

Covert Censorship at Oxford and Leicester University

CONTEST and State-Sponsored Discrimination

Kevin Mugur Galalae

April 2010

Oxford University and Leicester University collaborate with Britain's secret service agencies in a covert program that spies on and censors students in line with the dictates of CONTEST - *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*.

In the following, I will lay out compelling evidence and the sequence of events that have allowed me to uncover that at least two British universities, Oxford and Leicester, are collaborating with the British intelligence and security agencies in a covert surveillance and censorship program of the online academic environment. The program operates under the auspices of CONTEST, *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*, and employs foreign and domestic assets to spy on foreign and domestic students enrolled in British universities. It achieves this by embedding agents in programs and courses where they masquerade as regular students, but where they collaborate with the course tutors to control and censor the academic environment according to the dictates of CONTEST.

On the 20th of April, 2009, I began a ten-week online course in Political Philosophy at Oxford University through the Department for Continuing Education. The course was to be a warm-up to a two-year Masters program in International Relations and Global Order to which I had been accepted by the University of Leicester and that I subsequently began in October, 2009.

Six weeks into the Oxford course, on the 3rd of June, I was expelled for allegedly breaching netiquette. From the very beginning, I maintained that my expulsion was not only unfair, but also motivated by ulterior motives and have appealed it. My anti-monarchical stand and calls for a more equitable distribution of wealth and labour in a direct rather than representative democracy have obviously ruffled some feathers. Ten months and various internal adjudication bodies later and I have little to show for appealing my expulsion despite my sustained effort to seek justice and fairness from Oxford. Throughout the adjudication process the people entrusted with making fair and sound decisions have disregarded the rules and broken not only the letter and spirit of the law but also every ethical, regulatory, procedural, legal and professional guideline that are supposed to govern their actions. Puzzled by why a university as venerable as Oxford would act in such a manner, I ascribed its collapse of the adjudication system and obstruction of justice to censorship and racism, but did not identify an external cause until later, when I could compare Oxford's actions with those of Leicester. What I had already realized, however, was that Oxford had something to hide, namely a mechanism of censorship that entails a covert monitor who masquerades as a regular student (Ivor Middleton) and a dormant account in the name of a student who never posts (Max Tant) but who is activated as soon as the course tutor needs a proxy for ulterior motives – like manufacturing the opportunity for legally palatable reasons to expel students whose political ideas and ideals are not welcome at Oxford. This I identified in my second appeal document, at which point Oxford University shut down as tight as a clam and any and all communication ceased.

At Leicester, my criticism of British foreign policy led to a gradual devaluation of my assignments, so much so that from an A student in the first few weeks of the Masters program's

first module I became an F student by the eighth week. The glaring disconnect between the quality of my work and its evaluation by the course tutor, Mr. Nick Wright, as well as the tutor's attack on the integrity of my analyses, were clear indications that I was no longer welcome in the program and that I was being shown the door in the only way possible for the university to avoid accusations of censorship. They wanted me to quit of my own volition and ratcheted the pressure to ensure that I do so. I did, once my appeals for fair evaluation of my assignments and respectful treatment of my forum contributions went unaddressed by the course tutor's superior, Dr. Rofe, and asked for a refund of my fees. This was denied, at which point I began the appeal process.

Parallels between the two universities became obvious at this point:

1. My intellectual contributions were initially appreciated as first-class by the tutors of both universities but once it became clear that I was willing to question and criticise aspects of British society and policies the nature and tenor of their behaviour towards me changed radically.
2. Unable to expel me for my socio-political opinions both universities found alternate methods, in Oxford's case breach of netiquette and in Leicester's case failing grades.
3. Both universities employ covert monitors who masquerade as students but whose contributions to the forums are inconsistent with those of regular students and who obviously have access to information that betrays a direct line of communication with the course tutors and the administration. These covert monitors I identified as being Ivor Middleton at Oxford and Carla Liuzzo at Leicester.
4. The covert monitors of both universities attempted to persuade me through private emails that the respective universities had acted properly and that I had no grounds to complain. Moreover, when I questioned their impartiality and declared my intention to proceed with my appeals they reacted angrily and thus revealed that they are emotionally involved in my mistreatment and that they had a vested interest in justifying the universities' actions towards me.
5. Both universities shut down their adjudication processes and communications channels once I had identified the identities of their covert monitors and their roles within the universities' mechanisms of censorship. The shutdown was so complete that both Oxford and Leicester refused to even acknowledge let alone respond to my repeated requests that they issue a Completion of Procedures Letter, which is required by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), Britain's adjudicating authority outside individual universities, as a prerequisite for investigating an unresolved complaint. More recently, Oxford has even openly questioned the OIA's authority to investigate my allegations (see File 6), after missing the OIA's first deadline (see File 6a), which further shows the length to which Oxford is willing to go in order to cover its involvement in the

government's covert surveillance program of their online courses, not to mention its own breaches of due process. Oxford has also failed to respond to the letters the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has instructed me to send as a prelude to their decision to take the case I brought before them.

6. Individuals at both universities, whether academics or administrators, have lied on record or gone out of their way to conceal the true purpose and functions of those whom I had identified as secret monitors.
7. Both universities violated due process by denying me the right to have my case heard by the highest adjudicating authority of their university, the Proctors Office in Oxford's case and the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor's Office in Leicester's case, which would have entitled me to access the evidence and to legal representation unavailable at lower adjudication levels and that would have blown their involvement in the covert surveillance program wide open.

The picture that emerged as a result of the ability to compare the behaviour of Oxford with that of Leicester was that both universities are engaged in a cover-up and that no university regulation or law of the land is sacred or important enough to violate in order to conceal their involvement in a program that spies on their own students and that brazenly censors the academic environment. The legal breaches and consequent risks such activity would entail, not to mention the cost and the ethical implications, suggested to me that the universities did not act on their own, or of their own volition for that matter, but that a higher authority with deep pockets and a propensity for wasting money stood behind this. This could only be the British government.

Having now plenty of indirect or circumstantial evidence to suspect that both universities employ covert mechanisms of censorship and surveillance in collusion with Britain's secret service, I needed confirmation and proof. My hope for redress for the way I was treated by Oxford and Leicester took a backseat to the need to expose the existence of such a dubious program.

The first step I took was to ask Ivor Middleton and Carla Liuzzo, the suspected covert monitors, if they worked on behalf of their respective universities as secret monitors. They replied promptly that they do not. However, when I confronted them with the question whether they work as secret monitors on behalf of another entity such as the secret service they disappeared behind a veil of silence. This confirmed my suspicion that they are indeed working on behalf of Britain's secret service. Had that not been the case they would have vehemently denied it. I then wrote to Oxford's new Vice-Chancellor, Andrew Hamilton, in the hope that he, as an American citizen, will have the courage to expose Britain's covert surveillance program. He too, however, failed to respond.

At this point, being almost certain that Carla Liuzzo and Ivor Middleton are secret service agents spying on their fellow students, I began to investigate their identities. What I found is most

revealing. They both have lived (Ivor Middleton) or still live (Carla Liuzzo) in the Middle East and have extensive experience in the region. Ivor Middleton, it turns out, is also the Director of Complete Security Concepts, a large security company in Britain (see <http://www.csc-security.co.uk/personnel.html>). In the profile he posted for the Political Philosophy course, however, he declared to be a financial adviser. Carla Liuzzo, who is an Australian citizen, is a frequent contributor to the Lowy Interpreter, the publication of the Lowy Institute for International Policy, and is married to a correspondent of Al Jazeera in English and lives in Doha, Qatar. In the profile she posted for the first module of the Masters program, she declared to be employed by the Qatar Foundation where she works on food security issues. Given these discrepancies and the perfect prerequisites these two individuals have for secret service employment in today's environment, it is no wonder that they have been recruited to spy on students.

The ability to further confirm this suspicion came when Leicester University felt necessary to threaten me with legal action for communicating my findings to my fellow students. I took that opportunity and encouraged Leicester's officials to sue me if they thought their legal position was superior to mine. Caught in their own trap, they failed to respond and seem to have disappeared from the face of the earth. Now I had four confirmations but still no conclusive proof.

The proof could only come from the Information Office of the two universities once I requested information through the Freedom of Information Act 2000. At first, my request left the universities room to avoid giving me an honest answer since I did not ask about a covert surveillance program. Once I did ask about the existence of a covert surveillance program and about the universities' knowledge and tacit or implicit consent, the information officers also disappeared from the face of the earth. The information officers of both universities have gone out of their way to delay responding. Oxford's information officers have even refused to divulge their identities. They both waited until the end of the 20-day legal deadline to reply to my requests for information. Leicester's information officer basically confirmed the university's cooperation with the government in a covert surveillance program (see appendix 1) while Oxford's chose to trivialize my question and proceeded to lie (see appendix 2).

While I was waiting for Oxford and Leicester to answer my requests for information, I decided to test my conviction that the British government is behind this spy program. Also, sensing that political pressure is being applied to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator in order to refuse investigating my allegations against Oxford, I wrote to Mr. Allan, Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee (see appendix 3). As expected, I received no acknowledgement and no reply, further confirming that the program exists and does fall under the jurisdiction of Britain's intelligence services.

Indirect confirmation of the existence of such a spy program came also through the peculiar reactions or lack thereof from various media outfits, civil rights groups, the National Union of

Students, and the judiciary. The first media outlet I contacted was Cherwell, Oxford University's own newspaper, which purports to be independent since 1920. The editor's initial interest was soon replaced by total silence. The BBC was the second media outfit I contacted, this time by phone, only to be told that the BBC only reports stories that have already been reported on by local media, in other words, old news. The Guardian was my next attempt to elicit the British media's interest in exposing the spy program I have discovered. Once again, I received no emails or phone calls, not even an acknowledgement. More recently, on the 12th of April to be precise, I also sent this very file to Mr. Hartley, editor-in-chief of The Sunday Times; Mr. Kelner, editor-in-chief of The Independent; Mr. Lewis, editor-in-chief of The Daily Telegraph; and Mr. Dacre, editor-in-chief of The Daily Mail. But to no avail, since no one bothered to acknowledge let alone respond. The media, it appears, has been muzzled by Defence Advisory Notices or DA-Notices, the British government's official request to news editors not to publish or broadcast items on specified subjects for reasons of national security.

To test America's special relationship with Britain, I then contacted the executive editor of the New York Times, Mr. Sulzberger. Not surprisingly, he too has failed to respond.

I also turned to civil rights groups within Britain. Liberty, which purports to be "*an independent human rights organisation which works to defend and extend rights and freedoms in England and Wales*" first responded that my case did not fall under their jurisdiction. When I then explained why it did and renewed my request for their assistance, Liberty too fell silent (see appendix 4). I had even less success with Professor Ross Anderson from Cambridge University, who is apparently an outspoken defender of academic freedoms in England, but who did not turn out to be very helpful. More recently, the Equality and Human Rights Commission, Britain's top watchdog for human rights violations, has also chosen to go into hiding (see appendix 5). So much for civil liberties groups in Britain! Faced with the prospect of having to condemn their own government, Britain's civil liberties groups have turned out to be no more than window-dressing.

If the media is muzzled and civil society co-opted, then the National Union of Students will surely jump on my story, I reasoned. They are, after all, the "*national voice of students*". Low and behold the "*national voice of students*" has also remained mute to my revelation and deaf to my request for help (see appendix 6).

Out of curiosity rather than hope, I also attempted to find a solicitor in Britain who might take up my cause. But even though I contacted several, I have yet to hear from any.

Britain is a wall of silence. The entire society, it appears, is going along with a program that flies in the face of their nation's most sacred ideals and most basic rights. So much for democracy, a free press, human rights, privacy, the sanctity of the academic environment, or respect for the law of the land! The only thing left is hypocrisy and a carefully preserved illusion of democracy.

Fed up with Britain and convinced that any attempt to seek justice or find help exposing what is clearly an illegal and unethical program is futile, I decided to turn my efforts to Canada. At the end of February, I met with Detachment Commander Andy Harbour to alert him of the possibility that harm may come to me or my family as a result of my efforts to expose Britain's spy program on its universities. He was very sympathetic and promised to keep an eye on me, but could not offer any official protection, which indeed I did not request. He suggested I contact the media.

I then met with Human Rights Watch in Toronto, where I was told that they have no resources for such issues and that they could not help. They did refer me, however, to Professor Ron Deibert of the Citizen's Lab at the MUNK Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto, who promised to read my file and get back to me. I have yet to hear from him. More recently, I sent my evidence to the Canadian Civil Liberties Union and, for good measure, also to the American Civil Liberties Union, but I have yet to hear back from them. So much for Canadian civil rights organisations!

My efforts to date to get the media's interest in Canada have also failed. Although the editor of the local newspaper, Mr. Claude Scilley, of the Whig Standard, has received all the documents enclosed herein, I have yet to hear from him despite several emails and phone calls to his office. He too has conveniently disappeared from the face of the earth. Hopeful that Canada's most respected newspaper would publish my story, I contacted Mr. Stackhouse, the editor-in-chief of The Globe and Mail, but he too failed to respond.

Exhausted from ten months of fighting with the British system and apprehensive that civil rights organisations are as toothless in Canada as they are in Britain, I decided to seek the help and protection of my government. On the 22nd of March, I walked into the office of Mr. Milliken, my local MP, and asked to see him. Since he was not there, his constituency assistant, Mrs. Mary Davis Little, was kind enough to talk to me. After briefly explaining to her my predicament and asking for help in exposing Britain's spy program since it affects countless Canadians who study in British universities, she told me that there is nothing my MP could do for me or indeed the government of Canada. I asked if there is an agency in Ottawa she could direct me to for assistance. She replied that she could think of no one. I insisted that there must be someone who can help, at which point she suggested the Privacy Commissioner (I subsequently contacted the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, only to be told that it *"does not have the authority to investigate complaints against domestic or foreign universities"*). I then asked that she officially records my visit and my requests and that I would like to have a written response from my MP. She directed me to write to Mr. Milliken in order to obtain a written response. I did so on April 6 and his answer is pending.

Before I left her office, she asked me a rather puzzling question: "Why would you like to expose it?" While this is not what I would have liked to hear, I nevertheless considered her question to be a valid one. I muttered a few reasons and left empty handed and deeply disappointed. I

thought, how sad it is that the government of Canada always justifies going to war in far off places like Afghanistan as being out of concern for the security of Canadians and in order to defend our rights and freedoms, but when a Canadian who is in imminent danger and in dire need of Canada's assistance to truly defend our rights and freedoms the government can simply say, "There is nothing your government can do for you."

Here is why I believe that I have a duty to expose Britain's spy activities on Canadian, and indeed on all, students:

1. It is illegal, hence it violates privacy laws, the Data Protection Act, expressional rights, education law, and a variety of human rights, both in Britain and its equivalents in Canada and elsewhere, to name but a few. It also prejudices and distorts the adjudication of legitimate complaints, as my experience amply demonstrates, silences the media, which are supposed to act as the guardians of truth, and renders civil society powerless, leaving no one and no institution strong enough to ensure that the government respects the law.
2. It is subject to abuse, as my case also demonstrates. If this has happened to me, I shudder to think what happens to British citizens whose ideas are found to be to the dislike of Britain's secret services and who are within the reach of Britain's secret service goons. What criteria are used to decide who should be purged from Britain's universities and what consequences follow? Who oversees the censors and inquisitors? Are they accountable to anyone? Obviously not, since they operate in secret and outside the bounds of the law. Have I already been placed on a no-fly list as punishment for my efforts to expose this spy program? Will Britain seek to punish me further down the road by tampering with the breaks of my car or stabbing me in the back in a dark alley? Who is to know? Isn't this what Britain's intelligence agencies have been doing since their inception in places far and near? Will American border guards copy my hard drive and tear my car apart next time I cross into the US? Most likely they will.
3. It perverts the academic environment. There can be no free debate if secret service agents with secret agendas control the exchange of ideas and decide who can graduate and who cannot. In such an environment only subjects deemed to be politically safe will be objectively discussed and only topics that meet with the censors' approval will be funded. Furthermore, is the information the government collects on students used to prevent graduates from obtaining government jobs because they are deemed to have the wrong political inclinations? My case already demonstrates that strong criticism of Britain's foreign policy is sufficient grounds to prevent students from graduating. But what happens if one's criticism only marginally offends the secret service?
4. It creates a society of mistrust, where citizens spy on citizens and everyone must guard what he or she says in order not to offend the powers to be and to conform. Having been

born and raised in communist Romania, I know how easy it is for such a cancer to spread and how toxic it can be for society. Before long, an environment of mutual suspicion affects everyone and everything.

5. It impoverishes and eventually kills the democratic process. Why? Because it excludes opinions that question the status quo and the people who hold them from the political process and, more importantly, from the public discourse.
6. It is a betrayal of students' trust. No one likes to pay good money to be spied on and punished for ideas freely expressed in an environment of learning, an environment that is purportedly sacrosanct. Innocent young men and women are unbeknown to them sowing the seeds of their own destruction and exclusion rather than constructing a better future for themselves. By expressing views that run contrary to the interests of the elites, young people are being secretly branded as "enemies of the state" by government agents who spy on them and who have the power to interpret others' opinions any which way they like.
7. In a time of acute credentialism, it has the potential to distort the political process of nations who employ graduates from British universities duly screened to conform to British values and educated not to question the wisdom of British policies. Britain, one must remember, graduates more foreign students than any other nation except the USA. The supremacy of the English language, as the language of global communication, confers unfair advantages to the universities of English-speaking nations, and Britain is abusing this advantage.
8. It criminalizes thought.
9. It politicizes teaching and learning.
10. It is plain stupid and a waste of taxpayers' money. No terrorist takes a university course to announce his aggressive intentions. If anything, those with destructive plans will paint a totally different picture of themselves and their tendencies. In the faint hope of preventing a terrorist plot, the British government is wasting millions if not hundreds of millions (depending on the extent of this program) of taxpayers' money and untold human resources that could be better used for more constructive pursuits. No wonder Britain's deficit has skyrocketed! Worse, the freedoms and values the British government purports to defend are the first victims of this spy and censorship program.

In addition to these socially important reasons, I have personal reasons to expose this spy program. As a result of it I have been unfairly expelled from two universities, humiliated and denied fair and impartial adjudication. Leicester has robbed me of my last chance to fulfill my dream of obtaining a Masters in International Relations, for in choosing Leicester, I gave up two other universities where I had been accepted, one in Austria and one in the US. I have wasted

nearly a year of my life writing appeal after appeal into a system that has been entirely corrupted by secret directives. The time and effort I have put into this has cost me my health, my emotional wellbeing, and has nearly cost me my marriage. More than this, once I realized that I was not fighting two universities but Britain's secret service agencies, I have been living in a constant state of anxiety. There is no limit to the harm Britain's spy agencies can do to me and my family. The past few years have provided innumerable cases of abuse by intelligence agencies throughout the western world.

So the question is not why I would but why I wouldn't expose this program. What I would have liked to hear from my MP's aide is "How can your government best help you to ensure that Canadians know what happens in British universities and that you and others obtain proper redress?"

Had Mrs. Little asked me this, I would have said the following:

1. The Canadian government can issue an official letter to the British government that Kevin Galalae, as a Canadian citizen, is under the protection of Canada and that Canada will not tolerate any attacks on his person, family, property or reputation instigated by the British government and its agencies as acts of retribution for exposing Britain's covert surveillance program at Oxford and Leicester.
2. The Canadian parliament can discuss in session Britain's covert surveillance program and officially condemn it as a violation of Canadians' constitutionally-protected rights.
3. The Canadian government can demand that any file held on Canadian citizens by Britain's secret service agencies as a result of its spying on Canadian students in British universities be handed over to the Canadian government for destruction.
4. The Canadian government can call for the spy program's dissolution, for a public apology, and for compensation for all Canadians whose rights have been violated by it and who have thus been victimized by Britain. If the British government is not forthcoming then the Canadian government can provide legal assistance to all Canadians who have been victimised by Britain's spy program.

There is a great deal that the Canadian government can and should do. Will it take me another year of my life to get my government to protect and defend my rights and to protect and defend my family from foreign attacks? I hope not, for I have better things to do with my life.

Before I conclude this letter I want to identify the key points of Britain's CONTEST strategy – as outlined in the document *Pursue Prevent Protect Prepare: The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism* (<http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/UnitedKingdom2009.pdf>), and which is the brainchild of the spy program I have uncovered.

The CONTEST strategy, we find out in the foreword by Prime Minister Gordon Brown,

sets out our comprehensive approach for tackling international terrorism – from the international, through the national, to the local. It outlines how we are tackling the immediate threat through the relentless pursuit of terrorists and the disruption of terrorist plots; how we are building up our defences against attacks and our resilience to deal with them; and how we are addressing the longer term causes – particularly by understanding what leads people to become radicalised, so we can stop them becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism or violent extremism in the first place.

The CONTEST strategy has four components: *Pursue, Prevent, Protect* and *Prepare*. The covert surveillance program in Britain's universities would fall under the Prevent part of the CONTEST strategy. The stated goal of Prevent is to “*stop people becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism*” (p. 14).

The government introduced its revised Prevent strategy in October 2007 and this must also be the time when the covert surveillance program of universities would have been initiated.

Prevent has specific goals and a time frame.

0.33 In the next three years this workstream has five main objectives:

- To challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices.*
- Disrupt those who promote violent extremism and support the places where they operate.*
- Support individuals who are vulnerable to recruitment, or have already been recruited by violent extremists;*
- Increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism.*
- To address the grievances which ideologues are exploiting (p.14).*

The first objective – “to challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices” – is what has prompted Britain's secret service agencies to infiltrate university programs for the purpose of censorship, control, and surveillance of the academic discourse.

0.34 The two supporting objectives are to: develop supporting intelligence,

analysis, and information; and to improve our strategic communications(p. 14).

Universities have become intelligence gathering grounds and have been tied into the surveillance society that Britain has become by co-opting them to collaborate with the secret service apparatus.

0.35 The Government has allocated new funding to a wide range of agencies and Departments to develop programmes under these objectives. The cost of the key deliverables in 2008/09 alone is over £140 million (p. 14).

Needless to say, spying on everyone is expensive.

0.38 As part of this strategy we will take action against those who defend terrorism and violent extremism. We will also continue to challenge views which fall short of supporting violence and are within the law, but which reject and undermine our shared values and jeopardise community cohesion. Some of these views can create a climate in which people may be drawn into violent activity. We have no intention of outlawing these views or criminalising those who hold them (p. 15).

In the name of defending Britain's "shared values" and "community cohesion" covert censorship is now the order of the day in Britain's universities. So much for academic freedom and the sanctity of the academic environment!

In Part 2, Section 7 the reader is assured that the CONTEST strategy and human rights go hand in hand.

CONTEST and human rights

7.04 The importance we attach to the protection of human rights in our counter-terrorism work, in this country and overseas, is reflected in the aim of this strategy, in its principles, in the programmes which comprise it and through the organisations responsible

for its delivery.

7.05 Terrorism threatens some of our most fundamental rights, including the right to life itself. Our counter-terrorism strategy aims to 'enable people to go about their lives freely and with confidence'. It seeks to preserve and protect the rights to which we are accustomed because it is on these rights that our freedoms depend. It also seeks to promote these rights overseas. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), given domestic standing in the 1998 Human Rights Act, sets out these rights very clearly. They include the right to life (Article 2), the prohibition against torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (Article 3), the right to liberty (Article 5), the right to fair trial (Article 6), as well as the right to family life and privacy (Article 8) and the prohibition of discrimination (Article 14).

