

22 December 2010.

Dear Mr. Behrens,

This is my response to Mrs. Hohl's preliminary decision, issued by your office 21 December 2010, on my complaint against Oxford University (OIA/08877/10).

While Mrs. Hohl's decision is not a complete travesty of justice, because it seconds some of the regulatory breeches I have identified, its main object is to cover up the government's covert programme of *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) I have exposed, exonerate Oxford from any serious wrongdoing, and deny me a fair and impartial hearing as well as proper compensation.

The decision is unjust for many reasons, but since the OIA is unable and unwilling to act in good faith, being hamstrung by secret government directives, I will only take the trouble to point out the main reasons:

1. It does not acknowledge that Oxford expelled me from the course because it runs a covert program of *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) with the government's intelligence agencies that is both illegal and unethical. Instead it starts from the incomplete premise that "*the crux of his complaint to the OIA is that he feels he was wrongly removed from the course; that the University failed to follow procedure in dealing with his case; and that the remedy which was offered to him by the University was inadequate*". This oversight is intentional as it allows the OIA to overlook Oxford's violations of my right to free speech (Article 10) and freedom of thought (Article 9) of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, as well as breeches of the Data Protection Act and of British Education Law.
2. It does not recognize that my expulsion was manufactured by SAC's operatives on the course and by the course tutor who have colluded to create the conditions necessary to expel me from the course on bogus charges. This makes the OIA complicit in the violation of Article 2 (Right to Education) of the Protocol to the European Convention and of Article 17 (Prohibition of abuse of rights) of the European Convention.
3. The compensation it offers is an insult (I point out that the cyber attacks I have suffered at the hands of Britain's Agencies alone have cost me \$9,000 CDN). In refusing to offer proper compensation the OIA has violated Article 13 (Right to an effective remedy) of the European Convention.
4. It does not require Oxford to release my intellectual property by issuing a copy of the course forums, which unequivocally show that my expulsion is the result of prejudice against my socio-political views. The OIA is therefore complicit in the violation of

Article 14 (Prohibition of Discrimination) of the European Convention, of Article 1 (General prohibition of discrimination) of Protocol 12 of the European Convention, as well as of Intellectual Property Law.

All of the above show that the OIA is aiding and abating Oxford and the Government of Britain in hiding the illegal and unethical program of *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) I have exposed and the true reasons why I was expelled. In so doing the OIA has deprived me of Article 6 (Right to a fair trial) of the European Convention.

Since a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal is not possible in Britain in the current politicised environment and collapsed institutions of justice and civil society, I ask that the OIA issues its final verdict before the holidays so that I may take my case to the European Court of Human Rights.

In conclusion, I wish to state that while I understand the impossible position in which the OIA has been placed by the Government of Britain, I do not understand why the OIA, given that it finds itself in a conflict of interest situation, does not avail itself of rule 6.9.2 of its Regulations and recommends that “the complaint would be better considered in another forum”. Given the nature and history of this case, it is clear that only a legal authority outside Britain would have the necessary independence and impartiality to render a fair and just verdict. The proper forum, therefore, is the European Court of Human Rights at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg. The OIA still has time to make this recommendation and I hope that it will do so in its final verdict.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae