

Homicide and Serious Crime Command
New Scotland Yard
8-10 Broadway
London SW1H 0BG

Michael Jones
[Address]

28 June 2013

Dear Sir or Madam,

Report of the cover-up, between October 2008 and June 2013, by Guy's & St. Thomas' NHS Trust Radiology and Neurology Depts., of medical (MRI) evidence revealing illegal activities of surgeons at the North Staffordshire Infirmary (1967).

This letter relates to a previous communication and submission of evidence to your department, dated 7 January 2012.

On 19 March this year I submitted a complaint to Guy's & St. Thomas NHS Trust Complaints Dept. to address various failures in the process of reports made on the findings, and subsequent consultation over, an MRI scan of my brain, made on 02/10/2008 at St. Thomas Radiology Dept. (see enclosures 1-5).

The complaint sought explanations on four issues, the earliest and most important of which were the failures of both St. Thomas' Radiology Dept. (in their initial reporting of the scan results), and of Guy's Neurology Dept. (during my subsequent consultation with Dr. Thomasin Andrews there), to alert either the referring physician at the South London & Maudsley NHS Trust, or myself, of evident anomalies revealed by the scan.

The complaint drew attention to selected images from the scan published on my website at: <http://somr.info/report>, where there is displayed a three-image sequence from Series 7 of the scan (images 13-15). These three images reveal the presence of what I understand to be a small object of non-biological origin, to the right of my vertebral column, just below the base of the skull. The implication is that this object had been placed in my neck surreptitiously via an incision in the back of my throat during a 'tonsillectomy' operation I underwent at the North Staffs Infirmary, in 1967, aged six.

It transpires that the tonsillectomy was in fact a guise to conceal the execution of a piece of pioneering (and covert) medical research, focused upon advancing the understanding of the nature of intelligence and the workings of the brain. A full historical description and analysis of the events surrounding this operation, as well as suggestions for the medical and technological justification for such an enterprise, are presented on various pages linked from the above website, and in an updated version of the report *Special Operations in Medical Research*, downloadable there as a .pdf document.

The suggestion behind my complaint was therefore that both St. Thomas' Radiology Dept., and Guy's Neurology Dept., found themselves unable to discuss or disclose the anomalies revealed by the scan, for two principle reasons:

- 1) As the items revealed by the scan were illicit implantations, and medically unprecedented, there was no existing medical definition or diagnostic category with which to describe them.
- 2) The presence of such a foreign object in my neck could only indicate the suggestion of illegal activities by medical professionals at some point in my medical history, and therefore to disclose knowledge of it would be to break some implicit code of secrecy. It therefore presented the doctors at Guy's & St. Thomas' with the prospect of an unmanageable controversy, which, had they opted for disclosure, would have compromised them professionally, and exposed them to personal vulnerability.

My complaint therefore sought a reappraisal of the MRI evidence, through the overview of the Complaints Dept., and in the light of the additional evidence published on my website. The Complaints Dept.'s response (enclosure 6) was written on 17 May 2013, but was delayed until 3 June awaiting approval by the Trust's Chief Executive, Sir Ron Kerr. The progress of the complaint is described in detail at: <http://somr.info/report>.

The impulse of the response is defensive; i.e., to provide 'reassurance' of the 'absence' of any alleged cranial implants, the accuracy of the original findings, and the insignificance of the failures in the reporting process from 2008. It reiterates the conclusion of the original MRI Findings Report (by Dr. Hawkins: see enclosure 2), made on 6 October 2008, of: '*No significant intercranial abnormality and some small vessel ischemia*'. It states: '*..your MRI has been reviewed again by the Neuro-radiologists on 8th May 2013. They say that they agree with the original neuro-radiology report of Dr. Hawkins*'. The response however includes no documentary statement of this 'review', and no indication of the identities of the physician(s) affirming this second opinion, and therefore remains unconvincing.

The response goes on to state:

'The specific structures about which you have expressed concern and which you have highlighted on your website are as follows:- the saggital sinus (a vein running across the brain between the two hemispheres), and the left vertebral artery (seen with some surrounding soft tissue).

I have been advised both are normal structures and are seen on all MRI Brain.'

At the time of making this complaint, the images referenced on the website included some speculation about image 26 from Series 7 (of the extreme rear of my skull, in addition to images 13-15), which I had thought may have also been anomalous. I am now satisfied that image 26 is an image of the *sagittal sinus*, and is normal, and so I have removed this reference. The remaining three images in sequence are those it is suggested in the above quotation are explained in terms of the 'left vertebral artery' – an explanation which is clearly erroneous, as the object referred to in these images lies on the *right* (not the 'left') of the vertebral column.

In its reliance on what is clearly an error in explanation, the response to my complaint is bogus and unsustainable. It appears therefore as a tactical response, made in awareness of the anomalies revealed by the MRI scan, but whose purpose is to delay an honest and open response to the substance of the complaint, in defence against anticipated legal action.

The complaint had been submitted before I had access to the results of a second brain MRI scan, made at the National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, UCLH NHS Trust, on 6 March 2013 (enclosure 7). Although I have yet to receive any consultation over these scan results, I obtained a copy of the scan from the Medical Records Dept. of UCLH, and was able to select three images from the scan which reveal the presence of further objects situated in my neck area, and which were not revealed in the first MRI scan.* These images are presented at: <http://somr.info/report/rep0.php>.

The images reveal the presence of two rigid square or box-like structures, situated behind the back of my throat, close to the brain-stem, essentially confirming in principle my claims of the presence of illicit neurosurgical implants in my head and neck area, and reinforcing the above conclusion that the explanation given on behalf of St. Thomas' Radiology Dept., in respect of the three-image sequence from the first MRI scan, is a dishonest and cynical tactic in diversion from the truth.

* The three images referred to are images 51, 52, & 53, from the 128-image sequence located in the top folder named 'AAH SCOUT', in the scan explorer window which opens when running the scan application.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Jones

Enclosures:

1. CD copy of Brain MRI scan made at Guy's & St. Thomas' NHS Trust on 02/10/2008, plus copy of original disc face.
2. MRI Findings Report from St. Thomas' Radiology Dept., verified by Scott Hawkins, 06/10/2008.
3. Copy of MRI Findings Report as received by South London & Maudsley NHS Trust, dated 23/12/2008.
4. Letter from Dr. Thomasin Andrews at Guy's Neurology Dept., following MRI consultation on 14/04/2009, dated 24/04/2009.
5. My Letter of complaint to Guy's & St. Thomas' Complaints Dept., dated 19/03/2013.
6. Complaint response from Guy's & Thomas' Complaints Dept., dated 03/06/2013.
7. CD copy of MRI HEAD scan made at National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, UCLH NHS Trust, on 6 March 2013, plus copy of original disc face.