(p. 57)

My treatment at Oxford and Leicester shows conclusively that CONTEST is responsible for depriving me of a series of basic human rights. The two universities expelled me from their programs in order to deny me the right to free expression, thus violating Article 10 (Freedom of Expression), as well as to deny me the right to freedom of thought and conscience, thus violating Article 9 (Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion). They then set out to ignore or downright violate their own university regulations as well as the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act in order to deny me “*a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal*”, thus violating Article 6 (Right to a Fair Trial). Since these violations were motivated by the universities’ discrimination of my political opinion and my social and ethnic origin, they have also clearly violated Article 14 (Prohibition of Discrimination), which states: “*The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.*” Last but not least, they have violated Article 2 (Right to Education) of the first Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights, which states that “*No person shall be denied the right to education.*”

Most recently, both Oxford and Leicester have denied me the right to peaceful protest by refusing to grant me permission to stage a hunger strike on their campuses. While they purport to be bastions of free speech, Oxford and Leicester, perverted by CONTEST and by their own ideological inclinations, are in reality no better than dictatorships when it comes to protecting their own dirty secrets. As a last straw, I then sought permission to stage hunger strikes on public land from the police constabularies of Oxford and Leicester. Leicester's police have yet to respond, but Oxford has outright refused to grant me permission, thus violating the trust citizens place in the police as defenders of the law.

The evidence I have outlined shows the degree to which British democracy and its institutions have been perverted by CONTEST. It also shows that Canada's democracy has been severely damaged by my government's willingness to sacrifice Canadians' rights in order to protect the secrecy of Britain's illegal spy and censorship program.

As a result, I have a feeling that I am not the only one who has met with this fate in British universities. That is why it is crucially important that we expose and condemn this program and to let the world know that the rights of students are being violated. Spying on students, discriminating against socio-political opinions that are not sanctioned by the powers to be, expelling students on bogus grounds and denying them the right to fair trial and the exercise of their human rights are the actions of dictatorships not democracies.

Appendix 1

RE: request under the Freedom of Information Act

Von: **Atkinson, Colin** (ca46@leicester.ac.uk)
Gesendet: Dienstag, 30. März 2010 16:00:48
An: 'kevin galalae ' (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Dear Mr. Galalae,

I write regarding your emails below in which you seek a review of the response to your Freedom of Information request provided by Geoff Hamp on 3rd March 2010 and request further information.

Having reviewed the relevant correspondence I am in agreement with Mr. Hamp's application of the legislation. You are requesting the provision of third party personal data which is exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 by virtue of Section 40(2)(3)(a)(i):

40. Personal information

(1) Any information to which a request for information relates is exempt information if it constitutes personal data of which the applicant is the data subject.

*(2) Any information to which a request for information relates is also exempt information if—
(a) it constitutes personal data which do not fall within subsection (1), and
(b) either the first or the second condition below is satisfied.*

*(3) The first condition is—
(a) in a case where the information falls within any of paragraphs (a) to (d) of the definition of "data" in section 1(1) of the [1998 c. 29.] Data Protection Act 1998, that the disclosure of the information to a member of the public otherwise than under this Act would contravene—
(i) any of the data protection principles*

By providing you with the personal data that you have requested the University would breach the first data protection principle contained in the UK Data Protection Act 1998. Therefore, this information is exempt from release under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 as outlined above.

Please be assured that the University applies the legislation evenly and treats all personal data it holds in the same way. This includes your own personal data which would not be disclosed to third parties in this way.

If you are dissatisfied with this response then you have the right to submit a formal complaint to the University which will be treated according to its Freedom of Information Code of Practice. Please let me know in writing (email will suffice) if you wish to pursue this option.

It is your legal right under Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, to apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision whether a request for information made to the University has been dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It should be noted that there is a requirement that there will be no undue delay in making the application and there is an expectation that the complainant will have exhausted the University's local complaints procedure.

Complaints to the Information Commissioner should be addressed to:

FOI Compliance Team (Complaints)
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

In your emails dated 3 March 2010 and 18 March 2010 you also requested the following further information:

1. ... to preserve the privacy of the individuals about to be named, I only request that you identify those who are on the university's payroll and that you only name their job titles. The individuals who have participated in the MA programme's first module are: Sean Lawrence, Ali Al Mathkooor, Lory Madonna, Ekim Bireroglu, Sheldon Richardson, Carla Liuzzo, Pawel Wojtas, Liva Rabarihoela, and myself, Kevin Galalae. Please identify which of these students are also on Leicester University's payroll and the positions for which they are being paid.
2. The individuals who have participated in the MA programme's first module are: Sean Lawrence, Ali Al Mathkooor, Lory Madonna, Ekim Bireroglu, Sheldon Richardson, Carla Liuzzo, Pawel Wojtas, Liva Rabarihoela, and myself, Kevin Galalae. Please identify which of these students are also on Leicester University's payroll or are working for an entity, governmental or private, to conduct surveillance on their fellow students. Please also identify the positions for which they are being paid.
3. How many covert agents who masquerade as students perform duties or functions other than those of genuine students on behalf of Leicester University or another entity, governmental or private, with Leicester's knowledge and/or tacit or implicit consent, while participating in programmes or courses at Leicester University.
4. How many of its courses and programmes are subjected to a surveillance program by Leicester University or by another entity, governmental or private, with Leicester's knowledge and/or tacit or implicit consent, and what is the program's name, purpose, mandate and duration?

For clarity, please note that I am processing this request as a new request for information under the terms of the Freedom of Information legislation and separate from your original request.

With respect to the information requested in 1. above the University must refuse your request for the disclosure of data relating to the personal information of the individuals named. The personal information of the named individuals is exempt from access under Section 40(2)(3)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Additionally as this an absolute exemption (as defined by the Freedom of Information Act 2000) the University is not required to apply the Public Interest Test.

Having reviewed the information requested in 2., 3. and 4. above, and considered all relevant issues I am providing you with this refusal notice under the provisions of Section 17(4) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The University of Leicester neither confirms nor denies that it holds any of the information requested. To give a statement of the reasons why neither confirming nor denying is appropriate in this case could itself involve the disclosure of exempt information. To the extent that Section 23(3) Information supplied by, or relating to, bodies dealing with security matters; Section 24(2) National security; Section 31(3) Law enforcement; and Section 38(2) Health and safety of the Act apply, the University of Leicester has determined that in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exclusion of the duty to either confirm or deny outweighs the public interest in confirming whether or not information is held.

On occasion it may be necessary for relevant agencies to work in partnership with other organisations and agencies on matters of national security and law enforcement, and in order to combat such very serious issues as terrorism and organised crime. To avoid adversely affecting such activities it is a consistent University policy neither to confirm nor deny that the University holds such information by virtue of the relevant exemptions.

Please note that this should not be taken as confirmation or denial that the University of Leicester does or does not hold the information requested.

This completes the University of Leicester's response to your Freedom of Information request. If you are dissatisfied with this response then you have the right to submit a formal complaint to the University which will be treated according to its Freedom of Information Code of Practice. Please let me know in writing (email will suffice) if you wish to pursue this option.

It is your legal right under Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act, to apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision whether a request for information made to the University has been dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It should be noted that there is a requirement that there will be no undue delay in making the application and there is an expectation that the complainant will have exhausted the University's local complaints procedure.

