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

30 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 feel that despite all the *unenlightened* discussion you have offered me in the past, in which you probably realise you said at least one rather silly thing that positively invited ridicule, more *enlightened* discussion is overdue, discussion which might have got us much further, more quickly.. I feel that such enlightened discussion would have been rendered possible, if only you hadn't overlooked *answering the questions* below (original numbering retained), and had refrained from penning words that apparently sought to perpetrate the pretence that the questions had been answered, when even a child could discern otherwise, and therefore discern that here was a dialogue conducted in the dark, for want of a willingness on the government's part to shed the necessary light upon those discussions, by answering honestly those questions.

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?

Maybe January will bring HMG's frank answers. Then you would need not to play further games of pretence, speculation and naked non-sequitor that I am surprised that it did not shame you to find yourself playing.

Since you are taking your time rather over either deciding to become truthful in answering the above **bold** questions (if they'll let you) or to continue playing games of evasion (if that remains your brief), vis-as-vis unanswered questions **2** and **3** above, herein posed for the fourth time, I thought I would ask you a one new question, for practical reasons as well as to avert any possible boredom one your part. It is a question quite obviously necessary, in view of earlier answers you've given. It will tell me how worthwhile it will be in advertising in newspapers in order to make contact with other people who were left in no doubt that they were under surveillance and who applied in good faith to the Investigatory

Powers Tribunal for justice, unaware that the tribunal is one which (you admitted) *never* finds in favour of complainants, and which I have found out then won't explain why.

On your own admission, actually *upholding* the complaints of those who write to the Investigatory Powers Tribunal has not as yet proved in practice to be feat within that tribunal's repertoire, even (I would add) when complainants have deliberately been *informed* of their surveillance by the perpetrators (this *overt* surveillance being so much more *effective* for intimidating those who disagree with the authorities than *covert* surveillance could ever be), with witnesses able to corroborate.

Would you please now tell me **how many persons have made compliant to the Investigatory Powers Tribunal since it was formed?** (perhaps hoping to attain justice) unaware that, as you admitted earlier, upholding the complaint of an alleged victims of surveillance isn't one of those feats that the Investigatory Powers Tribunal has yet managed to accomplish.

Since you've told me that in practice the tribunal has never exercised any procedure it might have theoretically planned perhaps one day to deploy for *upholding* a complaint, I think my arithmetic is up to the task of subtracting nought from the total number of complainants, in order to arrive at the number of complainants who were either reassured, or, more likely, disgruntled by the tribunal's response.

Yours sincerely,

John Allman