

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

www.slavery.org.uk

27 March 2004

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 annoyed with the Prime Minister for asking you to reply to my letter to him of 11 January 2003, and with you for replying as you did on 5 March 2004.

Your letter contains two assertions which it is easy for me to prove are false and which you must have realised were false when you made those assertions in that letter. The common term for such assertions is "lies".

Lie 1: Your letter states:

"The Government's current position on the issues that you have raised has been made clear to you in previous correspondence."

This can be proved to be a lie. For example, you know very well that you have never answered my questions below, so you know that on these points at least the Government's position has not been "made clear" to me. These points are so fundamental to any discussion of the issues (as you more or less told me yourself), that almost nothing about the government's position on the issues raised *can* be "made clear", until those questions are answered.

Lie 2: Secondly, you say:

"There is nothing further that the Government can add on the matter at this point in time."

This is also a lie. The British government is *sovereign*. The sovereign government of an independent nation state can do more or less whatever it likes in its own jurisdiction, provided that its actions are both lawful and reasonable in the Wednesbury sense. So the British government most certainly "*can* add" answers, at this or any other "point in time", to the following two unanswered questions. Until it does, it isn't making its "position" clear, and you very well know it.

The two questions to which I still need the government's answers are:

Question 1: 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 2: 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?

As I have pointed out, there are only three possible answers ("admits", "denies", or "declines") to each of the two questions, and those answers have yet to be given.

I need your one word answers to each of the above questions, in time for an interview that I have been asked to give in Skegness on 2 April 2004, about the work of this group. The interview is expected to be used in a television documentary that will be broadcast in May of this year. An inordinate amount of the work of this group has been dissipated in asking *you* questions which you have evaded, making it obvious that that is what you are doing. That fact will probably therefore play a prominent part in the interview's agenda, if I do not hear from you.

I shall be away from home now until the interview is filmed. You must therefore *telephone* me in plenty of time, in order to obtain a fax number to which you can fax a copy of your letter answering the unanswered question, in addition to mailing that letter to me. I strongly advise against leaving it until the day before the interview, still less until the day of the interview itself. It may not be easy for me to arrange to receive your fax in Skegness.

Please do not put me in the position of having to tell the nation on television how evasive your department and the Prime Minister have been, perhaps naming names. It would have been perfectly easy for you to have said that in the cases of both question 1 and question 2, the government *declined* either to admit or deny awareness of the technology and its deployment respectively and there is still time for you to say this, since it appears to be the truth. This would remove the need for me to tell the interviewer that you had told the two separate lies I have identified in your letter of 5 March, a remarkable feat of dishonesty considering that the letter containing the lies was only five lines long.

If the government wishes, in the interests of balanced reporting, I shall try to arrange with the television company for (for example) you, or Simon Watson, or even a government minister, to be interviewed *with* me, so that the government can exercise its right to reply, to whatever I have to say about our frustrating correspondence and other matters. If the government wants to participate thus, you need to telephone me and to say so, more or less *immediately*, because I would need to inform the television company that the government was intending to field a spokesperson to deflect the media criticism which the government has brought upon itself in realtime, so to speak.

Yours sincerely,

John Allman