Complaints to the Information Commissioner should be addressed to:

FOI Compliance Team (Complaints)
Wycliffe House
Water Lane

Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Regards,

Colin Atkinson

Colin Atkinson
Data Protection and Freedom of Information Officer,
University of Leicester,
University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH,
Tel. 0116 229 7956, Fax. 0116 252 5169,
<mailto:ca46@leicester.ac.uk>
Times Higher Education University of the Year 2008/09

-----Original Message-----

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 18 March 2010 16:25
To: Atkinson Colin
Subject: Re: request under the Freedom of Information Act

Thank you for acknowledging my email, Mr. Atkinson. I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Kevin Galalae
Sent on the TELUS Mobility network with BlackBerry

-----Original Message-----

From: Atkinson Colin <ca46@leicester.ac.uk>
Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 16:04:22
To: <kgalalae@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: request under the Freedom of Information Act

Dear Mr Galalae,

Further to my email to you dated 8 March and in response to your recent emails I can confirm that I am still in the process of reviewing the response you received to your request and will reply to you shortly.

Regards,

Colin Atkinson

Colin Atkinson
Data Protection and Freedom of Information Officer,
University of Leicester,
University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH,
Tel. 0116 229 7956, Fax. 0116 252 5169,
mailto:ca46@leicester.ac.uk <mailto:ca46@leicester.ac.uk>
Times Higher Education University of the Year 2008/09

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 18 March 2010 12:56
To: Colin Atkinson (Leicester Information Officer)
Subject: FW: request under the Freedom of Information Act

Dear Mr. Atkinson,

Since you seem to have disappeared off the face of this earth along with my request for information under the Freedom of Information Act, I am now reiterating my request along with the insistence that this time it is treated as a formal request.

FORMAL REQUEST:

Dear Mr. Atkinson,

I have recently made requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 regarding the employment status of Carla Liuzzo, Sean Lawrence and Nick Wright. Information however was withheld since the data I have requested is "exempt from access under Section 40(2)(3)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act", which is "an absolute exemption".

Mr. Geoff Hamp, who processed my request, suggested that I turn to you should I be dissatisfied with the answer. Let me explain why this is the case.

Currently, Leicester University's Department of Politics and International Relations and I are involved in a dispute that is being adjudicated at various levels. It is my contention that the Department is involved in a covert surveillance program of the International Relations and World Order MA programme's online courses and I have evidence to suggest that Mrs. Carla Liuzzo is employed by the university and/or other organization to carry out duties that fall outside her declared participation in the programme as a student only. If this is indeed the case, then the most fundamental principles of the Data Protection Act - which your colleague, Mr. Geoff Hamp, is protecting by withholding me access to the employment status of the individuals I have requested information about - are being violated with impunity by the university, as are

various privacy laws, human rights laws, and commercial laws related to false advertisement, to name but a few.

In addition, withholding information that allows me to determine if Leicester's various officials have lied about the true identity of Carla Liuzzo in order to gain unfair advantage in the resolution of my case or in order to obstruct justice, prejudices the entire adjudication system and constitutes, in light of the university's insistence that Carla Liuzzo is only a regular student, a criminal act of perjury and a debasement of the public record.

To get to the bottom of this, I am now reiterating my request for access to information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. I request that you identify those who are on the university's payroll or who are paid by other entities to spy on or covertly monitor their fellow students while masquerading as students themselves, and who do so with Leicester University's knowledge and/or tacit or implicit consent.

The individuals who have participated in the MA programme's first module are: Sean Lawrence, Ali Al Mathkooor, Lory Madonna, Ekim Bireroglu, Sheldon Richardson, Carla Liuzzo, Pawel Wojtas, Liva Rabarihoela, and myself, Kevin Galalae. Please identify which of these students are also on Leicester University's payroll or are working for an entity, governmental or private, to conduct surveillance on their fellow students. Please also identify the positions for which they are being paid.

Leicester University being a public institution, I see no reason why your office should withhold this most basic information from the public's scrutiny, especially since access to this information is crucial in the pursuit of justice and withholding it prejudices the entire conflict resolution system as well as the Data Protection Act that you are entrusted to safeguard.

Further to that, I wish to know how many covert agents who masquerade as students perform duties or functions other than those of genuine students on behalf of Leicester University or another entity, governmental or private, with Leicester's knowledge and/or tacit or implicit consent, while participating in programmes or courses at Leicester University.

This is the time for Leicester to reveal how many of its courses and programmes are subjected to a surveillance program by Leicester University or by another entity, governmental or private, with Leicester's knowledge and/or tacit or implicit consent, and what is the program's name, purpose, mandate and duration?

I eagerly await your answer.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

I hope that this request will not be shut down as easily as my previous request and that you come out of hiding and fulfill the duties of your office. Sooner or later, this letter too will become part

of the public record and will be presented as evidence in a court of law. At that point, your behaviour will be scrutinised accordingly. I therefore urge you to act consistent with the duties of your office.

I also insist that you acknowledge receipt of this email and that you explain why my previous request, which you have chosen to deal with as an informal request, has not been resolved. You should also explain why you have ceased communication.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: kgalalae@hotmail.com
To: ca46@leicester.ac.uk
Subject: FW: request under the Freedom of Information Act
Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 18:31:39 +0100

Dear Mr. Atkinson,

Since you have not acknowledged the email I sent you yesterday, I am reiterating my question as to when I can expect an answer from Leicester.

I warn the university that withholding information about a covert surveillance program that I already know exists and have evidence to prove that it exists will place Leicester in even greater conflict with the law and will only worsen Leicester's already difficult legal position. I also wish to let the university know that I have contacted Mr. Alex Allen, Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee, to inform him about my knowledge of Leicester's involvement in the government's covert surveillance programme and that "should the JIC choose to stonewall my pursuit of justice... I will take my grievances, knowledge and evidence to the international media and to transnational human rights organizations and will eventually seek justice in a court of law and in the open court of public opinion."

To hide a programme that has already been exposed would be a foolhardy act by the university and one that will come to bankrupt it in legal fees due to a flood of lawsuits. I advise the university's administrators to reveal the truth now if they want to save Leicester from dire repercussions later.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: kgalalae@hotmail.com
To: ca46@leicester.ac.uk
Subject: FW: request under the Freedom of Information Act
Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 15:07:24 +0100

Dear Mr. Atkinson,

A week has passed since you have acknowledged receipt of my request and promised to discuss the matter with the relevant University offices. Since time is of the essence, I would like to know when I can expect an answer.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: ca46@leicester.ac.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Date: Mon, 8 Mar 2010 15:59:56 +0000
Subject: RE: request under the Freedom of Information Act

Dear Mr Galalae,

I write to acknowledge receipt of your email below, dated 3rd March 2010, in which you raise concerns regarding the University of Leicester's response to your Freedom of Information request of 1st March 2010.

I propose in the first instance to treat your concerns as an informal complaint in accordance with the complaints procedure as set out in the University's Freedom of Information Code of Practice. As such I will be discussing the matter with the relevant University offices and will review the handling of your request. I shall provide you with a response as soon as possible.

Upon completion of the informal review if the matter should remain unresolved I will advise you of the formal complaints procedure.

Regards,

Colin Atkinson

Colin Atkinson
Data Protection and Freedom of Information Officer,
University of Leicester,
University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH,
Tel. 0116 229 7956, Fax. 0116 252 5169,
mailto:ca46@leicester.ac.uk <mailto:ca46@leicester.ac.uk>
Times Higher Education University of the Year 2008/09

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 03 March 2010 12:40
To: ca46@leicester.ac.uk
Cc: gkh@leicester.ac.uk
Subject: FW: request under the Freedom of Information Act

Dear Mr. Atkinson,

I have recently made requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 regarding the employment status of Carla Liuzzo, Sean Lawrence and Nick Wright. Information however was withheld since the data I have requested is "exempt from access under Section 40(2)(3)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act", which is "an absolute exemption". Mr. Geoff Hamp, who processed my request, suggested that I turn to you should I be dissatisfied with the answer. Let me explain why this is the case.

Currently, Leicester University's Department of Politics and International Relations and I are involved in a dispute that is being adjudicated at various levels. It is my contention that the Department is involved in a covert surveillance program of the International Relations and World Order MA programme's online courses and I have evidence to suggest that Mrs. Carla Liuzzo is employed by the university and/or other organization to carry out duties that fall outside her declared participation in the programme as a student only. If this is indeed the case, then the most fundamental principles of the Data Protection Act - which your colleague, Mr. Geoff Hamp, is protecting by withholding me access to the employment status of the individuals I have requested information about - are being violated with impunity by the university, as are

various privacy laws, human rights laws, and commercial laws related to false advertisement, to name but a few.

In addition, withholding information that allows me to determine if Leicester's various officials have lied about the true identity of Carla Liuzzo in order to gain unfair advantage in the resolution of my case or in order to obstruct justice, prejudices the entire adjudication system and constitutes, in light of the university's insistence that Carla Liuzzo is only a regular student, a criminal act of perjury and a debasement of the public record.

To get to the bottom of this, I am now reiterating my request for access to information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. And to preserve the privacy of the individuals about to be named, I only request that you identify those who are on the university's payroll and that you only name their job titles.

The individuals who have participated in the MA programme's first module are: Sean Lawrence, Ali Al Mathkooor, Lory Madonna, Ekim Biringolu, Sheldon Richardson, Carla Liuzzo, Pawel Wojtas, Liva Rabarihoela, and myself, Kevin Galalae. Please identify which of these students are also on Leicester University's payroll and the positions for which they are being paid.

Leicester University being a public institution, I see no reason why your office should withhold this most basic information from the public's scrutiny, especially since access to this information is crucial in the pursuit of justice and withholding it prejudices the entire conflict resolution system as well as the Data Protection Act that you are entrusted to safeguard.

I eagerly await your answer.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: gkh@leicester.ac.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 2010 09:21:26 +0000
Subject: RE: request under the Freedom of Information Act

Dear Mr Galalae

I write in response to your request below dated 1 March 2010, made under the provisions of the UK Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

On behalf of the University I must refuse your request for the disclosure of data relating to the personal information of the individuals named. The personal information of Mr. Nick Wright and

Mr. Sean Lawrence is exempt from access under Section 40(2)(3)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act . Additionally as this an absolute exemption (as defined by FOIA) the University is not required to apply the Public Interest Test.

This completes the University of Leicester's response to your Freedom of Information request. If you have any concerns or wish to complain about any aspect of this response then in the first instance please contact the University's Freedom of Information Officer (Mr Colin Atkinson: 0116 252 2412, ca46@le.ac.uk <mailto:ca46@le.ac.uk>).

It is your legal right under Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act, to apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision whether a request for information made to the University has been dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It should be noted that there is a requirement that there will be no undue delay in making the application and there is an expectation that the complainant will have exhausted the University's local complaints procedure.

Complaints to the Information Commissioner should be addressed to:

FOI Compliance Team (Complaints)
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF
Regards
Geoff Hamp

=====
Geoff Hamp
Information Security Manager
IT Services
University of Leicester
University Road
Leicester LE1 7RH
Tel : 0116 229 7945
Fax : 0116 229 7811
E-Mail : gkh@leicester.ac.uk

University of Leicester - Times Higher Education Award for Outstanding Student Support 2009-10

University of Leicester - Times Higher Education University of the Year 2008-9

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 01 March 2010 16:22

To: freedomofinformation@leicester.ac.uk
Subject: request under the Freedom of Information Act

To whom it may concern,

I hereby request information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 regarding the employment status (i.e. position, title and pay) of Mr. Nick Wright, who is employed by the Department of Politics and International Relations at Leicester University, and of Mr. Sean Lawrence, who may also be employed by the Department of Politics and International Relations at Leicester University.

My name is Kevin Galalae and I live at 258 Bicknell Cr. Kingston, Ontario, K7M 4T6, Canada. I can be reached by email at: kgalalae@hotmail.com <mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com> or by phone at (613) 888-8268.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

Appendix 2:

Reply to request for information under Freedom of Information of Act	
Your Ref:	E-mail dated 5 March 2010
Address:	kgalalae@hotmail.com
Request	<p>(a) Further to my previous requests, I wish to know if Ivor Middleton, Max Tant, or Gloria Portella are/have performed duties or functions other than those of genuine students on behalf of Oxford University, while participating in the online Political Philosophy course taught by Dr. Giovanni de Grandis and offered through the Department for Continuing Education.</p> <p>(b) I wish to know if Ivor Middleton, Max Tant, or Gloria Portella are/have performed duties or functions other than those of genuine students on behalf of other entity, governmental or private, with Oxford's knowledge and/or consent, while participating in the online Political Philosophy course taught by Dr. Giovanni de Grandis and offered through the Department for Continuing Education.</p> <p>(c) Further to that, is Oxford aware if the said course was subjected to a surveillance program by Oxford University or by another entity, governmental or private, with Oxford's knowledge and/or consent?</p>

Thank you for your further request.

(a) Please refer to our reply to your requests dated 12 February and 1 March, which was sent to you on 5 March. We hold no further information relevant to this part of your request.

(b) The application forms submitted by Mr Middleton, Mr Tant and Ms Portella for the online Political Philosophy course include information about their occupations. However, we will not disclose this information, as it is exempt from disclosure under Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act. Section 40(2) enables a public authority to refuse to disclose the personal data of a third party i.e. a person other than the requestor, where it would breach data protection principles. In this case we believe that disclosure would breach the requirement of the first data protection principle that personal data shall be processed fairly. The three individuals concerned do not require the University's consent to pursue their occupations while participating in the online Political Philosophy course.

(c) Course tutors and directors monitor forums; it is part of their job to do so. The online courses manager also monitors forums to check they are functioning properly. The department's IT staff are authorised under the University's IT policy to monitor traffic on on-line courses e.g. to look for technical problems. However, they have not monitored this particular course.

If you are not content with this reply, you may ask the University to review its decision by writing to the Registrar at the following address:

The Registrar
University Offices
Wellington Square
Oxford
OX1 2JD

Alternatively, you may request a review by e-mailing foi@admin.ox.ac.uk.

If, after the investigation of your complaint, you are still dissatisfied, you have the right under Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act to apply to the Information Commissioner at the following address for a decision as to whether your request for information has been dealt with in accordance with the Act.

Information Commissioner
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
SK9 5AF

Further information on the procedure for submitting complaints to the Information Commissioner is available at <http://www.ico.gov.uk/complaints.aspx>.

FOI OXFORD

Appendix 3:

FW: academic surveillance programme

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Dienstag, 16. März 2010 13:20:40

An: Alex Allan (Joint Intelligence Committee) (jicchairman@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

Dear Mr. Allan,

To avoid confusion, I ask that you please acknowledge receipt of the email I sent you yesterday (see below). I would appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: kgalalae@hotmail.com

To: jicchairman@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk

Subject: academic surveillance programme

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 13:25:34 +0100

Dear Mr. Allan,

As Chair of the Joint Intelligence Committee, you may already be aware that the close operational relationship Britain's secret service agencies have established with several British universities has led to my expulsion from Oxford and Leicester. As a Canadian/Romanian citizen my constitutionally protected rights have been violated.

Two of your Academic Surveillance Programme's operatives, Ivor Middleton, imbedded at the University of Oxford, and Carla Liuzzo, imbedded at Leicester University, have through their overzealous acts caused me great harm and, as a result, compromised the Programme's secrecy and purpose.

If you wish to continue providing your operatives from the Office of Security and Counter-Terrorism with the cover of anonymity and protect the Programme from public exposure, I

suggest you act immediately to address my concerns. The British government owes me an apology, compensation and security assurances due to the prejudicial treatment its agents have subjected me to at Oxford and Leicester and the damage they have consequently done to my reputation, health and family.

I hope the JIC will choose to address my concerns discreetly rather than publicly and that it will do so before it is too late. The Secret Intelligence Service's covert Academic Surveillance Programme of Britain's HEI's runs afoul numerous national and international laws and has, as far as I can ascertain, no statutory footing even in the Intelligence Services Act, which is why it is run, it appears, with Qatar's assistance. While it is not my intent to expose it, I will have no choice if the JIC does not address my concerns. Needless to say, if it comes to this, the damage done to the reputation and economic viability of many of Britain's universities will be enormous and enduring.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (Ref: OIA/08877/10), the Equality and Human Rights Commission (Ref: 1-6972703), and the Information Commissioner's Office (Ref: RFA0295154) are all currently investigating my grievances against Oxford University, but we all know that the power to let justice prevail in this case rests with the JIC and that any adjudicating or investigating body within Britain can be compromised by JIC pressure. I have not yet divulged the extent of my knowledge about the said Programme to any of the above institutions or to the media, but I have enlisted the protection of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and have made additional arrangements should any harm come to me.

Should the JIC choose to stonewall my pursuit of justice or ignore this plea, I will take my grievances, knowledge and evidence to the international media and to transnational human rights organizations and will eventually seek justice in a court of law and in the open court of public opinion.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

Ph. (613) 888-8268

P.S. Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Appendix 4:

FW: Your query to Liberty

Von:

kevin galalae (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Sonntag, 21. März 2010 06:26:07

An: eduardog@liberty-human-rights.org.uk

 2 Anlagen | [Alle Anlagen herunterladen](#) (321,5 KB)

[foi follo...doc](#) (217,0 KB), [FOI reque...doc](#) (104,5 KB)

Dear Mr. Gill-Pedro,

My email to you dated March 8 has gone unacknowledged and unanswered. I would like to know if Liberty has reconsidered my appeal in light of the fact that the most egregious violation of privacy and human rights is currently occurring in British universities under the auspices of CONTEST, the United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism. Since this strikes at the heart of what your organization purports to defend, it is my hope that I can soon rely on Liberty's assistance.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: kgalalae@hotmail.com

To: eduardog@liberty-human-rights.org.uk

Subject: RE: Your query to Liberty

Date: Mon, 8 Mar 2010 17:30:36 +0100

Dear Mr. Gill-Pedro,

New developments in my case have brought to light evidence that the British government conducts a surveillance program of the online academic environment of both Oxford and Leicester universities. This means that my original appeal to Liberty no longer concerns my isolated case of prejudicial treatment at the hands of Oxford University. While my evidence is still only circumstantial or indirect, I hope to soon have direct evidence through the Freedom of Information Act.

In your poll released 15 June 2009, 95% of the respondents identified respect for privacy as either vital or important. The revelation I am now bringing to Liberty's attention strikes at the heart of privacy laws, not to mention anything about human rights pertaining to freedom of thought and expression. I therefore ask that your organization re-evaluates its decision to avoid being involved in my case. Liberty, for instance, is much better situated to request and obtain information regarding the surveillance program I have alluded to by requesting from Oxford and

Leicester information about the existence of such a program under the Freedom of Information Act. I am attaching my latest requests to give you an idea of where things stand to date (see attachments).

I hope to soon be able to count on your help, at which point I would like to send you my entire documentation of the Oxford and Leicester evidence.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

Subject: Your query to Liberty
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 2010 11:53:55 +0000
From: EduardoG@liberty-human-rights.org.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Dear Kevin,

Thank you for your query which we received on the 28/01/2010. I am sorry for the delay in responding to you which is due to the large number of queries we are currently processing and our limited resources.

I am sorry to hear of your situation. Unfortunately this is not a matter that Liberty is able to provide advice on. By way of explanation, Liberty is a small civil liberties organisation whose principal role is in campaigning to defend and extend civil liberties. We generally only take on specific test cases designed to force changes in the law, usually by mounting a challenge under European human rights law or the Human Rights Act 1998. We do not have specific expertise in education law and, for this reason, I am afraid we are unable to assist you directly.

I can only suggest that you seek the advice of a solicitor specialising in this area of law. You can find details of solicitors by contacting the Community Legal Service on 0845 345 345, by visiting the Law Society's website at <http://www.lawsociety.org.uk/choosingandusing/findasolicitor.law> or by visiting the Chambers and Partners website at <http://www.chambersandpartners.co.uk/uk/search31.aspx>.

You may also want to contact the National Union of Students, who campaign for the rights of students. Their website is www.nus.org.uk. I am sorry that we have not been able to help. I wish you all the best and thank you for contacting Liberty.

Yours sincerely,

Eduardo Gill-Pedro

Advice and Information Officer, LIBERTY

Appendix 5:

RE: EHRC reference. 1-6972703

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)
Gesendet: Mittwoch, 14. April 2010 14:13:43
An: englandhelpline@equalityhumanrights.com
 Anlagen | [Alle Anlagen herunterladen](#) (232,0 KB)
[Oxford's ...doc](#) (79,5 KB), [Leicester...doc](#) (93,0 KB), [Completio...doc](#) (59,5 KB)

Dear Mr. Watts,

Two weeks have gone by since your last communication. I would like to know if the EHRC has reconsidered my request and the additional evidence I have provided and, if so, what decision it reached. I would also like to inform the EHRC of additional violations Oxford and Leicester have committed. Recently, I requested permission to peacefully protest on Oxford and Leicester land by staging a hunger strike (see attachments). Although both universities purport to be bastions of free speech, they have denied me the right to peaceful protest; right that is enshrined in British, European and international legislation. This constitutes further evidence of breaches of human rights and discrimination.

I would also like to inform the EHRC that Oxford has finally issued a Completion of Procedures Letter (see attachment). As stated in the letter, any statute of limitations governing when I can seek redress begins on the date Oxford issued the said letter.

Talking of statutes of limitations, I would like to remind the EHRC that any delay on its part eats into the already limited time I have to fight for my rights. This being the case, I ask that the EHRC answers my queries in a timely fashion. That would be greatly appreciated.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: kgalalae@hotmail.com
To: englandhelpline@equalityhumanrights.com
Subject: FW: EHRC reference. 1-6972703
Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 15:46:12 +0200

Dear Mr. Watts,

Further to my email from yesterday, I am happy to report that Leicester's information officer has basically confirmed Leicester University's complicity in a spy program (see attached file). Oxford University, however, continues to lie and cheat. This time it has wilfully trivialized and misinterpreted my question in order to avoid giving an honest answer (see attached file). I will draft a new set of questions for Oxford over the next few days in order to leave them no room to avoid giving an honest answer.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: kgalalae@hotmail.com
To: englandhelpline@equalityhumanrights.com
Subject: RE: EHRC reference. 1-6972703
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 17:44:54 +0200

30 March 2010.

Dear Mr. Watts,

I have read your email with great interest and I am confident that the information I am about to provide you with will be more than sufficient to demonstrate that Oxford University is in violation of several human rights as well as the Race Equality Duty and that my case is well within the time limit set for investigating such claims.

You wrote:

“Claims for race discrimination in post 16 education must be taken in county court and there is a time limit of 6 months less 1 day from the date of discrimination to lodge your claim. As you were expelled from the course on 3rd June 2009 this time limit expired on 2nd December 2009.”

While the initial act of discrimination (i.e. my expulsion on socio-political grounds) took place on the 3rd of June, it was followed by a multitude of discriminatory acts that are ethical, regulatory, procedural and legal in nature and that I have documented in detail in the file and appendices I have sent you and which, I contend, are racist in nature. These violations were intended to and have succeeded in obstructing justice, denying me due process, and withholding incriminating evidence, in order to cover up the university’s participation in a government-sponsored covert surveillance and censorship program carried out under the auspices of CONTEST, The United Kingdom’s Strategy for Countering International Terrorism (see Open Letter and its 37 accompanying files). This discrimination is direct and indirect as defined by the Race Relations Act. These violations occurred throughout the internal adjudication of my case over a period starting on the 4th of June and are ongoing. The latest evidence of such discrimination is the university’s refusal to issue a Completion of Procedures Letter (see Documents 1 & 2), which marks the end of the university’s internal adjudication process and would have allowed me to take my case to an external adjudicator such as the Office of the Independent Commissioner. Equally discriminatory is Oxford’s refusal to acknowledge let alone give an answer to the letters the EHRC has advised me to send as a prerequisite for starting its investigation (see Documents 3, 4 & 5). Since Oxford has to date not issued a Completion of Procedures Letter or answered to the EHRC’s toolkit letters I sent them, Oxford is as we speak still acting in a blatantly discriminatory manner towards me. As such, the time limit for my claim for race discrimination against Oxford is 6 months from today.

In addition to this, the evidence I have provided demonstrates not only that Oxford breached the Race Relations Act, but also several human rights as defined by the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights. Oxford expelled from the course in order to deny me the right to free expression, thus violating Article 10 (Freedom of Expression), as well as to deny me the right to freedom of thought and conscience, thus violating Article 9 (Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion). It then set out to ignore or downright violate its own university regulations as well as the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act in order to deny me *“a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal”*, thus violating Article 6 (Right to a Fair Trial). Since these violations were motivated by Oxford’s discrimination of my political opinion and my social and ethnic origin, Oxford has also clearly violated Article 14 (Prohibition of Discrimination), which states: *“The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.”* Last but not least, Oxford has violated Article 2 (Right to Education), which states that *“No person shall be denied the right to education.”* Clearly Oxford has done just that.

According to the EHRC's statute, the time limit for bringing a case under the Human Rights Act is twelve months. I believe the EHRC has the mandate and the duty to investigate Oxford's violations of the Human Rights Act 1998. After all, your organization's name is The Equality and Human Rights Commission and not just the Equality Commission. I therefore ask that the EHRC reconsiders the merits of my case once it has read the enclosed materials (see Open Letter and its 37 accompanying files). I take this opportunity to also ask the EHRC to open an investigation into Leicester University, which is also complicit in spying on its students under the auspices of CONTEST and has as a result discriminated against me on social and political grounds, censored me out of the program and violated my constitutionally protected rights.

Since this is a matter of not only national but international importance, I ask that the EHRC fully dedicates its human resources to this case and that it investigates immediately and thoroughly without succumbing to political interference and compromising its impartiality and objectivity.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: englandhelpline@equalityhumanrights.com
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
CC: englandhelplinereplies@equalityhumanrights.com
Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2010 15:01:54 +0000
Subject: EHRC reference. 1-6972703

Dear Mr Galalae,

Thank you for your recent emails to the Equality & Human Rights Commission. They have been passed to me for a response. I apologise for the delay in responding to you; this is due to high levels of demand for the helpline's services.

I have read the attachments to your emails of 2nd and 4th February and my understanding of your case is as follows.

On 3rd June 2009 you were expelled from the online Political Philosophy course for allegedly breaching netiquette. You feel that this decision was taken by the course tutor because he disagreed with your political arguments. You wish to take a claim against the university for racial discrimination and failure to comply with the Race Equality Duty. The Commission's powers are set by the Equality Act 2006 and we cannot advise on the Education Act 1986 which you have referred to and we do not have powers to offer legal assistance in pure human rights claims. The Commission can offer advice and guidance on equality enactments including the Race Relations Act but we do not offer a legal advice service.

Before I go into the individual complaints that you have raised I would like to make you aware of the time limits which apply to legal action using the legislation you have listed. Claims for race discrimination in post 16 education must be taken in county court and there is a time limit of 6 months less 1 day from the date of discrimination to lodge your claim. As you were expelled from the course on 3rd June 2009 this time limit expired on 2nd December 2009. Judicial review proceedings have a shorter time limit of 3 months less 1 day. As your claims are outside this time it may be difficult to argue that a court has jurisdiction to hear them and I suggest that you seek legal advice if you wish to bring such claims.

The Race Relations Act (RRA) provides protection from discrimination by a higher education institution on the grounds of your race, colour, ethnic origin or nationality. the 2 main forms of discrimination are:

- Direct discrimination - where you are treated less favourably than a comparable student because of a protected characteristic - and,

- Indirect discrimination - where a provision, criteria or practice that is applied evenly to all students places students of one colour, ethnic or racial group or nationality at a disadvantage.

The Race Equality Duty places an obligation on public authorities, including universities to promote racial equality and to monitor the impact of their policies on different groups of people. Specifically it places an obligation on the authority to:

- eliminate unlawful racial discrimination;
- promote equality of opportunity; and
- promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

I do not think that you can show your dismissal from the course was racially motivated; In your own summary you have stated that the reason you were expelled from the course was 'because (the tutor) came to dislike the socio-political ideas and ideals my postings express'. I therefore do not think that a claim for direct discrimination can be taken. It is also unlikely to be possible to argue that the poor practice demonstrated by the various staff involved in this complaint shows indirect discrimination, as the disadvantaged group is not likely to be a racial group but rather a group who share certain philosophical views.

The University can be argued to have an obligation to carry out impact assessments on their policies relating to online courses to ensure that they meet the obligations above. As you have written to the University requesting a copy of their Race Equality Policy and any impact assessments relating to the course and received no response there is a possibility that they could be in breach of the Race Equality Duty. This legislation places general duties on the public authority and it will not enable an individual to claim against the university for individual redress. In order to look into this element of your claim further we would need you to send in copies of the letters that you have written requesting the above documents so that we can assess whether it would be appropriate for our enforcement team to take any action.

I hope that this information is of use to you and if you would like us to consider the equality duty issue further please send us copies of the letters that you have written using the public sector duty toolkit. If you have any other questions please feel free to return to the helpline.

Richard Watts

Helpline Specialist Adviser

Equality & Human Rights Commission

Our vision

A society built on fairness and respect. People confident in all aspects of their diversity.

Legal disclaimer

This email has been originated in the Equality and Human Rights Commission, which is an information and guidance service and not a legal advice service. If you require legal advice, please contact a solicitor. This paragraph does not apply to an individual who is assisted under section 28 Equality Act 2006.

This email message, including any attachments, is from the Equality and Human Rights Commission and is intended for the addressee only. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance of it.

Security warning: Please note that this email has been created in the knowledge that Internet email is not a 100% secure communications medium. We advise that you understand and accept this lack of security when emailing us.

If this email message has been sent to you in error, please notify us immediately by replying to this email. The Equality and Human Rights Commission accepts no responsibility for any changes made to this message after it has been sent by the original author. This email or any of its attachments may contain data that falls within the scope of the Data Protection Acts. You must ensure that any handling or processing of such data by you is fully compliant with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1984 and 1998.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission was established by the Equality Act 2006 as the Commission for Equality and Human Rights.

Appendix 6:

FW: covert surveillance program of the academic environment

Von:

kevin galalae (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Donnerstag, 25. März 2010 02:02:50

An: Dan Higgins (National Union of Students) (dan.higgins@nus.org.uk)

Dear Mr. Higgins,

You have neither acknowledged receipt of my email nor responded to my request that NUS does its job and informs Britain's students about their government's illegal and immoral spying program currently operating in British universities.

Since this is fully within the responsibility of NUS, I ask that you take immediate action. I warn you that your silence on this subject will reflect poorly on NUS' independence and will damage the organization for years to come. There are already allegations that the current NUS president, Mr. Wes Streeting, is too close to the government of Prime Minister Gordon Brown.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

From: kgalalae@hotmail.com

To: dan.higgins@nus.org.uk

Subject: covert surveillance program of the academic environment

Date: Sun, 21 Mar 2010 07:00:55 +0100

To whom it may concern,

I have evidence that Oxford University and the University of Leicester are collaborating with Britain's secret services in a covert surveillance program of the online academic environment. The program operates by imbedding agents in online courses and programs as regular students, but who with the implicit knowledge and consent of the universities collaborate with the course tutors to spy on the students and to control the dialogue in accordance with the goals of CONTEST, The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism, and in order to purge the academic discourse of what the British government considers to be extremist views and of those who express them.

I would like to know if NUS is aware of this program. If not, I would like to have NUS' help in exposing this program. My name is Kevin Galalae and I live in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. You can contact me by email or by phone at (613) 888-8268.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae