

A high-contrast, black and white close-up portrait of a man with dark, wavy hair and a full beard and mustache. He is looking directly at the camera with a serious expression. The lighting is dramatic, highlighting the texture of his skin and hair. The background is out of focus, showing some architectural elements.

HUNGER STRIKE

KEVIN MUGUR GALALAE

Copyright © 2014 Kevin Galalae

All rights reserved.

ISBN-10: 150868426X
ISBN-13: 978-150868426

HUNGER STRIKE

DEFENDING FREEDOM OF SPEECH, THOUGHT AND
CONSCIENCE IN EDUCATION

by
KEVIN MUGUR GALALAE

PROTECTING PEOPLE FROM GOVERNMENTS

DEDICATION

*To all who dare to dare.
And to all who care to care.*

*But especially to my father, who taught me by example how to
defend our basic rights and freedoms and why any price is worth
paying to prevail in what is man's noblest endeavor, the pursuit of
his conscience.*

CONTENTS

	Introduction.....	p. 10
1	Chapter One: The Great Secret.....	p. 11
2	Chapter Two: Kevin Galalae vs. the United Kingdom.....	p. 43
3	Chapter Three: Hunger Strike Pamphlet.....	p. 60
4	Chapter Four: Week One: Dear Mr. Hammarberg.....	p. 64
5	Chapter Five: Week Two: Letter from the Man Outside.....	p. 74
6	Chapter Six: Week Three: Educating the Educated.....	p. 89
7	Chapter Seven: Week Four: Last Chance.....	p. 115
8	Chapter Eight: Week Five: Appeal to Reason.....	p. 124
9	Chapter Nine: The People’s Declaration.....	p. 127
10	Chapter Ten: The Man Turning the Tide.....	p. 138

INTRODUCTION

All I wanted to do is get back in the course. Instead, I went to war with the West's intelligence agencies and my life, whatever is left of it, changed in every respect.

When in 2009 I was thrown out of a political philosophy course at Oxford University on the grounds that I had breached netiquette, I did not know that I had fallen victim to a covert surveillance and censorship program initiated by Britain's security apparatus for the purpose of combating international terrorism and radicalization. Nor did I know that this attack on freedom of speech, thought and conscience was delegated by the United Nations Security Council with the unanimous approval of governments throughout the world and that the world's media was sworn to secrecy. Least of all could I have suspected that this program was but an offshoot of the **global depopulation policy** and, as such, of vital importance to the system of global autocracy needed to subvert the rule of law and circumvent the democratic process.

I appealed my expulsion, indignant that a university as reputable and famous as Oxford should engage in blatant acts of censorship and certain that I would be reinstated in the course. In the process, I unraveled deep secrets that strike at the heart of the New World Order and I have made enemies in every secret service agency around the world.

This is the account of my struggle for our fundamental rights in the post 9/11 environment and of the sacrifices I had to make to get the spooks out of universities. It details the three step approach by which I succeeded: first, exposed the program; second, challenged it in court; and third, forced politicians to dissolve it.

I exposed the surveillance and censorship program by writing a series of articles and informing civil society about its existence. While the mainstream media refused to publish any of my articles, the online media did. I subsequently challenged the program first in the U.K., by adjudicating my expulsion through every level all the way up to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, England's national authority on unresolved disputes within universities. When I exhausted every national means, I turned to the European Court of Human Rights, where I sued the government of the U.K. for violating fundamental rights and debasing academic freedom. Last, I got on a plane and flew to Strasbourg, France, where for 30 days I engaged in a public hunger strike in front of the Council of Europe and addressed the Eurocrats with weekly letters.

The wall of silence I encountered proved impenetrable, as neither the press nor human rights organizations dared to break it. Even though my presence was not acknowledged, I did set in motion a crisis of conscience and the authorities did act behind the scenes. A secret program is only useful as long as it remains secret, and I had blown its cover and forced it to be shut down. In retaliation, the global establishment of power imprisoned me two days after I returned home to Canada and for more than two years has systematically attacked me to force me into submission and acquiescence.

They did not succeed and never will. They have instead awakened me to a life of activism, dissent and resistance.

The Great Secret

Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU

25 October 2010

A covert *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) program run by Britain's secret service agencies from spy centers in and outside the UK threatens the democratic foundation of Europe and undermines respect for human rights and civil liberties across the Western world.

THE GREAT SECRET

The following article is the result of 17 months of conflict with the British Government, Oxford and Leicester universities and 1500 hours of investigative work, time during which I took to task dozens of academics, administrators and officials in Britain and the EU. In the process, disturbing truths have come to light about the state of Great Britain and the EU, which reveal that Europe's democratic foundation is at stake.

Imagine a world where what you are allowed to say and think is dictated and controlled from spy centers in the tribal and autocratic Muslim states of the Arabian Peninsula, where polygamy is ripe, women are hidden behind veils and where some form of Sharia law or no law at all prevails.

Imagine a world where the offspring of the global elites are privy to a great secret that your sons and daughters are not and that can ruin their lives before they even have a chance to start.

Imagine a world where the people who are supposed to render justice and defend the law are lying through their teeth and judge in bad faith to make sure the government's dirty secrets stay secret.

Imagine a world where teachers are forced by secret government decree to fail their students in underhanded ways if they say anything critical of the nation's foreign or domestic policies.

Imagine a world where human rights and civil liberties are just words on paper and where the politicians are hypocrites pretending to defend the constitution and the laws of the land.

Imagine a world where the institutions of democracy have been silenced and the press closed to any and all who want to tell their fellow citizens about an international attack on liberty, justice and equity.

Imagine a world where fact is fiction and fiction fact, because that is the only way to keep together a feeble social fabric woven from the knotty thread of distorting inequalities and growing inequities.

Imagine a world where the laws of the land apply only to those whose opinions and ideas are sanctioned by government censors.

Well, you don't have to imagine it because you already live in that world; and if not, then you are about to live in it thanks to the Machiavellian ingenuity and perverse machinations of the British secret services and the gullible leaders of our abandoned democracies throughout the western world.

If you live in the United Kingdom or attend any British institution of higher education from close or from afar, then that is the reality that is being withheld from you thanks to a covert *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) programme of Britain's higher education institutions that took effect in 2007. If you live anywhere else in the European Union, then that world is coming to your neighborhood soon, if it isn't already there; just as soon as the Stockholm Programme that was agreed upon by the EC's member states in 2009 takes effect.

The *surveillance and censorship* programme (SAC) I have uncovered during 16 months of ongoing conflict with the British government and its intelligence agencies is a full scale assault upon free thinking. It is also a deep secret within a grand deception. It has its roots in **CONTEST, *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism***, a government document that dates back to 2003.

As Britain's "*strategic response to the threat from international terrorism*" CONTEST's stated aim is "*to reduce the risk to the UK and its interests overseas from international terrorism*". The strategy has four strands for achieving this: Pursue, Prevent, Protect and Prepare, and SAC is part of the Prevent strand.

The government introduced its revised Prevent strategy in October 2007 and this is also the time when the covert *surveillance and censorship* programme (SAC) of universities and other higher education institutions was initiated after years of painstaking groundwork. SAC, however, is only the latest of a series of sister programmes of surveillance that operate openly in the UK since 2003 and that have infiltrated places of worship, prisons, social and sports clubs and target mainly, but not exclusively, Muslims in Britain.

The Prevent strand was initially meant "*to stop people becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism and violent extremism*" and its first objective – "*to challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices*" – is what prompted the nation's politicians to empower Britain's secret service agencies to take control of the nation's democratic debate and to listen in and interfere with any conversation, whether real or virtual, deemed radical.

To achieve this they have covertly infiltrated the country's higher education institutions to censor and control the academic environment. In the meantime, CONTEST's Prevent strategy has assumed far more odious objectives and its tentacles are strangling every democratic institution in the UK, from the press to the judiciary, undermining the very foundation of a free society. This has occurred at breakneck speed due to the favorable geopolitical environment provided by Al Qaeda's attacks on America in 2001 and on Europe in 2004 and 2005.

To implement SAC Britain's spooks needed the collaboration of the nation's civil society, and the participation of Britain's administrators and academics. In the name of national security, they asked them to compromise the core values of democracy, pervert the premise of academic discourse, and sell out the sanctity of the academic environment. They obtained their collaboration by reminding them that funding for their institutions, departments and research will be abundant for those who collaborate and subject to review for those who don't.

Once a university's administrators, to feather their own beds, agree to collaborate with the government on SAC, the academics are forced to cooperate by threatening them with staff redundancy rules which include, as at Cambridge University, a vague list of disciplinary offences such as 'unreasonable refusal to carry out a reasonable instruction' or the catch-all 'any other act of serious misconduct'. Since competition for teaching jobs at British universities is fierce, the incentive is to cooperate or else risk losing one's teaching position and the ability to work at any and all British universities.

SAC works by circumventing, ignoring or blatantly violating both national and international laws. Government agents operating from within and outside the country – should the course be offered virtually - are assigned to specific universities where they enroll in programs and courses as regular students, paying tuition fees out of pocket. This allows universities to play innocent should anyone cry foul and to avoid legal repercussions for violating privacy rules, expressional rights, freedom of conscience, education law and the trust of their students. Once imbedded, the spies masquerade as legitimate students while secretly collaborating with the course tutors.

They gather information on every student, test the students' allegiance to the system, assist the course tutors in deflecting and diverting the discussions away from subjects the government deems taboo when the opinions expressed by students run counter to Britain's foreign or domestic policies, bully and coerce students into toeing the politically correct line, manufacture consent and, should that fail, provoke students to commit netiquette breaches or simply create an environment so harassing as to cause targeted students to quit their studies of their own accord. The overall effect is to brainwash the young and the impressionable to hold skewed and hypocritical views in line with the British Government's foreign and domestic policy objectives and not to question the new world order or criticize its shortcomings and injustices.

Should a student, for instance, criticize the wars in Iraq or Afghanistan and Britain's involvement in them, mention the word Caliphate, point out that the world's worst nuclear proliferators are all western nations, suggest that Al Qaida has more than marginal support among Muslims, identify the ongoing conflict between the West and Islam as a war of civilizations, or as much as whisper the notion that Iran is as entitled as any other nation to pursue a nuclear programme, a scripted and well-rehearsed censorship mechanism is activated.

The spy and the course tutor first gang up on the hapless student to challenge his arguments and to require substantiation, and if that does not work to accuse him of over-simplification, lack of sophistication, sweeping generalizations or intellectual shortcomings. Should the student stand his ground or refuse to sing from the same song sheet as the censoring duo then his marks will take a dive. Any further infringement of the British Government's secret dictates and directives will result in failing marks regardless of the quality of the student's assignments.

Since the guiding principle of CONTEST is to defend Britain's "*shared values*" and "*community cohesion*" the censoring duo (secret agent + course tutor) or trio – since oftentimes a student who is in training to become a censor will also be used to hone in on the victim – has absolute discretion in deciding who is in violation. And since students lack any real recourse should they fall afoul of the censors, this gives them unchecked authority that can be abused and misused. Showing republican tendencies, pointing out that monarchies are antithetical to democracies, and calling for the dissolution of the British monarchy; criticizing the system of parliamentary democracy and advocating for direct democracy; or suggesting a more equitable distribution of labor and wealth in free-market societies, can be sufficient reason to trigger one's expulsion.

What is even more disturbing is that one's ethnicity, nationality, color, religion as well as political persuasion are used to profile students and to discriminate against them in the name of defending Britain's shared values and community cohesion.

To avoid lawsuits for engaging in censorship, discrimination, and freedom of speech violations, the favorite methods of triaging unconfirming, undesirable and "un-British" students out of universities are netiquette breaches and the unfair evaluation of assignments leading either to direct expulsions or, respectively, to voluntary withdrawals. If students cannot be reformed or intimidated into submission, or if they happen to be deemed not British enough by the censors then they will be harassed to such an extent that they will drop out of the program of their own accord.

Alternatively, students who cannot be coerced to abandon their convictions and ideals and to adopt and regurgitate the British Government's propaganda are expelled for netiquette breaches, which are carefully instigated, especially in the case of courses offered virtually.

To ensure that SAC remains secret and that it is not challenged in a court of law for its obvious ethical and legal violations, the entire system has been rigged. The institutions of government and the organizations of civil society have been either redesigned to be ineffective or coerced to remain silent and the rule of law has been perverted to ensure that the laws of the land are used to suppress rather than defend truth and justice.

Universities that run SAC have been allowed to make their internal processes for conflict resolution a complete farce in order to hide the existence of SAC and their collaboration with the government in running it. Oxford and Leicester, the universities where I uncovered SAC, have even gone so far as to deny me (and everyone else, I suspect) the right to protest the existence of SAC on their campuses. They continue, however, to portray themselves as bastions of free speech.¹

To cover their shame, universities that have been exposed go so far as to threaten legal action against students who communicate their findings with their fellow students.² And if intimidation does not work, they then refuse to issue a Completion of Procedures letter, which a student needs to take his or her complaint to an authority outside the university.³

¹ Leicester University's Academic Registrar, Kathy Williams, wrote to me on the 8th of April, 2010: "*The University will not grant you permission to use the University's grounds for the purpose of conducting a hunger strike, or indeed, as you are no longer a student of the University, for any purpose at all. Our security service is being provided with your name and such personal details as you volunteered to us when you registered, and if you attempt to initiate the action you describe you will be asked by them to leave the campus. If you refuse to leave voluntarily, the police will be called.*"

² Leicester University threatened legal action if I continue to share my findings with other students. I wrote back: "*Given the many dirty secrets Leicester is trying to cover up, you would do me a great favour by initiating a lawsuit against me. I therefore urge you to do so at the earliest possible date.*" Needless to say, they have not followed their threat with action.

³ In my case, both Leicester and Oxford University have refused to issue a Completion of Procedures Letter, even though this flies in the face of their rules, in order to prevent me from taking my case to the OIA.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), which is the highest authority in Britain to adjudicate conflicts unresolved at the university level, was intentionally not given the mandate to consider complaints that relate to matters of academic judgment.

Since matters relating to prejudice or bias in the conduct of the assessment process – SAC’s favorite method of getting rid of students – can be pursued only at the university level, any and all incidents of censorship are thus buried within the university and rarely reach the OIA. But even if they do reach it, the OIA is under government directive not to address complaints that expose the existence of SAC and to instead conduct bogus investigations.

To prevent the establishment of precedents, the OIA refuses to release information on how many of the complaints it receives annually mention censorship, which runs counter to its declared transparency policy. And to shelter it from being forced to release damning information through the Freedom of Information Act, the government has exempt the OIA from having to open its books to such scrutiny and public oversight. This is all the more egregious and suspicious since officially the OIA promises full transparency and complete impartiality.

The OIA plays dirty in other ways too: by delaying its verdicts, refusing to issue a copy of the rules that govern it⁴, or communicating with the universities it investigates and with government agencies without the knowledge of the complainants, all of which fly in the face of its stated transparency and independence.

The OIA’s principal role, therefore, is to give students the illusion that their complaints are being considered in good faith and that the system works, when in fact they will be shelved without any regard to their validity and with complete disdain for the law, as long as they contain any reference to SAC. The OIA is the graveyard for SAC complaints; that is where they are buried and the slate is wiped clean.

Students who accuse their universities of censorship and thus with violations of Article 10 (Freedom of Expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, Article 9 (Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion), and Article 2 (Right to Education), or with discrimination, as defined by Article 14, will also not have their cases heard by the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), the watchdog charged with promoting and enforcing equality and non-discrimination laws, as well as human rights in Britain.

⁴ This is particularly egregious since its primary function is to determine if universities follow the rules. Obviously, by refusing to make its own rules public, the OIA is bound by no rules and instead reserves the right to make its own rules as it goes along and as it best suits its interests. I have requested the OIA’s rule book from its Chief Executive, Robert Behrens, six times and after initially ignoring me he instructed his Secretary, Ben Elger, to attempt to pass me a pamphlet as the rule book. When that didn’t work, he finally admitted that he will not release the rule book and offered no explanation why, all the while hiding behind his Secretary.

Its power to investigate human rights violations resulting from CONTEST's many programs, SAC included, has been clipped from its inception in 2007, the very year SAC was initiated, and when the EHRC replaced three previous commissions that had real teeth. The EHRC eschews its responsibility and hides its complicity in keeping SAC secret by conveniently and conspicuously invoking short statutes of limitation, so short in fact that a university's internal adjudication process will not have ended, or by failing to admit a complaint's validity. To look busy, the EHRC issues meaningless guides on best practices that are routinely ignored and never enforced.

The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO), which is the public body in charge of investigating violations of the Freedom of Information Act, the Data Protection Act and the **Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003**, thus with undue eavesdropping into people's communications via computers and access to electronic data – all of which SAC violates with impunity – no longer even bothers to reply to complaints that allege such violations.

The excuse the ICO uses is that it is backlogged to such an extent that it takes years to hear from them. Giving secret government agents unencumbered access to students' personal data and to their most intimate and honest thoughts posted on course forums and in written assignments is obviously a clear and gross violation of the Data Protection Act and privacy laws.

More than this, the information is gathered by foreign nationals in the employ of front organizations, such as the Qatar Foundation in Doha, Qatar, where the British intelligence agencies have located one of SAC's spy centers. This means that the data is taken out of Britain and even out of the European Union, without the knowledge let alone the consent of the individuals concerned, to be used and abused any which way the British and Qatari intelligence agencies wish. The Data Protection Act is thus violated in every respect, both in the letter and the spirit in which it was written.

Last but not least, claims for discrimination in post 16 education must be taken to county court within 6 months less 1 day from the date of discrimination to have one's claim heard. This again means that no student could possibly get through their university's internal adjudication process within that time, let alone reach a county court.

To shield itself from international opprobrium at the EU level and from being forced to adhere to the laws it professes to obey by a European court of law, the UK has refused to be bound by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and its elements of judicial and penal policy. This amounts to a free pass to trample the rights and freedoms of any European citizen (or indeed of any citizen period) without fear of being held accountable in a court of law outside the UK. And inside the UK, of course, no lawyer or law society will contest the legitimacy of CONTEST and SAC. I should know, for I tried and failed to get any solicitor's interest.

Prevent strategy updates published by various local authorities such as police departments as well as the progress and assessment reports published by the British Government on CONTEST neither address grievances nor report incidents of abuse and mistakes in the delivery of the Prevent programme. Instead they invariably declare that no human rights implications arise as a result of Prevent.

This blatant dishonesty serves the purpose of disarming criticism of the programme, which is deeply unpopular especially among Muslim communities, creating the impression that the rule of law still applies in the UK, as well as exonerating ministerial authorities, who are supposed to exercise oversight over CONTEST – namely the Home Secretary and the National Security and International Development Committee (NSID) – from any responsibility should the consequences of Prevent explode into criminal abuse or civil unrest.

Between 2003 and 2007, thus prior to SAC’s implementation, the UK totally redesigned its public bodies so as to ensure that no claim for human rights violations or discrimination can find an independent and impartial investigating body.

This was done systematically and intentionally to ensure that SAC meets with no opposition and that it cannot be exposed or challenged in a court of law. In the process, the rule of law has been suspended and replaced with government diktats⁵, reducing the entire officialdom to systemic dishonesty and state-sanctioned fraud and turning the nation’s higher education institutions into propaganda and indoctrination machines.⁶

Since no secret program can stay secret long enough in a democracy with a functioning and free press, the British Government had to also silence the media. It did and continues to do so by imposing publication bans on any and all newspapers and media channels that get a whiff of SAC. **Defence Advisory Notices**, which are official requests to news editors not to publish or broadcast items on specified subjects for reasons of national security, are slapped on editors’ desks to keep their newspapers or TV stations quiet.

While it is unclear to me how a similar ban is imposed on the European media from Brussels, it is clear that such a mechanism indeed exists.⁷ Although I have contacted a number of important newspapers in Germany, France, Italy and Spain not one of them has even bothered to acknowledge receipt of my evidence let alone publish it.

⁵ Paradoxically, the rule of law has been identified as the number one feature of britishness, the first and most important among ten core values Britain’s counter-terrorism strategy is supposed to protect from terrorists. “**No one is above the law - not even the government**” declares The Telegraph proudly and confidently.

⁶ Of the dozens of officials I have dealt with in Britain only one has proven to be brave and honourable. Colin Atkinson, Leicester’s Information Officer, in answering my request under the Freedom of Information Act about the identity of Carla Liuzzo (the spy working from Qatar on behalf of the British and Qatari intelligence agencies) and the university’s collaboration with the government in censoring the academic environment, has confirmed that the University of Leicester must “*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*” and that the information office cannot release information about Carla Liuzzo because such information cannot be disclosed due to Section 23(3) “*information supplied by, or relating to, bodies dealing with security matters*”. He covered himself by adding that this neither confirms nor denies that the University holds such information.

⁷ Freedom House as well as the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), both of which I have contacted several times, have not answered my repeated calls to help me identify the mechanism employed by the EU to muzzle the media. It is frightening that these two international and ostensibly independent organisations have become mere arms of the political establishment and enablers of censorship.

To ensure that SAC remains operational, secret and unchallenged, the British government has also bullied human rights organizations, such as Liberty, and student unions to keep their hands off any cases brought forth that so much as mention SAC and to refrain from publicizing its existence.

Without recourse to the law or access to the media, aggrieved individuals who want to peacefully protest their mistreatment, seek redress, or inform the public about the existence of SAC meet with police threats.⁸ Indeed, police constabularies actively deny individuals the right to protest the existence and abuses of SAC, even though the right to protest is enshrined in Article 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The final slap in the face of human rights and civil liberties comes through bilateral agreements on countering terrorism forged at the national level between Britain and its Commonwealth allies and multilateral agreements at the EU level to ensure that Canada, Australia, the U.S. and New Zealand remain silent about covert ops that violate their citizens' rights both directly and indirectly through social controls, censorship or consent manufacturing. Counter-terrorism clauses in agreements between the EU and third countries on co-operation in international and regional organizations, as well as counter-terrorism related assistance to select partners ensure that 80 countries so far will refrain from exposing SAC and programs like it. Democratic processes and human rights are thus undermined or outright suspended across the world in the name of security and thanks to the diabolical work of Britain's secret service agencies.

Throughout the western world, the good men have gone into hiding, lest they should be accused of fraternizing with the enemy or standing up for potential terrorists. Institutions of last resort for the defense of human rights and civil liberties refuse to get involved because taking on their government is a daunting task with few chances of success. I have personally appealed to the CANADIAN CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION (CCLA) and to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), organizations that advocate and litigate for individual rights.

The CCLA has responded that this is an issue they do not want to get involved in while the ACLU has completely ignored my plea for help. I fared no better with academic centers that advocate for civil liberties: The Citizen Lab at the Munk Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto (Canada); Professor Ross Anderson at Cambridge University (UK), and The Defence of Civil Rights in Academia (DCRA) Project of the National Council of Arab Americans (United States). These institutions of civil society have been defanged, silenced or, respectively, dissolved.

In this environment of see no evil, hear no evil, clearing one's name from the stigma of terrorism, subversion, extremism or radicalism is neigh impossible once these labels are applied, and especially when they are applied without the victim's knowledge.

⁸ Chief Superintendent Brendan O'Dowda of Oxford police and Deputy Chief Constable Gordon Fraser of Leicester police have both denied me the right to protest, thus violating Article 11 of the European Convention of Human Rights, and have insinuated that if I do so I will be in violation of the law. When asked which law they are referring to they went silent. O'Dowda went so far as to even attempt to intimidate me by suggesting that I will be in trouble with the immigration authorities if I enter the country.

Giving the power to assign such labels to apologists, ideologues, censors and simpletons with hidden personal agendas, class interests and no real oversight is a recipe for disaster, especially since such individuals have a license to stand in judgment over our opinions and convictions in secret, under false pretenses, without our knowledge, without due process, in contempt of the law, and across international borders where they have no jurisdiction.

The cancer spreads

The genie is now out of the bottle and getting it back will be impossible since the checks and balances between the institutions meant to protect democracies from such abuses no longer exist and the rule of law has been suspended. Not surprisingly, SAC has expanded exponentially not only in scope but also in reach, absorbing ever more human and financial resources.

As expected, the program is already out of control. Having run out of Muslims to harass and kick out of the United Kingdom on legitimate and illegitimate grounds, for good and for bad reasons, it has now honed in on foreigners of all colors and creeds; they are obviously un-British and jeopardize community cohesion.

Foreigners whose opinions and convictions diverge from those prescribed by the British Government and who dare reach out for power jobs in government or professions sought after by the privileged locals, are a favorite target, if not by policy than by dint of the popular mood reflected in the authority given imbedded government agents to exercise their deepest personal prejudices and their community's hatreds and biases with no oversight or safeguards. Expressions of such biases and hatreds are particularly ugly and prevalent at a time when employment is sparse because the economy of Britain is in shambles and meaningful employment throughout the western world is increasingly becoming a privilege.

From the evidence I have been able to gather, SAC's true objectives are far more insidious still and a lot broader than first expected, which is why it is kept secret at all costs. They are as follows:

1. Force the public to accept the status quo by discouraging or even obstructing criticism of the system and government actions and by creating artificial support for unpopular policies like the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.
2. Deny minorities, and especially Muslims, the ability to voice their grievances and to speak in defense of their values and convictions so as to keep them silent, weak, divided, isolated and suspicious of one another in order to prevent them from participating in the democratic process, the nation's discourse, and the political system.
3. Ensure that new ideas that challenge the wisdom of the current political and economic system are suppressed and discarded before they reach a mass audience and that those who put forth such ideas are discriminated against and prevented from graduating from university and

succeeding in life in order to ensure that they have no opportunity to change the system from within, command a public podium, or contribute to professional publications.

4. Annihilate cultural differences from the public sphere to create the illusion of community cohesion and to sell the notion that the many factions that make up the pluralist and multi-religious society of Britain could possibly coexist solely on the basis of a shared set of values. This amounts to denying members of different cultural groups their true identity.
5. Fill the civil service and ministry ranks of foreign nations, as well as the ranks of international and transnational institutions and organizations, with graduates who have abandoned their people's values and best interests and who for reasons of personal benefit and advancement have made Britain's agenda their own.
6. Exercise undue influence on the people and governments of other European countries in order to gradually and underhandedly shape the EU in Britain's image. This requires the active suppression of other nation's identities and their cultural subjugation to ensure that no competing world views capture the imagination of humanity and supplant the existing Western order.

The cancer of CONTEST and its most covert and virulent progeny, SAC, has spread to the European Community. In 2009, the EU Member States have agreed on a framework of cooperation, called the Stockholm Programme, in several areas of security policy, including counter-terrorism, for the period 2010-2014. Supposedly promoting "openness and security", the Stockholm Programme has begun unleashing the same covert surveillance and censorship operations upon the rest of Europe as are commonplace in Britain.

This new security architecture will allow individual governments and Brussels to misuse and abuse the instruments introduced for the purpose of counter-terrorism to quell legitimate social protests and to pursue social engineering goals without constitutional restrictions and despite grassroots opposition. If the UK is any indication, the fundamental rights promised citizens by the European Union, and enshrined in the **Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union**, will be conditional upon one's willingness to say and do only what the European Commission dictates.⁹

⁹ Since the Stockholm Programme was agreed upon during the Swedish presidency of the EU, I asked the Prime Minister of Sweden, Fredrik Reinfeldt, and the **Minister for European Union Affairs** in the **Swedish government**, Birgitta Ohlsson, if *"the Stockholm Agreement will implement the surveillance and censorship program (SAC) of the academic environment throughout the EU, as already covertly practised in the UK since 2007 under the auspices of CONTEST, Britain's anti-terrorism strategy"* and *"if SAC will be implemented covertly or overtly in other EU states with the tacit or implicit knowledge and permission of the Swedish Presidency and under the legislative framework provided by the Stockholm Agreement"*. Since they have failed to respond, I take their silence as confirmation that this is indeed the case.

With unabashed disregard for appearances, the Directorate-General for Justice, Freedom and Security (recently split into the Directorate-General for Justice and the Directorate-General for Home Affairs), Europe's agency for, ironically, protecting fundamental rights and creating a European area of freedom, security and justice, has adopted the UK's CONTEST strategy and text wholesale, so much so that its **webpage on terrorism** is nearly a carbon copy of CONTEST and its four strategy strands – Pursue, Prevent, Protect and Prepare.

To protect SAC from being exposed, the EC has adopted the same methods of obstruction and obfuscation as those developed in Britain. An appeal for justice addressed to the Commissioner for Education, Mrs. Androulla Vassiliou¹⁰, will be promptly answered by none other than Dr. Martin Schieffer¹¹, the Acting Head of Unit F1 (Fight against Terrorism), of Directorate F (Security) of the EC (which as of 2010 has become Directorate A of the Directorate-General for Home Affairs). He will confidently inform you that the violations of fundamental rights you allege have no link to European Union law and that the EC has therefore no power to intervene and that you should seek redress at national level through the competent authorities, including the courts.

¹⁰ I subsequently asked the Commissioner for Education, the following: *“Dear Commissioner Vassiliou, On the 3rd of April I send you an email (see File 1) informing you about the existence of a surveillance and censorship program in British universities under the auspices of CONTEST – The United Kingdom’s Strategy for Countering International Terrorism – and requesting that I lodge a complaint since the program in question violates European education law and human rights. To date, I have not received an answer from you, but only a reply from Dr. Martin Schieffer, Acting Head of Unit F1 (Fight against Terrorism) from Directorate F (Security) of the European Commission (see File 2). I found it rather puzzling that a request about education law and human rights addressed to you should be answered by the European Commission’s terrorism unit acting head, especially since such knowledge is outside Dr. Schieffer’s expertise. Since I am about to lodge a complaint with the European Court of Human Rights, I need you to commit yourself in writing that my case presents no evidence of violations of European education law and European human rights law, as Dr. Martin Schieffer has indicated on your behalf. Dr. Schieffer will be able to send you the material I forwarded to your office at that time. If not, I will be more than happy to personally send you the files. Should I not hear from you personally, I will take this as evidence that your office is being misused to cover up the existence of the surveillance and censorship program I have identified and exposed. I am attaching my latest correspondence with the OIA to further elucidate the issues at hand and the stage of my ongoing appeal within Britain (see File 3). Should you wish to read the 24 supporting documents of File 3, I will be more than happy to send them to you. I look forward to hearing from you. Sincerely, Kevin Galalae.”* Not surprisingly, she has refused to respond and has gone into hiding. As one would have expected given her actions, Mrs. Vassiliou studied law at Middle Temple Inn of Court in London (1961-1964) and international affairs at the London Institute of World Affairs (1964-1966). It appears that her loyalties lie with the British Government rather than the rule of law, justice, and the rights and freedoms of the citizens of the EU.

¹¹ I have asked Dr. Schieffer on multiple occasions to explain his actions, but to date he has remained silent and seems to have disappeared from the face of the earth. I wrote to him: *“Dear Dr. Schieffer, On the 19th of May, 2010, you replied to an inquiry I made to Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou (see File 1), regarding the violation of human rights and education law in British universities. I am currently preparing a complaint for the Council of Europe’s European Court of Human Rights and I am attempting to explain why an inquiry I made to the Commissioner for Education was answered by the Acting Head of Unit F 1 (Fight against Terrorism) of Directorate F, which is responsible for Security. Am I to understand this as (1) confirmation that the surveillance and censorship program I identified in British universities is operating with the knowledge and consent of the European Commission and (2) that it may be extant beyond Britain and active in universities throughout the EU? The current Stockholm Programme on cooperation seems to also reinforce this conclusion. Furthermore, could you please provide your expertise and qualifications in the area of education law and human rights? The information I have gathered thus far seems to indicate that you have no expertise in these areas and that you are therefore ill-qualified to assess the validity of complaints that relate to human rights and education law. Last but not least, I would like to know if it is common practice within the European Commission to have requests addressed to the Commissioner for Education answered by the Acting Head of the Fight against Terrorism unit. I look forward to your reply. Regards, Kevin Galalae.”*

By refusing to investigate abuses committed at the national level, the EC gives its Member States a free pass to implement whatever restrictive and undemocratic policies they deem necessary without fear of being prosecuted by the European Court of Human Rights or any other EU agency. The freedom to abuse the law and violate citizens' rights at the national level without fear of repercussions at the EU level is what would have made European consent for the Stockholm Programme possible.

Maintaining Europe-wide secrecy of covert operations that blatantly violate citizen's fundamental rights and civil liberties is achieved through a dozen conventions, joint actions, framework decisions and instruments designed to combat terrorism (http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/intro/docs/jha_acquis_1009_en.pdf, pp. 34-5). The Stockholm Agreement, it is safe to say, is Europe's first step towards autocracy and totalitarianism. And covert programs like SAC are the instruments that sow the destruction of Europe's democracies.

Binding and non-binding agreements at the EU level between Member States and bilateral agreements with western allies have elevated solidarity and collective action on combating terrorism above human rights and civil liberties, allowing allied states to violate or suspend the rights of each other's citizens as they see fit. That is why every appeal I made in Canada to my local Member of Parliament¹² and the heads of various political parties in the opposition have fallen on deaf ears. Canada's political establishment, like that of every EU Member State, has betrayed its citizens. Even the hunger strike I staged on Canada's Parliament Hill at the beginning of May has failed to convince Canada's politicians to act in accordance with the nation's Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which they purport to obey and defend.¹³

¹² Peter Milliken, the local MP, did absolutely nothing. As alumnus of Oxford University, Mr. Milliken chose to put the interests of his university ahead of the fundamental rights of his constituents. As elected Member of Parliament and Speaker of the House of Commons, Mr. Milliken has sworn to uphold and protect the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Instead, he joined the editor of the local newspaper, Claude Scilley of The Whig Standard, to ensure that Canadians are kept in the dark about the fact that their children are being ideologically purged, intellectually brainwashed, spied on and censored in British universities and that the constitutionally protected rights of Canadians are being trampled upon by the British Government with the full knowledge and tacit consent of the Canadian Government. The toxic combination of Canada's corporate owned media and a political establishment beholden to the British Crown and compromised by bilateral and multilateral cooperation agreements on counter-terrorism have annihilated freedom of speech, the rule of law and human rights in the country to which I immigrated as a child.

¹³ Due to personal circumstances my hunger strike was, unfortunately, much shorter than I intended, lasting only four days, two at home and two in front of parliament. As it came at the wrong time - three weeks before the birth of my second son - I had to abort it when my wife's blood pressure rose to dangerous levels. During my hunger strike the Canadian media completely ignored me, walking past me like I was invisible. Only one reporter spoke to me in passing and told me that no politician speaks to the press about my subject and that as long as nobody talks to them their hands are tied. The politicians too ignored me. The only one who talked to me in passing was Bob Rae, the Foreign Affairs critic for the Liberal Party, who told me not to ruin my health for this cause and to contact CSIS (the Canadian spy agency) and show them my evidence. I immediately phoned them and was told that someone would contact me soon. Six months later and I am still waiting.

The Solidarity Clause (contained in Article 42 of the draft Constitution for Europe) of the **Declaration on Combating Terrorism** of 25 March 2004 states that Member States and acceding States must act jointly and have a common approach to combating terrorism. This, in addition to intelligence sharing and a Europe-wide legislative framework, further weds Europe's Member States to central directives on security issues that are binding throughout the EU.

This means that once labeled or red-flagged as a potential threat or an enemy of the state by one of SAC's agents, an individual will have an uphill battle to prove his innocence and will be indefinitely treated as persona non grata throughout the EU and beyond.

The full consequences of such labeling to the individual concerned remain secret. In my case, I have been denied tertiary education, a slew of fundamental rights, and the renewal of my Romanian passport, all of which have far-reaching consequences for my life now and in the future.

The Declaration on Combating Terrorism has paved the way for an aggressive EU-wide policy on the prevention of radicalization leading to terrorism, which is indeed recognized in the 2009 extended report on the **Evaluation Of The Hague Programme And Action Plan** as "*the core of the 'preventing' strand of the European Union's counter-terrorism policy*" (p. 47).

Europe's Prevent strand is, not surprisingly, a carbon copy of Britain's CONTEST document and is based on the same four studies as Britain's (three of which are indeed British). Not surprisingly, as in Britain, it has generated a series of projects (seven to date) to tackle radicalization throughout society: in prisons, places of worship, higher education institutions, and elsewhere.

These are intrusions into people's lives that engender flagrant violations of fundamental rights, but that are supposed to be kept under control through Handbooks of Good Practices. These publications spell out "*best practices in cooperation initiatives between authorities and civil society designed to prevent and respond to violent radicalization*" and, as in Britain, they will be fully ignored, just as the evaluation reports by oversight authorities that are supposed to ensure the programs are in conformity with the law and that the rules are respected, will never be reached by reports of wrongdoing and abuse, which will have been purged from the public record along the way.

As in Britain, progress reports and evaluation reports will fail to register abuses and will declare instead with unabashed dishonesty that CONTEST's Prevent strategy entails no human rights breaches and that to date no violations have been registered. Civilian oversight will thus be bypassed at the EU, as within the UK, with cleansed reports that in turn ensure not only the survival of the program but also its proliferation into ever more intrusive and pervasive forms.

How many people have been expelled from Britain or persecuted as a result of SAC is therefore a well-guarded secret both at the national and EU level. The EU's 2009 document on the progress made by anti-terrorist legislation (TE-SAT 2009: EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report, published by EUROPOL) has exempted Britain from even supplying itemized figures on the "number of arrested terrorism suspects in 2008" or the "number of failed, foiled or successful attacks in 2006, 2007 and 2008", which aids the UK in hiding the true figures.

Prevent is spreading like wildfire and is here to stay. In its 2010 **annual report** on CONTEST's progress the UK Government declares that its Prevent program "*has established local and national partnerships with an increasingly broad range of community groups and organizations, successfully delivering over 1,000 projects*" (p. 12) and over 250 overseas projects "*in countries and regions which are most significant for the threat to the UK and our interests*" (p. 14).

In preparation for the Europe-wide expansion of SAC, the UK has set up an organization, called The Group, to distribute the materials and know-how necessary to initiate SAC programmes. The GROUP, as well as the National Archives, refuse however to release the propaganda and indoctrination materials they have on the subject. I have made multiple enquiries only to have my email blocked.¹⁴

On the EU level, the lofty ideals and ambitious agenda of the Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and Security have been hijacked by the forces of authoritarianism and their vested interests, who want to subordinate the new European governance and economic arrangements to British oversight and control so as to ensure that no one threatens the entrenched rights, privileges and economic interests of the elites by challenging their power base or by pointing out their hypocritical stances and pretenses.

These forces have already succeeded in changing the modus operandi of the European Commission and are now using programs like SAC to gradually change the political culture of the EU from one that is genuinely consensual, free and democratic to one that is covertly dictatorial, manipulative and autocratic.

¹⁴ The full name of this organization is "**Community Cohesion and Preventing Violent Extremism Champion Principals Group**" and is headed by Paul Head. I sent the following letter to Mr. Head, but instead of responding he blocked my e-mail: "*Dear Mr. Head, I would like to know what your Group's position is on the surveillance and censorship programme that currently operates in UK universities under the auspices of CONTEST and that imbeds government agents in courses and programs to masquerade as students in order to covertly spy on and censor their legitimate fellow students if their opinions do not conform with the dictates of CONTEST. I am particularly interested in the role the Qatar Foundation plays in this surveillance and censorship programme. I am preparing a case for the European Court of Human Rights at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg to challenge the legitimacy of this programme and your input would be greatly appreciated. Can you also please forward me a copy of the document "**Learning Together to be Safe - A toolkit to help colleges contribute to the prevention of violent extremism**". I would greatly appreciate it. I look forward to hearing from you.*" Sincerely, Kevin Galalae"

Mr. Rousseau at the National Archives and have unsuccessfully applied the following study: The Role of Education Providers in Promoting Further Community Cohesion, Fostering Shared Values and Preventing Violent Extremism - Initial Consultation (331 KB), The Role of Education Providers in Further Promoting Community Cohesion, Fostering Shared Values and Preventing Violent Extremism - Consultation Summary (86 KB), The Role of Education Providers in Promoting Further Community Cohesion, Fostering Shared Values and Preventing Violent Extremism - Consultation Response (74 KB), The Role of FE Colleges in Preventing Violent Extremism: Next Steps (611 KB), Learning Together To Be Safe - A toolkit to help Colleges Contribute to the Prevention of Violent Extremism (495 KB)

By taking control of Europe's academic discourse they hope to predetermine the outcome of democratic deliberations; a sneaky way to control or at the very least influence the nature of the EU. Ultimately this is part of the Anglo-American strategy to keep Europe within the fold and under the leadership of the US by rendering it fully dependent on Anglo-American ideas and fully subscribed to Anglo-American policies and to the free-market ideology the US and the UK espouse.¹⁵

By this strategy, it is only select American and British citizens, as well as their likeminded counterparts and minions elsewhere, who are allowed to contribute their ideas to the intellectual construct the new global order is to embody. Programs like SAC ensure that only those who toe the Anglo-American conception of the new world order are heard, that alternatives are discarded before they can be contemplated, and that no inconvenient truths are voiced that reveal the flaws, inequities and hypocrisy of this new world order.

On the global level, the democratic aspirations of people living under autocratic regimes are being suppressed through illegal and unethical programs like SAC in order to protect the stability of a global economic order based on injustice and inequality and which pits the West against the Rest. What is ultimately undermined is the means by which people everywhere can determine the shape and form of the political and economic system under which they want to live. This neo-imperialist objective demands that Britain positions itself favorably on America's side by devising an underhanded way by which to control continental Europe.

The rightwing military types, self-serving politicians and moneyed interests that have joined hands and seized control of Britain's democratic discourse and civil society under the pretext of counter-terrorism, the guidance of Britain's intelligence agencies, the cover of CONTEST, and the blessings of Washington are well on their way of achieving the same feat throughout Europe.

The international cabal they have assembled is part and parcel of the global push to seize control of the world government that is emerging and to ensure that it serves the interests of the global elite first and foremost. They alone are to make the rules while the rest of mankind has no choice but to follow them.

Why it spreads

Cooperation at the lowest common denominator

SAC has become a self-reinforcing mechanism of oppression because its insiders profit and the system has been rigged so that outsiders who are wronged have no recourse to the checks and balances a functioning democracy needs to correct abuses and breaches of the law, and also because the current geopolitical climate breeds fear and paranoia and feeds deeply held prejudices and naked racism.

¹⁵ The CIA Memorandum recently disclosed by WikiLeaks and titled "Counting on Apathy Why Might Not Be Enough", shows how America manipulates public opinion through propaganda in Europe and manufacturing of consent in order to sustain support for its wars in Iraq and Afghanistan despite public opposition. SAC is part of the same Anglo-Saxon effort to control the "internal enemy", the European public, when the population of the continent opposes state policy.

The fallen universities and their defeated academics receive copious funding; the privileged get to offer their offspring a free education and fat incomes; national governments have the perfect tool to pursue unpopular policies without much internal opposition and external opprobrium; the Eurocrats get to manufacture consent for unpopular integration and harmonization directives; allies who are equally paranoid about the Islamic fundamentalist threat and upcoming social unrest get free intelligence and an instrument for stifling political challengers; and the autocratic states in the Middle East that house the surveillance and censorship centers set up by the British intelligence agencies get an additional tool for repressing their people's democratic aspirations.

As a bonus, all stakeholders get to exercise their prejudices as they see fit and with their State's assistance and the EU's tacit blessing.

Undergirding this coalition of the willing is Europe's inability to contain a populist anti-immigrant backlash and the tacit decision to circumscribe the European Union's cherished free movement of people through covert methods of persecution delivered through programs like SAC; programs that deprive immigrants and foreigners of the right to be heard and ultimately of the ability to organize and to acquire political representation, which will act in the long run as a deterrent to leave one's country.

On the human level, SAC and its sister programs have created a reward system that pays petty and narrow-minded individuals for informing and spying on their fellow citizens and for throwing stones at those brave and honest enough to speak out their minds and to stand by their convictions in an environment of state-sponsored lies, injustice and misinformation. Unethical people can now exercise power over others and be handsomely paid for it.

That self-interest and sycophancy dressed as patriotism and concern over people's security should prevail over rare courage in an environment where the masses are silenced by inertia and acquiescence comes as no surprise to me. I have experienced this first-hand as a child in Ceausescu's Romania, when my father, Dr. Costel Galalae, took on the communists. What comes as a shocking revelation, however, is the ease with which SAC and its sister programmes have been forced upon and found acceptance in a people protected by the rule of law and empowered by rights and liberties the citizens of the former Eastern Bloc could only dream of.

The only logical explanation of why this has happened lies in the political structure and social organization of the UK. Given Britain's highly stratified society and the full control the elites have over the masses, CONTEST and SAC could only have been first instituted in the UK. Furthermore, as one of Europe's oldest partial democracies, Britain has no recent experience of the devastating effects of censorship and authoritarianism and this lack of historical perspective and first-hand experience have made it reckless and ignorant. A third factor is that the institution of the monarchy has conditioning the British populace to easily cower to authority.

That the British Government has succeeded in pushing its progenies to the EU level is partly the result of the tremendous soft power it commands through the hundreds of thousands of foreigners who have graduated from British universities over the past three decades. Many of them have been installed as point men and women in key positions throughout the EC after their careers have been fast-tracked by the British Government, often despite tangible achievements or merit.

Whatever the causes, Britain has created a self-perpetuating beast that can no longer be contained and that now feeds its growing appetite on unbridled prejudice and naked racism. This beast has nearly shattered my marriage, has irreversibly alienated me from my older brother, has altered my relationship with extended family and friends, has destroyed my love for Canada (where I reside) and my respect for its leadership, and has robbed me of just about every right and freedom I thought I had.

The consequences of its spreading

Deep social divisions, conditional rights and the suspension of the rule of law

A secret is only a secret if it stays a secret. A secret meant to protect society's shared values and community cohesion will by necessity be shared only among the minority that profits most from the status quo.

If your daddy happens to be a high ranking officer in the armed forces, a judge, a commissioner, an industrialist, a newspaper editor, or an academic, chances are that you will be let in on the big secret and invited to profit from it. The job of spying on your fellow citizens comes with many perks: a free education, fellowships to live and "research" abroad, free international travel, excellent medical plan, the cachet of secret service work and, of course, the power to exercise authority over your lesser citizens.

That kind of power, needless to say, is addictive. If you are the son or daughter of Joe the plumber, you can be certain that you will not be let in on the big secret and the lucrative work that comes with it. No, you and I need not apply for one must have the right pedigree, the right political inclinations, and the necessary connections and social status to be let in on the big secret and gorge on the public trough at the expense of the taxpayers and their rights. No, you and I need not apply, for we are the mob that needs to be kept in its place, lest we should revolt over growing unemployment, dwindling incomes, exploding debt, unfair distribution of wealth, and so on. You get the picture! The first symptom of the SAC disease is social division between insiders, those who are in on the big secret and who by necessity are the sons and daughters of the elites, and outsiders, those who will never be.

The rule of law no longer applies equally and human and civil rights are no longer respected let alone inalienable. Those with views and values not deemed by the elites as compatible with the society they live in are stripped of their every right, liberty and social protections that are supposed to be guaranteed by the constitution and upheld by law.

In this environment one is at the mercy of government agents whose individual judgments are based on uncontrolled prejudices, self-interest, class interest and the changing agendas of the ruling party. Abuses and mistakes will not be recognized because the survival of the programme is more important than any single individual's rights, 1000 individuals, or of any number of individuals for that matter.

And that is how a second division occurs, between the initiated and empowered, those who set themselves above the law because they have authority over others, and the uninitiated and disempowered, those who can be stripped of their rights, freedoms and protections the moment they say or do something that offends the initiated. The result is that if you think like us and say what we want to hear, your rights will be respected, but if you don't, your rights will be trampled upon.

Those at first reluctant to cooperate are soon keen supporters of the programme because the money is good and a cushy and safe job in a depressed economy is not something to sneer at, and because holding unrestricted power over others is corrupting. The democratic institutions that are supposed to hold in check and balance government power are thus corrupted along with the individuals co-opted into the inner circle. And that is how SAC becomes a tool for social oppression that holds society hostage to the status quo while the organs of democracy decay alongside the integrity of individuals. The predictable outcome of such a system-wide decay is that we, the people, no longer have a say in the running of our countries and of Europe and that those who make the rules are above criticism and therefore free to be as autocratic or totalitarian as they wish.

At a time when a university degree is essential for getting ahead and prospering, barring the underprivileged and the unconforming from education on the pretext that they do not hold views compatible with the society they live in will prevent social ascension and entrench privileges in ever fewer hands. This in turn will spell the end of meritocracy and the universal benefits it brings, since within a generation or two individuals previously appointed to positions of leadership according to intelligence and aptitude will be merely chosen due to their connections and to their willingness to prostitute themselves.

The gradual repression of free speech will translate into universal fear to utter any criticism however relevant or subtle it may be. This will not only destroy the foundation of democracy, since the pluralism of opinion necessary for democracy is replaced by state propaganda, but also the fabric of society, since the people will be imprisoned in their own minds, robbed of the ability to seek redress for injuries suffered at the hands of the authoritarian elite, and suspicious of anyone's motives, lest they should turn out to be informants, censors or ideologues. Fear and self-interest will sink society into an unbearably stultifying uniformity.

Inalienable rights have become conditional, participation in society subject to government scrutiny, the balance of power upset, freedom of speech and conscience subordinated to class interest, the academic discourse impoverished, human relations perverted, and the rule of law replaced by individual whim. These are the poisonous fruits that Britain is now reaping from its counter-terrorism strategy and whose end result will be a society deeply fragmented by fear and suspicion and irrevocably divided between insiders and outsiders, empowered and disempowered, full citizens and second class citizens, overseers and overseen, natives and foreigners.

***The consequences of its spreading outside Britain:
Autocracy in the making, Europe's new form of fascism***

SAC's appeal is obvious. It allows those in positions of authority to exercise power unrestrained by democratic processes and their lackeys to profit from government funding and job security unavailable to the great majority.

SAC has found acceptance at the European level because in the post 9-11 geopolitical climate it is politically safe not to oppose any program that purports to increase security; because it offers a covert way to exercise prejudices of all kinds and Islamophobia, xenophobia and racism are ripe throughout the western world; and because the Brits are adept at selling Trojan horses to unsophisticated continental politicians who are either unaware that they are sowing the seeds of their own country's self-destruction and the end of their people's self-determination, or are bought not to care by being offered a seat at the European governing table and access to the revolving door between the corporate and the political establishments.

Few governments in Central and Eastern Europe will want to or be able to cough up the money necessary to implement their own versions of SAC. So the task will graciously be taken over by Britain, which already has the people and the know-how in place to do so.

Gradually Britain will get to reshape other European societies in its own image by taking advantage of the asymmetric vulnerabilities of different nations, while also billing the EU and the rich puppet states in the Middle East and elsewhere for services rendered. Already the advantages conferred on British universities by the international supremacy of the English language are being used to ensure that only those foreign students graduate from British universities who are willing to espouse British ideas and values to the exclusion of others.

Before long, the entire European continent will be as stratified, elitist, snobbish and hypocritical as the UK, as well as subordinated to policies and ideologies emanating from Whitehall. Fifty years from now the much touted European Project will have produced an Anglicized and dependent continent overpopulated with lords and ladies at the top of an Orwellian society defended from the wrath of its citizens by millions of CCTV cameras and hundreds of thousands of informants, spies and ideologues at every level of society. To a great extent, that is already the reality of British society.

EU citizens will be no more than royal subjects with conditional rights rather than free citizens with inalienable rights. If Britain is allowed to reassert its dwindling importance and relevance on the world stage by taking control of the EU through the back door, not only the citizens of the EU but the citizens of the entire free world will face an uncertain future. If we allow it, the outcome is predictable; a populace that is acquiescent, apathetic, docile, demoralized and fully disenfranchised from the democratic process.

Those in charge of the EU Presidency come and go every six months while Britain's spoofs and their system of social control and consent manufacturing are there to stay and to entrench their power from year to year, turning Europe into a securitized society in which the military-industrial complex and its rhetoric pervert every aspect of life, just like in the United States, and has the power to legitimize extraordinary means to solve any perceived threat.

Within a few decades they alone will be Europe's mandarins, preying on people's insecurities and weaknesses, stoking their prejudices and vulnerabilities and turning them against the people's own best interests in order to strangle every democratic initiative that does not suit those in power.

What better way to undo hard-won European unity than by stoking the racist undercurrents that run deep in Europe and that have experienced a resurgence through the rise of rightwing and nationalist parties throughout the EU. CONTEST and its progenies, like SAC, are the clearest and boldest expression of a militarized, rightwing, conservative vision of the world in which the State keeps its eye on everything and everyone.

The paradoxes SAC's existence entails

The greatest damage to our democracies and threat to our rights and freedoms come not from Al Qaeda or other real or fictitious foes, but from our own allies and from our prejudices run wild, for the damage done to date by all terrorist attacks put together pales by comparison to the damage done to our societies by the application of covert methods of surveillance and censorship designed to control what we say and how we think, and to ensure that we acquiesce. In the name of defending our "*shared values*" and "*community cohesion*" the free, pluralist and multicultural societies that made western nations successful and free are being turned into xenophobic and repressive societies that have abandoned the very principles of democracy and freedom. The time has come to ask ourselves if a society that needs this kind of defenses deserves to survive, and if a world order obsessed with security when it should be concerned with humanity has a right to exist.

It is a bitter irony that the pursuit of knowledge, which is to lead to a better world and to a better life for the individual, leads instead to the discrimination, exclusion and stigmatization of the very individuals who have the courage to criticize the status quo and the foresight to suggest alternative solutions to enduring problems.

While SAC was purportedly instituted with the intent to safeguard Britain and Europe from terrorist attacks, it is conveniently used and abused for whatever purpose serves the people in charge of the programme. No one in their right mind can maintain that I was thrown out of Oxford and Leicester because my ideals and ideas mirror those of Islamic militants or terrorists. On the contrary, the record shows that my forum contributions stand in defense of democracy's most cherished values and Enlightenment's forgotten humanist ideals. There is no greater threat to today's brand of brutal capitalism and cruel Islamic fundamentalism than Enlightenment's forgotten humanist ideals.

The conviction with which I promoted these ideals and the forcefulness with which I attacked and criticized the current capitalist world order and its asymmetrical justice is what has infuriated the government's censors. What has also infuriated the censors is that my allegiance is to human rights for all (and not just for my fellow citizens or for the members of my social class) and not to narrow national interests, especially when they are defined as who gets the biggest share of the global economic pie and who exploits whom in this brave new world of emerging global government under American hegemony. That kind of thinking and acting belongs to the past (or at least ought to) and has no place in this day and age when humanity struggles to find unity in purpose and to solve

problems that are common to mankind as a whole and that, unless resolved, threaten human civilization itself and the very survival of the species.

CONTEST is by definition and by necessity blatant censorship and SAC is now being used and abused to achieve a broader neoconservative and imperialist agenda. Seizing the unique opportunity provided by Al Qaeda, the elites lost no time disabling the nation's institutions designated to protect human and civil rights by throwing an umbrella of surveillance and control over the entire nation and bullying and/or co-opting the people in charge of Britain's vital institutions.

The true scope of this is, pure and simple, to fabricate consent when it is necessary to do so in order to preserve what Britain's elites see as their birthrights: their wealth, privileges, power, and the right to meddle in and control the destinies of other nations. Never mind manufacturing consent, that was too laborious and unsafe and the UK is now in the business of inventing consent – for that is how removed they are from the people they govern – and SAC is just another weapon in their ever-growing arsenal of social controls.

Contemplate for a minute the paradox entailed by the notion that Britain's "shared values" and "community cohesion" should be defended from places like Qatar (which I have identified and exposed as the country that houses one of Britain's spy centers) and which is a tribal society that professes Islam as its religion and polygamy as a social custom, where the emir, Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, and his cohorts control all the wealth and have unrestricted power to do as they please, and where 1.2 million foreigners are treated no better than indentured slaves; and by people like Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser Al Missned¹⁶, the emir's favorite (and second) wife and a woman that sports multimillion dollar yachts, whose clan members, the Missneds, control the security services, whose life is shrouded in secrecy, and whose fabulous wealth gives her privileges Westerners can only dream of.

¹⁶ I wrote to the Sheikha's Qatar Foundation to request an explanation why their employee, Carla Liuzzo, is spying on and censoring students at Leicester University. No one answered.



Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani and his Consort, Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser Al Missned, visiting the UK on HM The Queen's invitation, October 26-28.

Of course, that is not how the people who control Britain see Qatar. Qatar, as far as they are concerned, is the same as Britain: a monarchy where the elites control all the power and wealth and with whom it is easy to strike shady and illegal deals of convenience because they both have to defend societies based on gross inequality.

Qatar, in their assessment, is the ideal place from whence to censor and control British and foreign subjects. It is the world's largest exporter of gas, which means that vast sums of money can be funneled into spy activities while masked as legitimate energy transactions. It is the home of Al Jazeera, which can report and criticize anything and anyone in the West as long as they do not touch Qatar's ruling elite.

With the Western media co-opted to cover up the existence of the spy program, Al Jazeera would have been the most likely media channel to expose it.¹⁷ That channel is now shut because any whiff of SAC would lead to the emir and his favorite wife. The emir, of course, is a graduate of the Sandhurst Military Academy, an elite British military school, and getting his collaboration in the spy program would have been very easy and would have involved one of his former colleagues at Sandhurst.

¹⁷ If this strategy was followed across the board, it is a sure bet that a similar spy center exists in Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates, where Al Arabiya is located, the other Arabic-language television channel of importance.

Carla Liuzzo, an Australian citizen, and the government spy I identified at Leicester, works for the Qatar Foundation, based in Doha, Qatar.¹⁸ The Qatar Foundation is the brainchild of Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser Al Missned, the emir's third wife. Sheikha Mohzah's Qatar Foundation was purportedly set up to bring world-class education to Qatar and has spent billions of dollars to attract some of the best American universities to Qatar.

As you can imagine, if they have an agreement with the British intelligence agencies to spy on foreign and domestic students studying in British universities, the same is being done to the Qatari and foreign students enrolled in the American universities now in Qatar. Obviously, this is happening with American approval and perhaps even as a result of America's initiative. Qatar, after all, is home to a huge American base that is the forward headquarters of America's Central Command, which feeds the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan with supplies and equipment. Furthermore, the Americans are the emir's closest allies, while the British are Qatar's second most important ally. One also has to ask, what other universities in what other countries are already being censored from Qatar?

In order to protect our rights and freedoms the government of Britain decided that it is both wise and necessary to deprive us all indiscriminately of our rights and freedoms.

When SAC is exposed, as I have done, the need to cover up its existence trumps any single individual's rights and freedoms. So it is that in order to cover up SAC's willfull violations of my right to free speech, thought and conscience, the people in charge of the spy programme have deemed it necessary to also deprive me of the right to a fair trial, perverting the adjudicating process of universities, silencing the Information Commissioner's Office¹⁹, sending the Equality and Human Rights Commission into hiding²⁰, corrupting the Office of the Independent Adjudicator through secret directives, instructing the police constabularies of Oxford and Leicester to refuse me the right to protest peacefully and to even issue veiled threats if I enter the country, perverting even the office of the Governor General, the Queen's representative in Canada, who refused to allow me to protest on the Canadian soil where the official residence is located.

¹⁸ The spies I have exposed at Oxford are Ivor Middleton (a British citizen of South African origin and Director of Complete Security Concepts, a British security firm) and Gloria Portella (a Brazilian citizen and lawyer operating from Brasilia, Brazil, and daughter of Supreme Court Judge Antonio de Padua Ribeiro).

¹⁹ My appeal to the ICO to this day has yielded nothing but a computer generated case number, even though I sent them my file nine months ago.

²⁰ The EHRC has refused to investigate my case and transferred its responsibilities to the OIA even though the OIA has no proper jurisdiction over human rights issues.

By instructing the Romanian authorities to refuse me the renewal of my Romanian passport they have also interfered with my right to free movement.²¹ They have also infringed my right to free association when depriving me of access to the media, which has been silenced not just in Britain but also in Canada and throughout the western world through intelligence sharing agreements between allied nations that trump their citizens' human rights.

Although I have contacted just about every important newspaper in Western Europe, Australia, Canada and the US, I have yet to hear from any. Were it not for Mr. Paunescu, who is truly a lion among sheep, I would have been screaming in the wind because the so-called free press of the so-called free world has long ceased to exist.

Nearly three decades ago, Mr. Paunescu saved my father's life from the communists by intervening on my father's behalf when he languished in jail as a political prisoner. Today, Mr. Paunescu saved my dignity by giving me the opportunity to inform the public when the capitalist press denied me access. This is all the more egregious given my family's history, for when my parents fled Romania in the 1980s, my father could finally speak freely and publically in the UK on BBC.

Today, I have to leave Canada and the UK to be able to speak freely and publically in Romania. Nothing illustrates better the decay of British (and Canadian) democracy than this tidbit of personal history.

In the name of security, a regime of global oppression is being forged. This regime has no respect for human rights and civil liberties and has perverted the national and international institutions entrusted with safeguarding our rights and freedoms to such an extent that the constitutions of individual nation states are mere words on paper.

It has also annihilated the protections previously afforded by citizenship, so much so that the social contracts implied by nationality are rendered null and void.

This is occurring because the ideology of greed (Anglo-Saxon free market capitalism) is in a life and death struggle with the ideology of hatred (Wahhabi Muslim fundamentalism), and because the West realizes that Islam is the only remaining force large enough to threaten the new global order and to refuse to adopt the tenets of capitalism. Those of us who subscribe neither to the MacWorld nor to the Jihad ideology are being victimized twice over. The Islamic fundamentalists have robbed us of our sense of safety while capitalism's censors have robbed us of our fundamental rights. Arguably, the latter have done the greater damage to our society. In any case, those who rob us of our rights in the name of security are no better than those who rob us of our security in the name of religion. Both live among us under false pretenses and both seek the destruction of our noblest values. That is why we must name and shame both terrorists and censors and pursue them with equal determination.

Since I subscribe neither to the 'profit over people model' of the capitalist West nor to the 'God over humanity model' of fundamentalist Islam, I reserve the right to criticize both as I see fit. I refuse to regurgitate the propaganda and half-truths of either party or have my opinions and convictions

²¹ In May 2010, I tried to renew my Romanian passport at the Romanian Embassy in Ottawa, where I was told it is not possible and that I am probably no longer a citizen since my passport expired eight years ago.

controlled by secret service agents or by mullahs. Freedom of speech, thought and conscience are not either or propositions, as the Government of Britain would have it, and they are certainly not the domain of God, as the Islamists would have it. They can only survive and thrive in an environment that is free of intrusion and control.

Given the contradictions and paradoxes I have outline above, what is the more logical conclusion: that SAC was initiated to catch a few Muslim fundamentalists or that it was meant to manufacture consent in line with the interests of Britain's privileged class? What terrorist goes to university or posts in forum discussions to announce that tomorrow he will blow up Big Ben, or to persuade his fellow students to blow up Big Ben? The very notion that terrorism can be prevented and vulnerable individuals protected by censoring the academic discourse is ludicrous.

This shatters the possibility that SAC was created to prevent violent extremism. SAC was meant from the very beginning to render alternative political views, dissenting voices, minority interests, and the common man voiceless by denying them the ability to exchange ideas and organize in order to sway public opinion, obtain political representation, and shape the society they live in. By controlling public opinion and censoring the academic discourse Britain's masters have found a covert way to dictate the outcome of democratic deliberations and thus to ensure that only policies sanctioned by the powers to be have justification and are heard. SAC allows the Brits to police thought for the benefit of its elites while pretending that Britain is a free society.

What the existence of SAC and its proliferation on the EU level also demonstrates is that the security-military-industrial establishment has become too large, too powerful and too internationally interconnected post 9/11 to be able to be contained by national and even international civilian authorities. Without civilian control and in the absence of a functioning civil society, the continuing militarization and securitization of society is inevitable, and the consequences of this trend, unless reversed, will be dire.

What is to be done?

If SAC is allowed to spread beyond Britain, the only way to stay true to one's convictions, beliefs, ideas and ideals will be to worship in secret, to reserve one's thoughts to a trusted circle of family and friends, and to withdraw one's participation from civil society and the political process, which will be irreversibly perverted. This is exactly the predicament of Britain's Muslims and increasingly of its immigrants and of its disaffected native population.

The sole defining feature of our democracies will be hypocrisy and our children will be second-class citizens in perpetuity and fully at the mercy of a global fraternity of powerful and wealthy individuals who are bound by self-interest and autocratic power rather than the common good and democratic participation. For if we tolerate this we will only replace the 'you do as you're told or else rot in prison' world of dictatorship communism with the 'you do as you're told or else starve to death' world of totalitarian capitalism.

If we allow this, Europe will descend into a second phase of fascism. While in the 30s Jews were the main target of fascists and Nazis, and socialists, communists, pacifists, homosexuals and gypsies were secondary targets, in the brave new world of the 21st century, Muslims have become the primary targets and immigrants, communists, civil libertarians and the Roma, once again, the secondary targets.

This time around the fulcrum of hatred and prejudice is not Germany but England and today's Gestapo is Britain's OSCT, its Office of Security and Counter Terrorism. National Socialism was the ideology of the persecutors then, and their objective a 1000 year 3rd Reich. Free market capitalism is the ideology of the persecutors now and an unchallenged new global world order their goal.

Those who don't share the ideology and stand in the way of the goal, then as now, will be mowed down. The Nazis herded their victims into concentration camps and exterminated them. The British electronically encircle and isolate their victims and through discrimination and intimidation render them socially and politically irrelevant.

As always in crimes perpetrated at this level and scale, a few people carry most of the responsibility. It is however an indictment on the entire nation because such crimes require broad participation. I will now identify those who have been revealed by my investigation to bear most of the responsibility.²²

²² Air Vice-Marshal Andrew Vallance, the man in charge of muzzling the British media, has advised me on September 2 against revealing the names of the spies. I quote: "*Turning to whether you should 'name' alleged secret agents embedded in British Universities, my unequivocal advice is not to do so.*" I go against his advice because the damage to human rights and civil liberties that their continuing activity as spies and censors engender is greater than the threat they face from potential enemies.

The Political Conspirators



Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani
Emir of Qatar



Gordon Brown – former PM
of Britain (2007-2010)

The Overseers



Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser Al Missned²³
Consort and 2nd wife of the Emir of Qatar &
Chairperson of The Qatar Foundation



Alex Allan – spy chief
Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee
& Head of Intelligence Assessment

²³ In 2007, the same year Sheikha Mozah agreed to cooperate with the British Government on running a spy center from her foundation, she was rewarded with a Chatham House Prize for improving international relations. Chatham House said she was awarded the prize because of her commitment to progressive education and her strong advocacy of closer relations between Islamic countries and the West.

The Facilitators



Paul Head
Chair of Principals
Champions Group



Dr. John Hood
former Vice-Chancellor of
Oxford University (2004-2009)



Dr. Andrew Hamilton²⁴
current Vice-Chancellor of
Oxford University



Dr. Elizabeth Murphy²⁵
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
Leicester University

The Bullies



Phillip Whiteley
Superintendent Operations
Leicestershire Constabulary



Brendan O'Dowda
Chief Superintendent
Oxfordshire Police



Kathy Williams
Academic Registrar
University of Leicester

²⁴ When Dr. Hamilton took over the Vice-Chancellorship from Dr. Hood, and inherited SAC from his predecessor, who is primarily responsible for involving Oxford in the spy and censorship program, I wrote to him on the 16th of February 2010 and asked: *“Since you are an American citizen who is not bound by British secrecy laws I urge you to tell the world about the sorry state of Britain’s democracy and the intrusive, illegal and covert encroachment of the academic environment by Britain’s government. I remind you also of the solemn duty you have to uphold the sanctity of the academic environment.”* I concluded my letter to him by saying: *“I hope that unlike your predecessor you will do what is right.”* He did not reply, publicly apologize to students, condemn SAC or offer compensation. If SAC continues, and there is no reason to believe otherwise, then Dr. Hood is aiding and abating foreign nations to spy on fellow American citizens, which is treason. The only visible sign of corrective action is that he took Dr. Giovanni de Grandis, the tutor in charge of the Political Philosophy course where I uncovered the existence of SAC, off his teaching duties and has relegated him to an office position where he has no contact with students.

²⁵ Professor Murphy, unlike her colleagues at Oxford who knew enough to remain silent, went on record to lie about Carla Liuzzo’s true identity. To date, the only corrective action Leicester University appears to have taken is the early retirement of Kathy Williams, the Registrar who would have been instrumental in fudging the records in order to make the spies/censors in their courses appear to be common students.

The Clean-sweepers at the UK level



Robert Behrens
OIA Chief



Fiona Draper
OIA Adjudication Manager



Felicity Mitchell
OIA Deputy Adjudicator

The Clean-sweepers at the EU level



Martin Schieffer
Acting Head, Counter-Terrorism Unit
Directorate-General Home Affairs



Androulla Vassiliou
EU Commissioner for Education

The spies/censors



Ivor Middleton, Oxford spy



Gloria Portella, Oxford spy-in-training



Carla Liuzzo, Leicester spy

Ivor Middleton (British citizen, born 1960), Director of Complete Security Concepts (CSC), a British security firm. CSC is a subsidiary of ESC, which manages events for the royal family and other prestigious clients. Ivor Middleton has worked within the security industry both nationally and internationally for over 20 years, 5 of which he spent working for a prominent Middle Eastern family. Yet the profile he posted at Oxford reads: *"I am 44. I live some 15 miles south of Oxford, near the Thames. I was born in South Africa, but have lived in the UK for some 30 years. I work as a finance director for larger small businesses."*

Gloria Maria Portella (Brazilian citizen) is a lawyer and daughter of retired Superior Court Judge, Antonio de Padua Ribeiro, a highly decorated high ranking officer in the armed forces. She lives in Brasília, the capital of Brazil. When I uncovered her at Oxford she was acting as a spy/censor-in-training under the tutelage of Ivor Middleton. Her full name is Glória Maria Lopes Guimarães de Pádua RIBEIRO Portella.

Carla Liuzzo (Australian citizen) is a frequent contributor to the Lowy Interpreter, the publication of the Lowy Institute for International Policy, where she describes herself as a freelance consultant, and is married to Dan Nolan (shown in the picture), who is a correspondent for Al Jazeera in English. They live in Doha, Qatar. She was formerly senior consultant for Parker & Partners, an Australian public affairs consultancy. In the profile she posted at Leicester University she declared to be employed by the Qatar Foundation on food security issues. When I uncovered her spying on and censoring students at Leicester University her phone number at the Qatar Foundation was +1-974-686-6379, which confirms her employment there.

If you want your rights to be inalienable then this is the time to stand up and be counted. The threat to our rights and freedoms has never been greater. For the first time in history, the forces of authoritarianism have joined hands across the globe and are working in tandem to keep us weak and powerless by usurping our rights, to make us ignorant and purposeless by depriving us of the truth, and to render us suspicious of each other and isolated by denying us the trust of our fellow man. Nationality in this environment is but the prison that contains us and passports no more than documents of slavery. To deny them dominion over us, we must join hands across the globe and make the people's power the vehicle of freedom.

This is the time to say:

Over my dead body will the international conspiracy against freedom emanating from Britain dash the hopes and dreams, ideals and innocence, sincerity and morality of our sons and daughters!

Over my dead body will the democratic processes that secure our rights and freedoms be replaced by state propaganda and government decrees enforced by a global elite made up of sell-outs, profiteers, propagandists and ideologues bent on instituting an autocratic rather than a democratic world order.

Over my dead body will humanity be split into insiders and outsiders, empowered and disempowered, full citizens and second class citizens, overseers and overseen.

This is not the kind of world I want my children to grow up in and I will not bend until the free world is free once again and until the rights and freedoms our forefathers have bled and died for are fully restored for our children to enjoy.

To restore the western world to democratic principles and processes and to the rule of law will take a revolution. And it is a revolution of conscience and passive resistance that I am attempting to ignite.

The time has come to stand up and say no more. Whatever the odds of success, whatever the consequences we cannot allow the desecration of mankind's most hallowed rights. For it is those rights that make us human and our society humane, and it is those protections that give us dignity and make life in free societies dignified.

I, for one, have returned my Romanian passport to the President of Romania, Traian Băsescu, and my Canadian passport to the Prime Minister of Canada, Stephen Harper, and will remain stateless until such time as the rights and freedoms of our constitutions are respected and defended by our governments and politicians.

To shame and punish those who rob us of our rights, I will be pursuing legal action against them and against the governments of Britain and Qatar at the European Court of Human Rights and at the United Nations. Hopefully, these institutions are still untainted and not yet beholden to autocratic interests and forces.

If these international institutions of last resort prove to be as corrupted as those in Britain, or as indifferent and/or co-opted as those in our own countries, then I will dedicate my efforts to create a People's Protection Force, an authority of the people, by the people and for the people, which will stand up for individuals whose human rights and civil liberties have been trampled on by their governments across borders and irrespective of the victim's nationality, race, religion, gender or sexual orientation. For a man who is not allowed to think aloud and act freely is but a slave, and slavery has no place in the 21st century.

I shall keep you posted.

**KEVIN GALALAE vs. THE
UNITED KINGDOM**

Application no. 13386/11

1 March 2011

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS COURT EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Application

under Article 34 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Rules 45 and 47 of the Rules of Court

IMPORTANT:

This application is a formal legal document and may affect your rights and obligations.

SUMMARY

The Government of the United Kingdom, in collaboration with select university departments and the Qatar Foundation, operates a covert and illegal program of *surveillance and censorship* of the academic environment (henceforth referred to as **SAC**) that is secretly enabled by the Prevent strand of CONTEST: *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*, whose stated first objective is *"to challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices"*.

In the name of defending Britain's *"shared values"* and *"community cohesion"*, which are CONTEST's primary goals under the Prevent strand, SAC's operatives, who are imbedded in university courses to masquerade as legitimate students, have engineered my expulsion from Oxford and Leicester, which I attended in 2009 online from my home in Canada, because they deemed my political opinions to be unsuitable to CONTEST's secret directives.

My mistreatment constitutes a breach of freedom of thought and conscience (Article 9), freedom of expression (Article 10), and of the right to education (Article 2 of the First Protocol), and was made possible by the British Government's decision to allow discrimination on political grounds to occur covertly in its universities, which is a breach of Article 14.

The appeals and counter-appeals I made during the adjudication process at Oxford and Leicester universities, at the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Information Commissioner's Office, and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator have been hampered by the British Government's interference with the course of justice, thus denying me the right to a fair trial (Article 6) and to an effective remedy (Article 13).

To intimidate and prevent me from pursuing justice outside the UK and from exposing the illegal and unethical actions of Britain's universities and secret service agencies to the public, the British Government has cyber attacked my home on three different occasions, destroying the entire contents of my computers, has intercepted my postal mail, has interfered with my electronic communication and blocked my emails, has shut down one of my email accounts, has infected my computer's hard drive with phishing software, has prevented me from peacefully protesting on public land, has colluded with the Government of Romania to deny me the renewal of my Romanian passport, and has shut down my attempts to reach out to legal organizations, the media, NGOs and immigrant organizations in Britain and beyond.

These actions constitute violations of the obligation to respect human rights (Article 1), of the prohibition of abuse of rights (Article 17), of the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8), of freedom of assembly and association (Article 11), and of the right to freedom of movement (Article 2 of the Fourth Protocol) with dire consequences for my reputation, health, and wellbeing, causing the destruction of my marriage and the alienation of friends and even family members.

These violations are all the more egregious and reflective of the misguided nature of CONTEST and its progeny SAC, since I am neither Muslim nor Arab, and, in fact, not only have no fundamentalist views of any kind, but am agnostic by conviction, apolitical, non-ideological, and have never resorted to violence. This means that my treatment cannot be justified by national security prerogatives, especially since I gave the Government of the UK several opportunities to address my grievances away from the public light.

I hereby request an expedited assessment of my pleading's merit, on account of the danger my family and I are subjected to due to possible further retaliatory measures by the British secret service, the Qatari intelligence agency, which is implicated in my expulsion from Leicester University, and the many vested interests and forces at the EU level and beyond that wish to safeguard the secrecy and existence of SAC.

The European Court's assessment team will, I hope, consider that the British Government has not only violated nearly every human and fundamental right I have both as a Canadian and Romanian citizen, it has also defanged the institutions of civil society, corroded the legal system, and silenced the media in order to prevent me from exposing its illegal and covert program of surveillance and censorship of the academic environment.

Since the country of my birth, Romania, and my current country, Canada, as indeed the entire Western world, are acting as a block and assisting Britain in covering up the existence of SAC, I find myself in the unenviable position of having nowhere to turn to for help and justice.

The European Court of Human Rights is my last resort, which is why I cannot and will not leave Strasbourg without a court date

II. Statement of the Facts

(See § 19 (b) of the Notes)

14.

II.1. The Government of the United Kingdom, in collaboration with select university departments, operates a covert and extrajudicial program of *surveillance and censorship* of the academic environment (henceforth referred to as **SAC**) that is secretly enabled by the Prevent strand of CONTEST: *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*, whose stated first objective is “to challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices”.

II.2. SAC works by circumventing, ignoring or blatantly violating both national and international laws. Government agents operating from within and outside the country – should the course be offered virtually - are assigned to specific universities where they enroll in programs and courses as regular students, paying tuition fees out of pocket. This allows universities to play innocent should anyone cry foul and to avoid legal repercussions for violating privacy rules, data protection laws, expressional rights, freedom of conscience, education law and the trust of their students. Once embedded, the spies masquerade as legitimate students while secretly collaborating with the course tutors.

II.3. In the name of defending Britain’s “*shared values*” and “*community cohesion*”, which are CONTEST’s primary objectives, the embedded SAC agents gather information on students, test their allegiance to the system, assist the course tutors in deflecting and diverting the discussions away from subjects the government deems taboo when the opinions expressed by students run counter to Britain’s foreign or domestic policies, manipulate and coerce students into toeing the politically correct line, manufacture consent and, should that fail, provoke students to commit netiquette breaches or simply create an environment so harassing as to cause targeted students to quit their studies of their own accord. The overall effect is to brainwash the young and the impressionable to hold biased views in line with the British Government’s foreign and domestic policies and to squash dissenting opinions that challenge the status quo before they reach a larger audience. Whether deliberate or accidental, the Government of the UK imposes positions that are contrary to reason, factually incorrect, and antithetical to the values, background and experience of foreign and even domestic students, positions that fly in the face of academic freedom, violate free speech and cause the retreat of reason, endemic dishonesty, and the corruption of public debate; enchainning intellectual discourse and political analysis to preconceived notions derived from a toxic mix of political correctness, manufactured consent and hidden agendas. As a result, entrenched discrimination towards foreigners who do not share British values, and/or natives who do not accept received wisdom and collective denial, and who do not show unquestioned respect for British institutions and policies, or who dare diverge from accepted beliefs, is the order of the day in British universities that collaborate with the government in SAC and allow government agents to define the terms and parameters of intellectual debate.

II.4. On the 3rd of June 2009, six weeks into a ten-week online Political Philosophy course offered by Oxford's Continuing Education Department, which I attended from my home in Canada, 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. Subsequent evidence has revealed that I was subjected to a premeditated attack by the course tutor, Dr. Giovanni De Grandis, the embedded SAC agent, Ivor Middleton, and agent-in-training, Gloria Portella, who had decided that my views are unwelcome at Oxford and then took the liberty to devise a legally palatable way to run me out of the course. They achieved this by posting an inflammatory and leading question in the common room inviting equivocation and then insinuating that my long posts had prevented others from participating in the course. When I took issue with this notion and defended myself against their accusations and attempt to scapegoat me for invented offenses, I was rebuked for breaching netiquette and was not only immediately shut out of the course but also, a fact at the time unknown to me, barred from ever attending Oxford University.

II.5. The subsequent appeals I made to Oxford's various internal adjudicating bodies – namely, in the following order, to the Director of Public Programmes, the Director of the Continuing Education Department, the Proctors Office, and finally to an interdepartmental Disciplinary Panel convened by the Senior Proctor, a process that lasted nearly seven months, from 26 June 2009 to 18 January 2010, and that properly ended only when the OIA compelled Oxford to issue a Completion of Procedures Letter, which occurred 31 March 2010 – revealed systemic obstruction of justice, bad faith, withholding of evidence, delayed release of evidence, selective release of evidence, misrepresentation of facts, false depositions, and repeated and flagrant violations of the university's rules and regulations so as to hide Oxford's complicity in SAC and conceal the fact that my expulsion from the course was a direct result of the government's covert surveillance and censorship of Oxford's academic environment. The Disciplinary Panel, Oxford's final adjudication authority in my case, convened its meeting and held its deliberations in my absence and despite my objections that I had not been allowed to present my defense, which was promised to me by the Senior Proctor, and found that I should not have been excluded from the course and that my expulsion was "*disproportionately severe*", but failed to compensate me beyond the already reimbursed tuition fees or give me the opportunity to finish the course. I thus decided to take my case to England's highest adjudication authority, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), whose remit is to consider complaints that have first been taken through the procedures of a Higher Education institution's own internal system without reaching a satisfactory conclusion in the view of the complainant. **Oxford time frame: 3 June 2009 – 31 March 2010 (nearly ten months)**

II.6. Although Oxford tried to prevent me from taking my case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) by repeatedly refusing to issue a Completion of Procedures Letter and then by questioning the OIA's jurisdiction, I nonetheless succeeded in referring my case to the OIA on 4 February 2010 and the OIA accepted my appeal and assigned case handler Siobhan Hohls to my complaint file (OIA/08877/10) in April 2010. On 1 November 2010, after unusual and conspicuous delays on both the OIA's and Oxford's part, Oxford finally provided its representations to the OIA in respect to my complaint. On 12 December 2010, I presented my rebuttal to the OIA. The OIA issued its Draft Decision on 21 December 2010, despite the fact that Oxford compromised the OIA's decision-making process by failing to provide the minutes of the Disciplinary Panel's meeting, choosing to keep them secret while pretending that they do not exist. I issued a response to the OIA's

Draft Decision on 22 December 2010, voicing my deep dissatisfaction. The OIA issued its Formal Decision on 20 January 2011, which found my complaint against Oxford to be “*partly justified*” due to minor regulatory breaches on Oxford’s part, but exonerated Oxford of any serious wrongdoing, deliberately overlooked and made no mention of SAC and of Oxford’s complicity in SAC, went out of its way not to connect SAC with my expulsion, and failed to offer proper compensation, or to take Oxford to task for withholding the minutes of the Disciplinary Panel meeting. **OIA time frame for complaint against Oxford: 4 February 2010 – 20 January 2011 (eleven and a half months)**

II.7. The Political Philosophy course I attended at Oxford was to be a warm-up to a two-year Master’s 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. On 18 November 2009, eight weeks into the first ten-week module of the Masters in International Relations and Global Order programme at Leicester University, I was forced to withdraw. Mr. Nick Wright, the course tutor, deliberately marked down my assignments as soon as it became obvious that my socio-political analyses and my political philosophy clashed with the dictates of CONTEST. From an A student I became an F student. It is unclear to what extent SAC’s embedded agent, Carla Liuzzo – who operates from Doha, Qatar, and works for the Qatar Foundation, which is a front for the Qatari secret service – was involved in Leicester’s decision to force me to quit the program by unfairly evaluating my assignments.

II.8. My attempts to seek a fair evaluation of my work and a persecution-free environment for my contributions to the discussion forums went unheeded. As at Oxford, Leicester’s academics and administrators have lied on record, have acted in bad faith, and have denied me recourse to the university’s highest adjudication body in order to hide the university’s complicity in SAC. Several adjudicators (i.e. the Director of Distance Learning, the Head of the Department of Politics and International Relations, and the Pro-Vice Chancellor, in this order) refused to admit any bias in the way my assignments and work were evaluated by the course tutor and his colleagues, despite their flagrant lack of objectivity and fairness. This was the university’s way to show me the door without openly expelling me from the course, which would have exposed the university to easily provable accusations of censorship and breaches of education law. It is thus Leicester and SAC put an end to my decade-long dream of studying International Relations and to five years of financial preparations and career adjustments in order to be able to enroll in the Master’s program.

II.9. At first, I thought that Leicester University’s Department of Politics and International Relations is narrow and ideological and does not tolerate dissenting views. In time, however, I came to understand that the prerogatives of CONTEST – *The United Kingdom’s Strategy for Countering International Terrorism* – trump academic freedom and are used to purge Leicester University’s academic environment of ideas and ideals that are deemed to threaten Britain’s “*shared values*” and “*community cohesion*”. In this politicized and censored environment informed debate is not possible and given my family’s background – my parents left communist Romania in the 1980s and abandoned their careers and lives in order that their children may live in freedom in the West – I had no choice but to act according to my conscience and quit the program. **Leicester time frame: 18 November 2009 – 28 April 2010 (over five months).**

II.10. Although Leicester University tried to prevent me from taking my case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) by repeatedly refusing to issue a Completion of Procedures Letter, which the University was compelled to do by the OIA on 28 April 2010, I nonetheless succeeded in referring my case to the OIA on 12 April 2010 and the OIA accepted my appeal and assigned case handler Fiona Draper to my complaint file on 9 July 2010. On 26 July 2010, the OIA issued a Preliminary Decision on my complaint against Leicester University. I presented my response to the OIA's Preliminary Decision on 15 August 2010. I took issue with the OIA for failing to answer whether it "*is under a government directive not to investigate complaints about the existence of a covert surveillance and censorship program of the academic environment*", which would have demonstrated its impartiality and independence. I also took issue with the OIA's ill-construed notion that my withdrawal from the course was voluntary; when it clearly rested on conditions imposed on me by the university, conditions that created an atmosphere which made it impossible for me to continue either the course or the program, an atmosphere that bordered on harassment and that can only be construed as the result of an escalating and concerted effort to make my participation in the course so unpleasant, and my work so blatantly misevaluated as to force me to quit. The OIA nevertheless issued its Formal Decision on 14 September 2010 and found my complaint against Leicester to be "*not justified*". Its decision is based on material errors, complete disdain for the facts, negligent refusal to consider the existence of SAC at Leicester and its effect on my expulsion, and suspicious willingness to overlook any and all regulatory and procedural breaches and violations committed by Leicester before and after my expulsion, all of which I have documented in my response to its Preliminary Decision. **OIA time frame for complaint against Leicester: 12 April 2010 – 14 September 2010 (just over six months).**

Against the background of my expulsion from and appeals to Oxford University, Leicester University and, subsequently, the OIA, the following events occurred:

II.11. Once I became aware of the existence of SAC and of the risks that the British and Qatari intelligence agencies, who had been empowered by their governments to act outside the law, posed to me and my family, I sought the protection of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. At the end of February 2010, 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 illicit spy program on its universities, and that though this possibility is remote he should be aware of who may be behind potential reprisals. 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.

II.12. My efforts to get the British, Canadian or Western media to publish my evidence on SAC, which is an ongoing process that began in March 2010, failed. Had I succeeded in getting public exposure, it would have provided a level of security for me and my family since the public's knowledge would have deterred the British and Qatari security agencies from attempting to harm me. D-Notices in Britain and self-enforced censorship in Western media, fuelled by widespread racist sentiments and/or fear of Muslim fundamentalists appear to be the reasons why no one in the West is willing to publish the truth about SAC. In April 2010, however, I did succeed in publishing my "Open Letter" in the Romanian magazine "Flacara lui Adrian Paunescu", partly due to personal family connections to the editor and owner of the magazine.

II.13. My appeals and petitions for help to various human rights and legal organizations and to Canadian politicians, which I launched in April 2010 and are ongoing, have also fallen on deaf ears. The marginalization I experienced as a result of seeking justice and exposing SAC, only raised the level of anxiety and disappointment for me and my wife and marks the beginning of serious problems in our marriage. It has also spelled the end of my relationship with my older brother, who is a German citizen, and several friends, both in Canada and abroad, who appear to be afraid of the forces behind SAC and would rather distance themselves from me than suffer dire repercussions.

II.14. In May 2010, this marginalization and discrimination reached a peak when the Romanian embassy in Ottawa, most likely at the request of the British Government, refused to renew my Romanian passport (I have dual citizenship, Romanian and Canadian) and told me in no uncertain terms that I may not even be a Romanian citizen anymore, but failed to explain why.

II.15. Alarmed at the level of repression I was experiencing and at the reluctance of civil society throughout the western world to condemn SAC and the multiple violations of my human rights, I decided to go on hunger strike. I first asked Oxford and Leicester universities to grant me permission to hunger strike on their campuses, but they both refused. I then requested permission to hunger strike on public land from the Oxford and Leicester police constabularies and they not only refused to grant it, but also issued veiled threats that my protest would infringe unnamed laws and that British immigration will want to have a word with me if I enter the UK. Unable to protest in the UK, I then sought permission to protest on the grounds of the residence of Canada's Governor General, the Queen's representative in Canada, but she too refused to grant it. Finally, I was given permission to hunger strike on Canada's Parliament in Ottawa. To my dismay, the leaders of Canada's political parties ignored my pleas for help, as did the Canadian media, throughout the duration of my hunger strike, which, due to health problems my wife experienced at the time (she was nine months pregnant), I had to cut short after only four days (June 1-4). My second son was born five days later, on 9 June 2010, and I was not able to resume the hunger strike.

II.16. Over the course of the last twelve months, I have suffered three cyber-attacks that have disabled my computers, damaged their contents, disrupted my work and caused me great material losses. Two of these attacks have succeeded in completely erasing my computer files. Had I not saved them on external hard drives most of the evidence I had collected on SAC would have been destroyed. While I cannot prove it, these cyber-attacks could have only come from Britain's security agencies with the aim of intimidating me and destroying the evidence.

II.17. Over the course of the past twelve months, my electronic communication has been routinely intercepted and tampered with. I have been prevented from contacting a variety of media, immigrant, legal, and Muslim organizations, so much so that in order to ascertain whether or not my emails reach their destination I have had to end them with the request that the recipient acknowledged receipt and with an explanation as to why this is necessary. The British secret service has for all intents and purposes electronically imprisoned me, ensuring that even email accounts I opened from the public library are shut down within a day or two. It has even disrupted my electronic (and perhaps even telephone) communication with family and friends.

II.18. I have evidence that my postal mail has been intercepted and delayed on one occasion, a file from the OIA, which represents a clear and unnecessary violation of the right to privacy and was meant solely to ensure that Oxford does not release any evidence on SAC and that justice is delayed and denied.

II.19. Having exhausted national authorities and national and international NGOs, I appealed for justice to the European Community and the United Nations. My letter to the European Commissioner for Education, Androulla Vassiliou, was answered by none other than Mr. Martin Schieffer, the Acting Head of Unit F1 (Fight against Terrorism), of the Directorate-General for Home Affairs, who confidently informed me that the violations of fundamental rights I allege have no link to European Union law and that the EC has therefore no power to intervene and that I should seek redress at the national level through the competent authorities, including the courts. I fared even worse with Dr. Martin Scheinin, the UN's Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism, who never even bothered to reply to my repeated entreaties, let alone do anything about it.

II.20. My subsequent enquiries and investigation have revealed that the EC has adopted Britain's SAC through the Stockholm Programme and that it has begun implementing it Europe-wide in 2010. I have exposed this in my article "*The Great Secret: Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU*", which I wrote in April 2010 and succeeded in publishing on the Internet a few months later, first on Cryptome and then on Wikispooks, and which in the meantime has found its way as far afield as China, but still no mention of SAC in the mainstream media.

II.21. On 8 February 2011, I collapsed, lost consciousness for several minutes and had a seizure due to pneumonia aggravated by stress and exhaustion from 18 months of conflict with Britain and chronic sleep deprivation. I was taken to the hospital by ambulance and kept there for observation. I am still recovering as I write this pleading two weeks later.

II.22. The stress the British Government has subjected me to has most recently caused the destruction of my family. Unable to bear the stress, anxiety, surveillance and repression the Government of the UK has unleashed on us, and the innumerable hours and nights I have had to dedicate to the struggle for justice for the past 20 months, my wife has chosen to separate from me on 21 February 2011. I am writing this pleading from a hotel room.

III. Statement of alleged violation(s) of the Convention and/or Protocols and of relevant arguments

(See § 19 (c) of the Notes)

15.

III.1. The Government of the UK has violated Article 1 of the European Convention, the obligation to respect human rights for “*everyone within their jurisdiction*”, in causing and/or facilitating breaches of my right to freedom of expression; right to education; right to a fair trial; right to an effective remedy; right to respect for private and family life; freedom of thought, conscience and religion; prohibition of discrimination; and prohibition of abuse of rights.

III.2. The Government of the UK has violated Article 10 of the European Convention, freedom of expression, which states clearly that “*this right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers*”. Covertly embedding government operatives in university programs to masquerade as regular students while in fact performing surveillance and censorship functions on behalf of foreign and domestic secret service agencies and in line with CONTEST’s directives to purge the academic environment of ideas and ideals that are deemed to threaten Britain’s “*shared values*” and “*community cohesion*”, constitutes a clear and gross violation of Article 10. The graduated attempt by Oxford and Leicester universities to coerce me to hold views that are antithetical to reason and to my own experience and values, and that are politically motivated and covertly enforced, followed by my expulsion from Leicester and Oxford on manufactured grounds, are the direct results of the UK Government’s illegal and unethical SAC program. As a foreign citizen, participating in online studies in British universities from my own country, Canada, I can neither be expected to know nor to adhere to Britain’s “*shared values*” and “*community cohesion*”, especially since these requirements are imposed in secret, without disclosure, and without my knowledge. It is therefore not only absurd but also patently unfair to be expected to adhere to something that I have no knowledge of and without being explicitly told in advance that I must do so in order to study in a British university.

III.3. The Government of the UK has violated Article 9 of the European Convention, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, which states that “*Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance.*” The SAC operatives’ attempt to coerce and intimidate me to hold views that are contrary to my conscience and thoughts, and my expulsion when I refused to submit to manipulation and coercion, constitute a clear violation of my freedom of thought and conscience, especially since this occurred in an educational environment where the pursuit of truth and freedom of thought and conscience are sacrosanct and must be actively defended and promoted.

III.4. The Government of the UK has violated Article 14 of the European Convention, prohibition of discrimination, which states that “*the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground*” including “*political or other opinion, national or social origin, birth or*

other status” all of which have played a role in the decision of Britain’s SAC agents to discriminate against me by curtailing my freedom of speech and denying me the right to education.

III.5. The Government of the UK has violated Article 6 of the European Convention, right to a fair trial, which upholds that “*everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law*”. The adjudication of my case at the university and OIA levels has not been fair and has not been carried out within a reasonable time because the Government of the UK has hamstrung the independence and impartiality of both the university authorities and the OIA, by elevating the need to keep SAC secret and the prerogatives of CONTEST above human rights under the pretext of national security, and even though I have never presented a threat to Britain’s national security but merely exercised my conscience and free speech in an academic environment where my thoughts, ideas and analyses were requested by the course tutors and elicited in written assignments and discussion forums. Furthermore, the Government of the UK has imposed a see no evil, hear no evil attitude on civil society and the legal system, so much so that any and all attempts I made to bring my case to a court of law has been blocked. Lawyers and law societies in Britain and Canada have not only refused to take my case, they have not even had the decency, or have been prevented, to acknowledge my emails. Even appeals for legal representation that I made on the Internet through websites like JustAnswer.com have been shut down by the Government of the UK in order to prevent me from challenging SAC and my mistreatment in a court of law.

III.6. The Government of the UK has violated Article 8 of the European Convention, the right to respect for private and family life, which states that “*there shall be no interference by a public authority*”. The cyber-attacks I have suffered, the phishing software the Government of the UK has installed in my computers, the interception of my electronic communication, telephone conversations and postal mail, represent clear and egregious violations of Article 8, which states that “*everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence*”, and that cannot be excused by the pretext that I ever posed a threat to Britain’s national security.

III.7. The Government of the UK has violated Article 11 of the European Convention, freedom of assembly and association, which safeguards the right to peaceful protest. In order to prevent me from protesting my mistreatment by Oxford and Leicester and the violation of my rights by SAC’s operatives, both Oxford and Leicester refused to grant me the right to protest on their campuses. The Government of the UK has prevented the police constabularies of Oxford and Leicester from granting me the right to protest on public land. Last, Canada’s Governor General has denied me the right to protest on the official property, which is located on Canadian soil.

III.8. The Government of the UK has violated Article 13 of the European Convention, the right to an effective remedy, which states that “*everyone whose rights and freedoms as set forth in this Convention are violated shall have an effective remedy before a national authority notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity*”. The fact that the OIA has refused to answer whether or not is under a government directive not to investigate allegations of surveillance and censorship of the academic environment, and that it has proceeded to issue a decision in bad faith and in conflict of interest in order to assist the Government to cover up the existence of SAC, shows that the Government of the UK has prejudiced the nation’s highest adjudication authority for complaints against universities.

III.9. The Government of the UK has violated Article 17 of the European Convention, prohibition of abuse of rights, which denies States the right to “*engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth [in the Convention] or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for in the Convention*”. Having at no point in time posed a threat to the security or morals of the UK, the violations I have suffered represent an abusive and unjustifiable overreaching by the Government of the UK well beyond the limitations and to a greater extent than provided for in the Convention. Given that the Government of the UK has violated a number of my human rights for the sole purpose of covertly and illegally enforcing objectives that are unethical, in an environment where freedom of speech, thought and conscience must be actively defended and promoted, and that it then violated my right to a fair trial, effective remedy, and respect for private and family life, for the purpose of covering up the existence of SAC and preventing me from exposing SAC, the Government of the UK has not just failed to abstain from the prohibition of abuse of rights, it has consciously chosen to do so in order to cover up and perpetuate the existence of the SAC program that it well knows to be illegal.

III.10. The Government of the UK has violated Article 2 of the First Protocol (the Paris Protocol) to the European Convention, the right to education, which clearly states that “*no person shall be denied the right to education*”. In trying to impose the objectives of CONTEST upon HEIs, and in the process instituting a covert regime of surveillance and censorship of academia, the Government of the UK has allowed itself to violate my right to education and has devised a hidden mechanism to expel students whose philosophical convictions it deems to be in violation of Britain’s “*shared values*” and “*community cohesion*”.

III.11. Though not a signatory to the Fourth Protocol, The Government of the UK has violated Article 2 of the Fourth Protocol (the Strasbourg Protocol) to the European Convention, the right to freedom of movement. There is evidence to suggest that the Government of the UK has requested from the Government of Romania to deny me the renewal of my Romanian passport and even to suggest that I am no longer a Romanian citizen. This represents a clear violation of my right to freedom of movement. Under no circumstances can my actions be shown to have necessitated the violation of my right to free movement for the “*interests of national security, the maintenance of public order, for the prevention of crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others*”.

III.12. Though not a signatory to the Twelfth Protocol, The Government of the UK has violated Article 1 of the Twelfth Protocol (the Rome Protocol) to the European Convention, the general prohibition of discrimination, which states that “*the enjoyment of any right set forth by law shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, color, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status*”. The discrimination I have suffered and the multiple violations of my rights can be shown to have been motivated and enabled primarily though not exclusively by the British Government’s CONTEST strategy decision to elevate “*shared values*” and “*community cohesion*” above the right not to be discriminated against for one’s “*political or other opinion*.”

IV. Statement relative to article 35 § 1 of the Convention

(See § 19 (d) of the Notes. If necessary, give the details mentioned below under points 16 to 18 on a separate sheet for each separate complaint)

16. Final decision (date, court or authority and nature of decision)

On 13 September 2010, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) issued its Formal Decision on my complaint against Leicester University (OIA/09223/10), which it found to be “*not justified*”.

On 20 January 2011, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) issued its Formal Decision on my complaint against Oxford University (OIA/08877/10), which it found to be “*partly justified*”.

17. Other decisions (list in chronological order, giving date, court or authority and nature of decision for each of them)

Decisions pertaining to Oxford:

1. On 9 June 2009, Philip Healy, Director of Public Programmes, upholds the decision taken by Dr. De Grandis, Claire Kelly and Marianne Talbot to expel me from the course
2. On 23 June 2009, Professor Jonathan Michie, Director of the Continuing Education Department, does not support my appeal and upholds the expulsion.
3. On 27 July 2009, Professor Martin S. Williams, Senior Proctor, reaches the determination that the Department of Continuing Education “*has not followed appropriate procedure in considering [my] appeal*” and “*that it should now do so by convening a Disciplinary Panel*”.
4. On 7 September 2009, the Disciplinary Panel (composed of Professor C. Gosden, member of the Continuing Education Board, Dr. A. Hawkins, Deputy Director of International Programmes, and Dr. Peter Gamble, Secretary of the Continuing Education Board) found that Kevin Galalae did breach netiquette but that the decision to remove him from the course for this offence was “*disproportionately severe*”.
5. On 27 April 2010, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), refuses to assist me in taking my claim (EHRC reference: 1-6972703) against Oxford further.
6. On 12 November 2010, the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO), finds in the case of my complaint (Ref. RFA0295154) “*that it is unlikely that the University of Oxford has complied with the requirements of the DPA [Data Protection Act]... “because the University of Oxford failed to respond to your subject access request within the statutory timescale of 40 days provided by the DPA*”. It concluded, however, “*that further regulatory action is not appropriate at this time*”. To date, the ICO has failed however to address my complaint that Oxford and Leicester are engaged in a covert program of surveillance and censorship

of the academic environment run in collaboration with Britain's secret service agencies and, in the case of Leicester University, assisted by the Qatari secret service, a program that violates many aspects of the Data Protection Act and personal privacy.

7. On 21 December 2010, the OIA issued its Draft Decision on my complaint against Oxford University, which it found to be "*partly justified*".

Decisions pertaining to Leicester:

1. On 20 November 2009, Dr. Rofe, Director of Distance Learning, decided that my assignments were evaluated fairly by his colleague, Nick Wright, the tutor of the course.

2. On 4 January 2010, Professor Phythian, Head of the Department of Politics and International Relations, upheld the decisions of his colleagues in regards to the way my assignments were evaluated and refused to grant me the full refund I had requested.

3. On 1 February 2010, Professor Murphy, Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Head of the College of Social Science, rendered her verdict and found none of the seven points I raised to have merit. Nonetheless, she authorized a full refund.

4. On 17 February 2010, Leicester refused to grant me the right to have my appeal heard by the university's highest adjudicating authority, the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor's Office, and informed me that no further appeal avenue is open to me, while also threatening me with legal action if I continue to communicate my findings to my fellow students and with removal by police if I attempt to hunger strike on the university campus.

5. On 26 July 2010, the OIA issued its Preliminary Decision on my complaint against Leicester University, which it found to be "*not justified*".

18. *Is there or was there any other appeal or other remedy available to you which you have not used? If so, explain why you have not used it.*

No other appeal or remedy is available to me in Britain. Furthermore, even if there had been, I would not have tried to avail myself of it since the impartiality and independence of Britain's legal system and the nation's organizations of civil society have been prejudiced by government intrusion in a heavily politicized environment that discourages any real investigation and hinders the administration of justice if the nation's ill-construed effort to combat terrorism is in any way jeopardized or even criticized, and if covert and extrajudicial programs like SAC are in danger of being exposed.

V. Statement of the object of the application

(See § 19 (e) of the Notes)

19.

The object of this application is to prove in a court of law that the Government of the UK operates a covert surveillance and censorship program of the academic environment that is illegal and unethical and whose operatives have engineered my expulsion from Oxford and Leicester in order to prevent me from exercising the right to free speech and the right to freedom of thought and conscience as a result of legislation that allows discrimination on political grounds and that has led to the violation of my right to education. Subsequently, the Government of the UK, in order to hide SAC from being exposed, has denied me the right to a fair trial and the right to effective remedy by prejudicing the internal adjudication of universities and the independence and impartiality of the OIA. Last, the Government of the UK has allowed its intelligence agencies to intimidate me so as not to reveal the truth about SAC and to apply pressure by denying me freedom of movement, by violating my private and family life, and my right to protest. These actions show that the Government of the UK has failed to respect the prohibition of abuse of rights, the general prohibition from discrimination, and has failed in its obligation to respect human rights. I therefore seek reparation and compensation for the damage done to my academic reputation, intellectual reputation, and consequently to my professional credibility as a writer/consultant. I also seek full reparation and compensation for the hardship I suffered, hardship that has placed tremendous strain on my marriage and led to its dissolution, on my time and resources, on my ability to fulfill my duties as father and the consequent hardship to my sons, on my ability to meet the demands of my work, and on my physical health and state of mind. I also seek full compensation for the humiliation of being treated unjustly and with prejudice.

VI. Statement concerning other international proceedings

(See § 19 (f) of the Notes)

20. Have you submitted the above complaints to any other procedure of international investigation or settlement? If so, give full details.

As explained above, in paragraph II.19, having exhausted national authorities and national and international NGOs, I appealed for justice to the European Community and the United Nations. My letter to the European Commissioner for Education, Androulla Vassiliou, was answered by none other than Mr. Martin Schieffer, the Acting Head of Unit F1 (Fight against Terrorism), of the Directorate-General for Home Affairs, who confidently informed me that the violations of fundamental rights I allege have no link to European Union law and that the EC has therefore no power to intervene and that I should seek redress at the national level through the competent authorities, including the courts. I fared even worse with Dr. Martin Scheinin, the UN's Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism, who never even bothered to reply to my repeated entreaties, let alone do anything about it.

VII. List of documents (no original documents, only photocopies, do not staple, tape or bind documents)

(See § 19 (g) of the Notes. Include copies of all decisions referred to in Parts IV and VI above. If you do not have copies, you should obtain them. If you cannot obtain them, explain why not. No documents will be returned to you.)

21.
 - a. 9 June 2009, decision of Philip Healy, Director of Public Programmes.
 - b. 23 June 2009, decision of Professor Michie, Director of the Cont. Ed. Department.
 - c. 27 July 2009, decision of Professor Martin S. Williams, Senior Proctor.
 - d. 7 September 2009, decision of the Disciplinary Panel.
 - e. 27 April 2010, decision of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC).
 - f. 1 November 2010, Oxford's representations in respect to my complaint
 - g. 12 December 2010, my rebuttal to Oxford's representation
 - h. 12 November 2010, decision of the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO).
 - i. 21 December 2010, OIA's Draft Decision on my complaint against Oxford University.**
 - j. 22 December 2010, my reply to OIA's draft decision on Oxford complaint.**
 - k. 20 January 2011, OIA's Formal Decision on my complaint against Oxford.
 - l. 20 November 2009, decision of Dr. Rofe, Director of Distance Learning.**
 - m. 4 January 2010, decision of Professor Phythian, Head of the Department of Politics and International Relations
 - n. 1 February 2010, decision of Professor Murphy, Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Head of the College of Social Science.
 - o. 17 February 2010, decision by Leicester University.**
 - p. 26 July 2010, OIA's Preliminary Decision on my complaint against Leicester University.**
 - q. 15 August 2010, my response to OIA's Preliminary Decision on Leicester complaint.**
-

- r. 13 September 2010, OIA's Formal Decision on my complaint against Leicester University.
- s. 19 May 2010, letter from Martin Schieffer, European Commission – Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security.
- t. 24 April 2010, Open Letter, appeal to Canada's politicians and the press.
- u. 25 October 2010, *The Great Secret: Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU*.

VIII. Declaration and signature

(See § 19 (h) of the Notes)

I hereby declare that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information I have given in the present application form is correct.

Place
Ottawa, Canada

Date
25 February 2011

(Signature of the applicant or of the representative)

Kevin Galalae

HUNGER STRIKE PAMPHLET

10 April 2011

HUNGER STRIKE: REASONS AND OBJECTIVES

In the name of security and counter-radicalization Europe's politicians have approved a covert program of *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) of universities that is unlawful, unethical and discriminatory. As a result, our sons and daughters are being subjected to thought control, ideological manipulation and indoctrination. Our children's education and future now depend on the judgments of government censors and secret directives.

To keep it secret, Europe's institutions at all levels of government, the media and civil society have been corrupted, co-opted and intimidated to remain not only silent but also blind and deaf to the cries of individuals whose fundamental rights, civil liberties and protection under the law have been violated.

Without the knowledge and consent of its citizens, the EU has adopted the methods and means of thought control and indoctrination formerly used by communist dictatorships. What our sons and daughters should believe and how they ought to express their views is the job of parents and one's own conscience, not the State. SAC makes the right to education conditional on one's willingness to think and say only what the State approves of.

The objectives of the hunger strike are:

- 1. To achieve the dissolution of the program of *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) of universities both at the UK and EU level.**
- 2. To break the media's cover-up and activate the institutions of civil society to fulfill their duties in respect to upholding the truth, protecting human rights and equality under the law.**
- 3. To obtain justice for the mistreatment of any and all students who have suffered discrimination and the violation of their fundamental rights at the hands of British and European universities that collaborate with SAC.**

FREEDOM IN EDUCATION.ORG

Freedom in Education.org is a fledgling non-governmental organization born out of necessity and dedicated to the protection of expressional rights, freedom of conscience, academic freedom and the right to education. Educational institutions must be free of political interference and state-sponsored discrimination.

Freedom in Education.org came into being in 2010 and is located in Canada.

WHAT IS SAC?

Since 2007, the UK operates a covert program of *surveillance and censorship* (SAC) of universities that is secretly enabled by the Prevent strand of its anti-terrorism legislation, whose stated first objective is “*to challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices*”. Despite being unlawful and discriminatory SAC has been approved by the EU Members States and scheduled for replication throughout the European Union as part of the Stockholm Programme, which began implementation in 2010.

SAC avoids legal barriers by covertly embedding agents in online and onsite university programs as common students, paying tuition fees out of pocket. This allows universities to claim innocence should anyone glimpse the truth and to avoid legal consequences for violating privacy rules, data protection laws, expressional rights, freedom of conscience, education law and the trust of their students. Once embedded, the spies masquerade as legitimate students while secretly collaborating with the course tutors. The prerogatives of Europe’s counter-terrorism strategy trump academic freedom and are used to purge the academic environment of ideas and ideals that are deemed to go against Europe’s “*shared values*” and “*community cohesion*”. Political science, international relations and philosophy courses are primarily targeted by SAC.

The embedded SAC agents monitor students, test their allegiance to the system, assist the course tutors in deflecting and diverting the discussions away from subjects the government deems taboo when the opinions expressed by students run counter to the State’s foreign or domestic policies, manipulate and coerce students into toeing the politically correct line, manufacture consent and, should that fail, provoke students to commit netiquette breaches or simply create an environment so harassing as to cause targeted students to quit their studies of their own accord.

Whether deliberate or accidental, SAC imposes positions that are contrary to reason, factually incorrect, and antithetical to the values, background and experience of foreign and domestic students, positions that fly in the face of academic freedom, violate free speech and cause the retreat of reason, endemic dishonesty, and the corruption of public debate; enchaining intellectual discourse and political analysis to preconceived notions derived from a toxic mix of political correctness, manufactured consent and hidden agendas. As a result, entrenched discrimination towards foreigners who do not accept received wisdom and collective denial, and natives who do not show unquestioned respect for institutions and policies, or who dare diverge from accepted beliefs, is the order of the day in the European universities that have allowed SAC operatives on their campuses and have given up control as to who defines the terms and parameters of intellectual debate. The overall effect is to brainwash the young and the impressionable to hold biased views in line with State policy and to squash dissenting opinions that challenge the status quo before they reach a larger audience.

To keep SAC secret, the institutions of democracy and all branches of government have decayed into a state of incestuous and self-serving secrecy, coercing the media and co-opting NGOs to remain silent. The rule of law and due process have been suspended, reducing the entire officialdom to systemic dishonesty and state-sanctioned fraud and turning Europe's higher education institutions into propaganda and indoctrination machines.

Those who contest SAC's legitimacy or try to expose it, as I have done, are stripped of their human rights, civil liberties and protection under the law and turned into second class citizens in their own countries.

For detailed information on SAC see http://wikispooks.com/wiki/Kevin_Galalae or read the main article at <http://cryptome.org/0003/great-secret.pdf> . SAC is currently contested at the European Court of Human Rights. The pleading is entitled *Galalae v. The United Kingdom* (Application no. 13386/11).

WEEK ONE

DEAR MR. HAMMARBERG

19 April 2011.

Mr. Thomas Hammarberg
Council of Europe
Commissioner for Human Rights
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
FRANCE
commissioner@coe.int
press.commissioner@coe.int

Dear Mr. Hammarberg,

A week has gone by since I first have hand delivered a letter to you at the fortified gates of the Council of Europe, where I wrote that upon arriving in France on the 12th of April I began a hunger strike on behalf of *Freedom in Education.org*, explained my reasons and that I need to speak to you. Next day I came to see you but I was told you are too busy. At your secretary's advice, I have followed my initial request for an audience with an email that very afternoon and then again on the 18th of April, but to no avail. I am now 20 pounds lighter, having lost 10% of my body weight, but tenfold stronger and more determined than ever to see to it that Europe rescinds its unlawful, discriminatory, divisive and unethical program of covert ***surveillance and censorship*** of students in universities, which I shall henceforth refer to by its acronym **SAC**.

The exigencies of your office must be great indeed, but if you are too busy to see a man who puts his life on the line so that the fundamental rights of our most vulnerable members of society, our children, are respected by the powers to be, then perhaps you ought to reconsider your priorities. It is bad form and bad manners, as well as callous and cruel to ignore a man who is starving at your door. It is also a breach of common and universal etiquette, especially since I am not appealing to you to push my own case, which is grinding its way through the European Court of Human Rights, but to make sure that SAC is shut down before other young men and women are hurt by it and to ensure that those young students whose lives have been damaged are properly compensated and apologised to. The latter point is particularly important since only a public *mea maxima culpa* from the EU leadership will ensure that SAC is not reincarnated under a different disguise or continues to exist under the cover of secrecy.

The men and women who have conceived this abominable program are as of today guests in your building for a three-day conference on how else to deprive the populace of their rights and liberties while maintaining a façade of democracy and law so as to allow the Council of Europe Secretary General Thorbjørn Jagland and other officials to publicly and earnestly declare that:

"The Council of Europe has developed a unique three-pillar approach to fighting terrorism: strengthen the international legal framework, address the causes of terrorism and safeguard fundamental values. Our commitment to the rule of law and human rights is key in this approach".

Nothing could be further from the truth and I hope that you will give me the chance to show the participants the damage they have caused by allowing me to address them on the last day of the conference. What I shall tell them is that Europe does not need more counter-radicalisation measures but a psychological transformation within itself, a transformation that will allow it to embrace the world, not reject it. Continuing down the path of vindictive counter-radicalisation will lead only to the ghettoization of Europe's minorities and to yet another age of pseudo-Christians.

I speak now from bitter experience when I say that Europe's institutions have decayed to such an extent and have deviated from their true purpose – which is to serve the people – that Europeans consider themselves fortunate to be given the opportunity to beg for their constitutionally protected rights. Well, I do not beg for my rights. I am Canadian and we Canadians do not beg for our rights from those whom we pay from the public purse to serve us. We demand them and I am here to demand that our rights are respected. I should think that medieval barons were more considerate of their subjects than the public officials who make up the ranks of the EU nowadays. Adenauer would turn in his grave if he knew what had become of his noble dream.

Now that I have vented seven-days-worth of hunger strike frustration let me state a few inconvenient truths about Europe's counter-radicalization policies, their most abject progeny, SAC, and the EU institutions as a whole.

It has become clear to me from the evasive actions of the Council and the delays of the European Court that SAC is not only approved at the highest levels of the EU, but that it is also protected by the Council of Europe, the very institution entrusted with safeguarding legal standards, the rights of citizens, democratic development and the rule of law, all of which SAC tears into with impunity. Had this happened in Europe and not affected my fellow Canadians I would have let it go, but this unlawful, discriminatory, unethical and divisive program has violated my fundamental rights as a Canadian (see pp. 9-11 at https://wikispooks.com/w/images/1/19/Kevin_Galalae_vs._the_United_Kingdom%2C_European_Court_of_Human_Rights.pdf.) and has deprived me and many others of parliamentary access and legal protection in my own country. I take that personally. More than this, it has perverted and corrupted the institutions of Canadian democracy, the freedom of the press, the impartiality of the courts, the humane activities of NGOs and civil society, and the inclusive nature of Canadian society, which is a society of immigrants that prides itself on multiculturalism and tolerance (for details see https://wikispooks.com/w/images/0/06/Covert_Censorship_at_Oxford_and_Leicester_University.pdf.) It has therefore damaged my country to the core.

This means that countless other Canadians and foreign nationals across the globe who are attending EU universities online or onsite are affected and their lives destroyed and dreams irrevocably altered by Europe's political decision to knowingly institute a program that is flawed in every way and that represents gross abuses of power directed at people and countries where the EU has no jurisdiction and no right to misshape public opinion by manufacturing consent or by imposing its cultural values.

Europe has no right to judge the religions, ideologies and thoughts of non-Europeans in the conceit that this will bring about peace, engagement and security, when Europe's religious schisms, ideologies and actions have been more violent, excessive and destructive than those of any other lands and cultures. Even today, Europe's and by extension the West's socio-economic system, which is being imposed on the globe, causes more pain and suffering through institutional manipulations, economic exploitation and immoral speculation than Al Qaeda could ever hope to achieve.

On a more philosophical level, no one, not even God (if He exists) has the right to interfere with man's thinking, for that constitutes an assault upon free will. No good practice manuals, however rigorously written and enforced, could possibly avoid the pitfalls of abuse on the part of the overseers and of humiliation on the part of the overseen. That is because the agents trained to apply the rules of surveillance and censorship, as indeed the writers of the manuals themselves, are conditioned by their own cultures and backgrounds, as well as unduly influenced by their own petty prejudices, political preferences, racist tendencies and religions or lack thereof.

At the very least, European universities must explicitly state that participation in their programs is subject to government interference and that the opinions expressed are censored by secret service agents according to the objectives of Europe's counter-radicalisation strategy. It should also clearly state what those objectives are and what one is allowed and not allowed to say in Europe's universities so that foreign students who choose to participate in studies at European universities can decide for themselves if they want thought control and ideological indoctrination to be part of their educational experience. I should think that most will opt out and will not pay the triple tuition fees that foreigners are charged. They will instead take their parents' hard earned money and study where the sanctity of the academic environment, free speech, and freedom of conscience are respected and not conditional on one's ability or willingness to conform to European norms and values.

The very least Europe can and must do is be honest and considerate of the fact that if it wants to profit from foreign students then it must respect their cultures and opinions. Europe cannot have its cake and eat it too; that is to say, it cannot secretly subject foreign students to thought control and ideological manipulation meant to purge the continent of foreign norms and values that are different or clash with those of Europeans while at the same time profit from the exorbitant tuition fees it charges its foreign students.

European universities are now in the business of exporting bigotry and prejudice instead of inculcating knowledge, mutual respect and a desire for truth. In the process, SAC is giving all Europe's universities a bad name for there is no way of knowing those that do not collaborate with SAC from those that do. In Britain alone, where SAC originates and has been fully operational since 2007, 2/3 have succumbed to SAC.

The fact that Europe has tried to get away with SAC without fully disclosing its perils to its foreign and, for that matter, its domestic students attests to the bigotry, prejudice, hypocrisy and arrogance of the European establishment of power; traits that have caused two world wars, a Holocaust and countless pogroms in the last century alone. Traits that have dragged the entire world into hell and that are once again threatening to cause a global conflict.

The crimes and abuses of the 3rd Reich, we must not forget, began with the burning of books written by Jews. SAC is eliminating the ideas and ideals of non-Europeans as they are expressed and before they have a chance to make it on paper, and it is doing this on the sacrosanct soil of its universities where free speech and freedom of conscience are supposed to be actively promoted and defended. This is happening despite the fact that the European constitution is crystal clear on that free speech gives one the “*freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers*”, that freedom of conscience gives everyone the right to publicly manifest their beliefs, and that education is for all and no one should be deprived of the right to education.

Well, on this last point it turns out that Europe makes a mockery of the right to education not only for counter-radicalisation reasons but also in the name of Chemical and Biological Weapons Convention and thus has given itself secret permission to pre-screen innocent foreign students from chemistry programs. The proof comes from a 2008 US embassy cable (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/wikileaks-files/nuclear-wikileaks/8297132/CWSBWC-CLOSE-ALLIES-MEETING-JUNE-17-18-2008.html>.)

“The Close Allies (U.S., UK, France, Germany) met in London on June 17-18 to discuss issues related to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions.

...both Germany and France also expressed reservations about proposals that would increase the numbers of students from developing countries studying chemistry in Western countries, noting that their governments went to considerable lengths to limit and manage the degree to which students from countries of concern had access to such programs.”

The “*considerable lengths*” used by Germany and France to “*limit and manage*” access to chemistry university programs, while not specified, indicate that deserving young people are denied entrance to university on false grounds just because they might pose a danger in the distant future.

This is a clear and gross violation of Article 2, the right to education, enshrined in the 1st Protocol of the European Convention, both of which Germany and France are signatories of, not to mention a terrible injustice perpetrated on the young and innocent. While SAC weeds out students post-enrolment in university, by engineering various expulsion methods, the prerogatives of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Convention are used to selectively deny students access to chemistry programs in the pre-enrolment phase.

Those who still refuse to believe the reality that EU countries subject foreigners to discriminatory treatment in education, a reality I have lived through as a student at Oxford and Leicester universities, will say that SAC and other counter-radicalisation programs that comprise Europe's *prevent* strategy are merely after extremists who promote violence. Well, I am no extremist and I certainly do not subscribe to violence. Nevertheless, I was expelled from these two universities by overzealous SAC agents and I am neither Muslim nor Arab. If anything I am the antithesis of Muslim fundamentalists, being European by birth, agnostic, apolitical, non-ideological, fiercely independent, outspoken and perfectly peaceful. If I could fall victim to SAC's censors than anyone can because the programme is out of control and is animated by racist tendencies.

Knowing that SAC cannot be defended in a court of law or even in the court of public opinion, Europe's politicians have given themselves the right to act outside the law and to do this without the consent of the people. More than this, and what is most frightening, is that in order to get away with it, Europe's politicians and security service agents have played on the fears and prejudices of those in key positions to selectively shut down any and all possibilities of SAC being exposed in the media or contested in a court of law. For the first time in history, even the fifth pillar of democracy has been corrupted, the NGOs, becoming fully complicit in this grotesque conspiracy of silence.

The fact that Europe's politicians have succeeded in obtaining the collaboration and silence of the entire civil society shows just how riddled with fear and hatred Europe's populace is and demonstrates that Huntington's dire prediction of civilizational conflict is upon us, for this kind of extrajudicial and unethical collaboration dwarfs the greatest conspiracies and can only be explained in terms of cultural divides. It is a coalition of the willing; those willing to be partners in crime and to cover up their misdeeds at all costs and in the name of preserving the integrity of their cultures under the pretext of national security.

But even this mighty coalition of the willing can be brought down, especially now that I have already shattered its ranks. *Universities UK*, the definitive voice of all British higher education institutions, has followed my lead only one month after I exposed SAC and its abuses on Cryptome and published a report, entitled *Freedom of speech on campus: rights and responsibilities in UK universities* (<http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/Publications/Documents/FreedomOfSpeechOnCampusRightsAndResponsibilitiesInUKuniversities.pdf>.) in which it tells the government in no uncertain terms that their members will no longer perform surveillance and censorship functions on behalf of the nation's intelligence apparatus.

Despite my small victory, the cost to democracy and freedom remains greater than any damage terrorists could have ever done. That cost I have elucidated in my by now infamous paper *The Great Secret: Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU* (https://wikispooks.com/wiki/File:The_Great_Secret.pdf.) That Europe thought it could get away with SAC shows a complete lack of good judgment on the part of those who make executive decisions, in that they should have known better that once policies that give every Dick, Jane and Harry the right to judge the expressions of others will bring the worse human instincts to the fore and prejudice, bigotry and hypocrisy will multiply like mushrooms after the rain and lead to abuse. It also shows their reckless arrogance that they could suppress the truth forever, as though a country could be turned into a tribe and a continent into the *cosa nostra*.

It is no secret that I have made but few friends anywhere in the West while exposing the incestuous agreements and backroom deals that have made SAC possible and knowledge of its existence a well-kept secret. But that is of little importance, for what the world now needs is not more corruptible friends but unapologetic human rights defenders and freedom fighters who can still see beyond the blinding cultural divides, and that is exactly who and what I am. I will continue to poke my fingers in the eyes of power until I am dead or get the free world back to being free...and fair and just; for I am an idealist who believes it is not too late, a humanist who knows that nothing matters more, and a realist who reasons that this is the only right way.

I was taught to treat others as I want to be treated myself and to stand up for the underdog. It is an unspoken truth that the entire counter-radicalisation agenda is directed at foreigners in general and Muslims in particular and I am an unlikely defender of Islam because I am agnostic and highly suspicious of organised religion. But I am just as suspicious of governments who set themselves above the law. For what is lost in the blindness of fear and prejudice is the simple fact that a Muslim life is as much worth as a Christian life and that a Muslim's dreams are as valuable and precious as a Christian's dreams. That is why I will not allow Europe and indeed the entire Western world to squash those dreams and ruin those lives, be they Muslim, Christian or otherwise at university, where lives are supposed to be made not ruined. The victims, we have seen, come in all colours, creeds and political orientations. I will also not allow Europe to divide my country in the name of its own safety.

And if I die here in France fighting for equality under the law, mutual respect and human rights, then so be it. For I have no desire to live among a people who can justify such injustice because they are led by hatred, fear and prejudice towards those who are not like them. Sadly, the entire western world seems to now fall in this category to various degrees and to resemble thus more than ever the intolerance, sectarianism and factionalism of the Islamic world.

Since my arrival here in Strasbourg I have contacted several French newspapers, the Council of Europe press office, and just about every human rights organisation on earth. I have yet to hear from any of them, which is what I expected knowing what I know about the extent to which democracy, truth, and justice have been annihilated by Europe's counter-radicalisation strategy. The reason they are not interceding on my behalf or publishing my story and revelations is because these good Christians have decided that I am not one of their own and that in exposing them and their state-sponsored discrimination I have dealt a deadly blow to their efforts to purge Europe of foreign and especially Muslim elements, which is the hidden agenda of Europe's counter-radicalisation strategy.

Civil society will not breathe a word or help for reasons of civilizational loyalty, to put it kindly, and Muslim organisations are petrified that if they do help they will be seen as aggressive and will suffer further reprisals from an overbearing super-state on the hunt for victims and a population crazed with vigilante fervour. In the process the rule of law and equality under the law have been shattered and with them the lives and wellbeing of countless people. That is why I stand alone in this struggle and why no one will help even though most people on either side of the cultural divide want me to win. But that is fine with me for all I need is for the law to be applied without prejudice so the innocent can be protected from the cultural and religious conceits of civilizations gone mad. As it is, I want no part in either the Muslim or the Christian camp since they both behave according to their worst instincts.

Europe's good Christians and secularists alike must get it through their heads that it is not possible to live in a globalized world and isolate the continent in order to preserve its cultural purity – even if there was such a thing to preserve. These days are over and everyone must get used to this new reality and move on down the path of tolerance, acceptance and inclusiveness. Otherwise shut down your borders and become an island, but live also on your own devices and resources and stop exporting your goods and services and drawing profit from peoples and nations you are reluctant to coexist with on an equal basis.

While the reality is that Europe's people have not been considered in either the design or implementation of the counter-radicalisation strategy, it is quite clear that any measures aimed at purging the continent of foreigners meets with the approval of a great many Europeans and that if SAC were to be put to a referendum it would probably pass in those countries that feel threatened by their large Muslim and foreign minorities, which are mainly former colonial powers that by now should have learned to live with the effects of their past occupations and abuses of foreign lands.

Until such democratic test, however, the fault and the responsibility lie with those in power and it is their interests that SAC best represents. Instituting programmes of oppression like SAC reflects the attitude of people who are locked up in ivory towers and have little or no connection with the common people or a desire to coexist with them on an equal basis. This kind of elitism is alive and well at the EU institutional level and breeds disdain for the fundamental rights of citizens, creating new lines of division in society.

This kind of elitism has also given rise to secrecy in government. Secrecy is antithetical to democracy. Nothing good could ever come out of secrecy and nothing good has ever come out of it, yet secrecy has become the modus operandi of the EU institutions resulting in an embarrassing gap between their public pronouncements and the actual reality. This gap is so great that the EU as a whole is becoming a simulacrum, a counterfeit and fraudulent product, being neither democratic nor consensual, neither respectful of human rights nor kind to its people, neither transparent nor accessible, as it bulldozes its policies over an increasingly resistant population. As a result, their decisions and policies no longer command respect but instil fear.

But let me now return to the reality of my hunger strike, to the bizarre and embarrassing spectacle of being on public display. The hunger is the easy part. The difficult part is having to subject myself to the judgment of strangers and their derisive smiles, even though they have no idea that I am starving myself so that they can live in freedom and their children can still have rights in a kind and fair society that is creed-, color- and culture-blind. The even more difficult part is being ignored by those who come out of the rarefied and climate-controlled offices of European power, as though I did not exist and should not exist or as though I were the one trapped in some fiction, when they are the ones caged up in institutional bunkers, both literally and figuratively, where fictions are passed as facts.

The hardest part is having to live with the knowledge that the world is ignorant of what is going on and apathetic, yet these very ignorant and apathetic people look upon me and other protestors with whom I share the space in front of the Court or Council, as “loose cannons”.

They fail to remember that if it were not for “loose cannons” like us – that is to say, people who are willing to make great personal sacrifices in the name of justice and truth – the world would have long succumbed to the tyranny of those reasonable masses who always choose the easiest path, the path that compromises away everything their forefathers have bled and died for, a path that always ends up in corruption, decay, lies and hypocrisy. Does that sound familiar? Is SAC and the entire counter-radicalisation fiasco not the embodiment of such compromises? And if the regime of surveillance, censorship and secrecy that has been instituted in the last ten years is allowed to continue and proliferate will democracy and freedom not be lost for generations to come?

This generation of leaders thinks it can cage the beast but it cannot. Already the beast is out of control and devouring everything sacred the West purports to defend from terrorists and extremists. It is in fact so out of control that Europe and its allies will do anything to keep SAC secret and its abuses unpunished.

No sooner do I take my place in front of the Court that I am visited by two policemen in civilian clothes. Every day two different men come by and they are invariably polite and amiable so much so that I actually look forward to see whom I will meet next. Nevertheless, their visits are not courtesy calls but security precautions. None of the other protesters get this kind of attention.

The establishment of power must be truly afraid of me. But that need not be the case for my heart is not ruled by hatred or anger but by love and peace and my intention is not to wreak havoc but to spread goodwill among men.

To achieve my goal I use the power of persuasion, be it through the written word or my self-less actions. I am guided by the light of truth and the strength of courage, for I have nothing to fear and nothing to hide. The law and lady justice are on my side and I also have the moral high ground. This may not mean much in a world controlled by heartless institutions, self-serving bureaucracies and the profit motive. But it means the world to me. I have also nothing to lose. What Europe could take from me it has already taken: my wife, my children, my rights and my protection under the law. But Europe has not robbed me of my dignity, honour, courage and self-respect. And it never will.

It is my responsibility as a father to ensure that I leave behind a better world than the one I inherited and it is my responsibility as a citizen to keep our public officials honest. I intend to fulfill both of my responsibilities to the best of my abilities and whatever the cost to me.

I hope, dear Mr. Hammarberg, that you have not closed your eyes to the truth and the suffering and humiliation of students injured by the actions of those who want to hang on to and expand their illegitimate powers at all costs, and that I will not have to sacrifice myself to force your and their eyes open by reawakening your consciences.

The only other alternative would be violence and I am not a violent man. Besides, violence cannot cure Europe's ills or the cancer that has taken hold of its government; it would only aggravate them. So as you watch me decay into a walking cadaver, I will watch your heart bleed with remorse and will hope that you will be able to live with yourself for having had the power to stop it, but not used it. The longer you let me suffer for Europe's sins and conceits, the greater the damage to the EU institutions and to Europe's reputation as a society of justice, freedom, and kindness.

I hope that you will act in accordance with the values and norms expected of your position and publicly condemn SAC. If you do not have the courage to do it, then you must resign. That way, the world will know that Europe is once again in the clutches of fascism and the people will rise to make sure that they will not suffer the same dire consequences for a second time in only 70 years.

Your actions will determine if Europe's good Christians, who are so keen on preserving their values and norms from foreign influences, will let me die for their sins.

Respectfully yours,

Kevin Galalae

P.S. Please note that this letter has been posted on the Internet at the same time as you received it.

WEEK TWO

LETTER FROM THE MAN OUTSIDE

25 April 2011.

People of the world,
Commissioner Hammerberg,

Two weeks have gone by since I first knocked on Commissioner Hammarberg's door – figuratively speaking since he is hidden behind layers and layers of bulletproof glass, concrete walls and security; imprisoned, so to say, in an ivory tower. After 14 days of hunger strike I am 33 pounds (=15kg) lighter, having lost 14% of my body weight, but one hundred times more determined to see to it that I succeed in shutting down the covert program of discrimination, thought control and intimidation that Europe has secretly adopted in 2010 as part of the Stockholm Programme and that I have baptized by the acronym SAC.

There are occasional dizzy spells and weakness, a constantly dry mouth and at times blurry vision, but otherwise I am in good shape and hunger is entirely absent having shut down the need to eat and the desire for food. The minibar in my hotel room has a box of peanuts and three cans of pop. On any given day I would have devoured them all within a few hours, but even though I have only had water in the first 10 days and some juice in the last 4 days, I have not even been tempted to sneak a bite or a sip. On the contrary, the items remain on their shelves to warn me when my will, my angels, or my God (you have your pick) have abandoned me.



So if you are counting on me to give up and go home, Mr. Hammarberg, your calculation is wrong.

THE PEOPLE'S LAST LINE OF DEFENCE OR THE ESTABLISHMENT'S FIRST LINE OF DECEPTION?

The Human Rights Commissioner's continuing silence on what should be a clear-cut case of gross violations of the European Convention and international law proves beyond a reasonable doubt that SAC is vital to the success of a hidden agenda, an agenda that has nothing to do with counter-radicalization or combating terrorism and that he is either powerless or afraid to denounce it.

Logic dictates that a covert programme that has been blown open is of no use anymore if its intended purpose was to prevent young people from becoming terrorists by subjecting them to covert surveillance in universities. I therefore thank the Commissioner for confirming to the public that there is far more to SAC than what meets the eye. SAC is in fact so crucial that no amount of human suffering will compel the global nexus of power that is behind the counter-radicalization lie to give up this new tool of thought control.

Every pound of flesh I lost during the two weeks since I have started my hunger strike confirms also that Commissioner Hammerberg is not doing his duty, which is to ensure that the EU member states act in accordance with the human rights they profess to treasure and respect. I remind you, Commissioner, that your function is to be the people's last line of defense. There is still time to show that you are the people's last line of defense and not the establishment's first line of deception. I hope you will be using this time wisely.

Easter weekend has just gone by and I hope Commissioner that it was a happy time for you and your family. I certainly could not be with mine.

The UN Security Council's conference that took place here in Strasbourg last week has also come to an end on April 21. The fact that the officials in charge of the counter-radicalization strategy have not condemned SAC, even though they were in Strasbourg to assess their policies and progress, is also an indication that it is too important to give up because it is critical to the entire counter-radicalization deception, a deception that I shall fully expose in this letter.

Abandoning SAC would be an admission that the UN's safeguards put in place to protect human rights and the rule of law from abuse do not work, opening them up to unprecedented legal liabilities. The UN's refusal to admit this shows also that there is no accountability for mistakes made and crimes committed under the cover of counter-radicalization.

The high officials in charge of the programme at the UN level cannot say that they did not know, for I have personally tracked down six of them²⁶ at the Holiday Inn Hotel Strasbourg and hand-delivered envelopes to each of them containing both my hunger strike pamphlet and a copy of the first letter I sent Mr. Hammarberg. The high officials were therefore fully aware.

On the morning of the first day of the conference, Mr. Puri, who is the Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, walked by me with an entourage of four men and as I tried to give him another pamphlet he grumbled that he had already read it. His face was as crimson as his turban.²⁷ That is not because he was angry to see me, but because in the letter I enclosed in his envelope I explained that the largest ethnic group that reaches the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) with complaints unresolved at the university level is Indian, that is, his fellow nationals.²⁸ I am sure he had a few words to say to the British representatives and that they were not kind.

²⁶ The high officials in question are: Hardeep Singh Puri, Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC); Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED); Edward Flynn (CTED); Ahmed Seif El-Dawla (CTED); Zeeshan Amin, Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force; and Syed Haider Shah (CTED).

²⁷ Mr. Suri is a Sikh.

²⁸ For details see p. 61at: <http://www.oiahe.org.uk/downloads/OIA-annual-report-2009.pdf>.

In my last letter, I explained the damage SAC does to young and innocent lives and to democracies in Europe and throughout the Western world. In this letter, I will put the current counter-radicalization policy and its deformed child, SAC, in perspective and in so doing show that they are not what we are led to believe. You, Mr. Hammarberg, of course already know this since you are a party to it, but I have to be explicit for the benefit of my readers since this letter, like the last one, will be posted on the Internet as soon as you get it.

The counter-radicalization strategy is part of the greater struggle against terrorism, which is delegated from the UN by the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) since 2001. The CTC's job is to bolster the ability of UN Member States to prevent terrorist acts both within and outside their borders and is assisted in its work by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), which carries out the policy decisions of the CTC, conducts expert assessments of each Member State and facilitates technical assistance.

The CTC is guided by three Security Council resolutions: 1373 (adopted in 2001), 1624 (adopted in 2005) and 1963 (adopted in 2010). The counter-radicalization strategy was born in 2005 with resolution 1624. Not surprisingly, it was drafted by the United Kingdom²⁹ and calls upon Member States to, among other things, adopt measures necessary to countering incitement of terrorist acts motivated by extremism and intolerance, prevention of subversion of educational, cultural and religious institutions. In other words, everything one needs to institute a covert programme like SAC and to infiltrate not only universities but also places of worship and cultural institutions.

Knowing that 1624 would have a devastating effect on human rights and especially on freedom of expression, association and religion, the preamble to the resolution starts by reaffirming the Council's will to combat terrorism in accordance with the United Nations Charter and to use measures that conform to international law; a clear indication that this would not happen.

The resolution also emphasizes efforts for dialogue to broaden understanding among civilizations to prevent any indiscriminate targeting of religions and cultures; once again knowing full well that deeper divisions between civilizations and the indiscriminate targeting of religions and cultures are to be expected and unavoidable once such measures and the extraordinary powers to carry them out are loose on the world.

²⁹ The covert programme of **surveillance and censorship (SAC)** against which I am currently on hunger strike was, I remind the reader, conceived in the United Kingdom and in use there since 2007, before being approved for replication by the EU in late 2009 through the back door of the Stockholm Programme. It is very revealing to note that as Britain was setting the stage at the UN and getting legal cover for violating the expressional, privacy and conscience rights of any foreigner studying in British universities and regardless whether online, from their home countries, or onsite, it also adopted the **Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005** at home to give itself legal and political permission to commit even greater breeches of human rights and civil liberties.

To cover up the human rights violations and the cultural divisions that the drafters of resolution 1624 knew would inevitably ensue, they called upon the media, business and society to *promote tolerance*, which in the twisted jargon of diplomacy means suppress all cases and incidents of intolerance and abuse caused by the resolution and remain blind and deaf to any victims who cry for help. The United Kingdom, in other words, set the stage for unencumbered state-sponsored discrimination at home and abroad and arm twisted every Member State to cooperate both in a conspiracy of silence and in undermining their own nations' democratic processes and independence.

Despite its obvious incompatibility with human rights and civil liberties, resolution 1624 was unanimously adopted because it offered a priceless gift, a license to suppress dissent. The gift that every government took home was the ability to commit any crimes at home against anyone and then label the victims extremists and terrorists to avoid being held accountable in the courts or exposed and criticized in the local or international press. That is a mighty gift that no one in power can refuse and that oppressive governments far and wide now use to counter insurgencies and to nip in the bud any legitimate dissent. The impact to democracy and to democratic aspirations is greater than anyone can know and it will take decades to reveal and great suffering and hardship to reverse.

*

Having gotten what it wanted from the UN, the UK then set to work and repackaged its 2003 counter-terrorism strategy, putting out a revised version in 2007 and then again in 2009³⁰.

The new CONTEST strategy, the Home Secretary, Jacqui Smith, boasts in the 2009 introduction, “*is one of the most comprehensive and wide-ranging approaches to tackling terrorism anywhere in the world*”. That indeed it is, but what we are not told is that it is also thoroughly unlawful and dangerously unethical. It has four strands: Pursue, Prevent, Protect, Prepare, and it is within the *Prevent* strand that counter-radicalization is introduced as a way to stop people from becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism.

To achieve the miracle of identifying terrorists in the making, the government gave their secret service agencies broad powers to engage in covert surveillance and interception of communications. That is how universities became infiltrated by secret service agents and how SAC came to be.

*

³⁰ The document is entitled “CONTEST: *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*”

In parallel to the UK, the EU began formulating its own counter-radicalization strategy as early as September 2005 when it issued the “*Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council Concerning Terrorist Recruitment: Addressing the Factors Contributing to Violent Radicalization*”. The EU’s strategy at that time, however, relies on education, integration, economic support and law enforcement rather than covert surveillance and interception of communications. The removal of websites that promote violence is as far as the EU is willing to go in 2005.

By the end of 2005, the EU adopted the British four-pronged approach to combating terrorism, but not necessarily the same controversial and unlawful methods, leaving implementation up to the individual member states.³¹ It also put the Prevent strand first, followed by the Protect, Pursue, and Respond. That the EU chooses to describe its fourth strand with the word *Respond*, as opposed to the word *Prepare* used by the British, is merely semantics and therefore of no relevance. Of more importance is the order chosen in the EU version, which indicates that the main priority is on *protecting*, whereas the UK’s is on *pursuing* terrorists.

Despite the changed order and the implied difference in priorities, it is clear that since the end of 2005 the UK already sets the tone in Europe as far as counter-terrorism and counter-radicalization are concerned. It is also clear that the UK wants to be the darling of the US and is staying as close as possible to America’s aggressive pursuit of terrorists; a desire clearly expressed in a US cable (09LONDON2768, available at: http://wikileaksnoir.blogg.no/1292086801_viewing_cable_09londo.html.) and whose tone is embarrassingly servile.

At Britain’s request, the US and the UK begin holding weekly videoconferences to coordinate ever closer counter-radicalization policies. This is revealed in cable 09LONDON1933 (available at: <http://www.wikileaks.ch/cable/2009/08/09LONDON1933.html>).

That the EU strategy is a copy of the UK strategy (minus the cowboy attitude) is reflected in the language used by the EU document and that copies that of the UK, as for instance when it says: “*we need to ensure that voices of **mainstream** opinion prevail over those of extremism by engaging with civil society and faith groups*”. (p. 8) I have highlighted the word ‘mainstream’ because its choice is very deliberate and the result of close and exclusive consultations between the UK and the US.

This comes out in an October 2007 US cable (07LONDON4045, available at: <http://wikileaks.ch/cable/2007/10/07LONDON4045.html>.) between a British high official, EUR SENIOR ADVISOR for Muslim Engagement Farah PANDITH, AND A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE OFFICIAL, S/P Member Jared Cohen, in which the former explains:

³¹ The EU’s policy document is entitled: “The European Union Counter-Terrorism Strategy: Prevent, Protect, Pursue, Respond” (30 November 2005).

“HMG is currently working on an updated strategy, yet to be blessed by ministers, to update and improve its approach to stopping terrorists and extremists...One project currently underway is preparation of a paper on what language works best in public outreach, Lowen said; for example, the advantage of using the word “mainstream” to define common values, as opposed to “the West”, which can have negative connotations.”

Between 2005 and 2009, the UK must have used its considerable soft power to good effect, exerting influence through the dominance it has over EU institutions, and appears to have persuaded the EU Member States to adopt the same controversial and unlawful methods of counter-radicalization as Britain through the *Stockholm Programme*, which contains guidelines of common policy – including cooperation in the areas of police, military and secret services – for the EU Member States for the years 2010 through 2015.³²

THE HIDDEN ANGLO-SAXON OBJECTIVES BEHIND SAC AND COUNTER-RADICALIZATION



One must ask, how did the UK succeed in corrupting the EU’s commitment to human rights and respect for the law in the fight against terrorism when there have been no major terrorism acts since 2005 and no reasons to strengthen the existing tools of fighting terrorism? I have already mentioned the UK’s dominance of EU institutions, but in addition to this the UK has used its ability to deceive. Before I show the reader how, I should mention that continental Europeans would not have been difficult to blind. All the UK needed to do to get the Europeans to eat out of their hands was to let them glimpse and drool over at the hidden potential of counter-radicalization conducted through programmes like SAC, and the success they achieved at suppressing minority views, controlling the media, taming the courts, and manufacturing consent where there is none. Let me explain.

While the unsophisticated technocrats and politicians of the EU and its Member States were swept off their feet at the repressive potential of CR³³ British style, the UK and the US are pursuing geopolitical objectives of far greater importance and that promise rich rewards.

³² How I come to this conclusion is explained in detail in my paper, “*The Great Secret: Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU*”, available at Cryptome and WikiSpooks. pp. 11-13.

³³ I will henceforth occasionally use the abbreviation CR for counter-radicalization.

In the era of openness and of easy access to information that we live in, hidden interests can only be advanced through hidden means. A policy that is to serve its masters must have multiple facets. Counter-radicalization has three faces: a public, a confidential and a secret face, and SAC lies hidden behind the secret face. This deception is not uncommon and necessary in order to avoid public resistance and to advance the interests of those who govern, interests that are often but not always antithetical to democracy, to the wellbeing of the masses and to the greater good.

In the case of SAC and the counter-radicalization policy, the public face, which is only for public consumption, is to protect the populace from terrorists and ensure national security. The confidential face, which is shared with select parties in the corridors of power at the EU and the UN, counter-radicalization is sold as the best way to promote a culture of peace, ensure global security and stability while at the same time giving collaborating governments a tool to ignore their people's legitimate grievances and the green light to fight internal dissent and political opposition.

On the EU level, as I have stated before, this new security architecture allows individual governments and Brussels to misuse and abuse the instruments introduced for the purpose of counter-radicalization to quell legitimate social protests and to pursue social engineering goals without constitutional restrictions and despite grassroots opposition.

The third face, the secret face, is for the inner circle only, the close allies, and in the case of SAC the objective is to render alternative political views, dissenting voices, minority interests and the common man voiceless by denying them the ability to exchange ideas and organize in order to sway public opinion, obtain political representation and shape the society they live in. SAC allows the so-called free world to police thought for the benefit of its elites while continuing to pretend to be free, fair and equal societies.

Ultimately, this kind of thought control allows the global power structure to declare that there is consensus where there is none. While this is necessary to overcome those deeply ingrained social, cultural and religious relics that ill-fit the New World Order and indeed often stand in the way of necessary progress, a lot more gets dragged and drowned by this giant net that now pulls the world forward kicking and screaming towards global tyranny.

The counter-radicalization strategy, therefore, has three manifestations: a protective, a preventive, and a manipulative one. In its last manifestation, SAC' ultimate goal is to ensure that the only worldview left standing at the end of the day is the Western worldview and that along with this great sweep all other identities, including national identities, are erased off the face of the earth so that the people of the world, regardless of their traditions, can be subsumed in one and ultimate global nation, which is the end goal of the New World Order.

While the goal of a borderless world is a noble one, and I support it fully, too much gets lost in this stampede towards the New World Order, because the pace and the means by which it is pursued is wrong.

Let me now point out what has been destroyed. Most importantly, people no longer matter. What matters is the integrity of the system and the unquestioned authority of the superstructure of control. People everywhere are being bullied, manipulated, strong-armed, ignored and overridden.

The institutional power balance necessary to catch and to address injustice and breaches is also gone. The global nexus of power now has the ability to deprive citizens of their rights and liberties without having to justify its actions and without permission or repercussions. SAC is one such example.

The responsibility and freedom to follow one's conscience has been taken from every human being on earth in positions of power or importance. This completes the infrastructure of absolute control and now that it is in place all it needs is to be fully activated. If it falls in the wrong hands, mankind will then succumb to its darkest age yet and from which there will be no escape because the system of control is now global. This will render humankind prisoners to a system that has no conscience and no compassion.



³⁴ I have just received news that my older brother, who lives in Kiel, Germany, has received a visit from the police, informing him of my hunger strike. It appears that the police have then asked my brother to persuade me to give up my hunger strike in an email sent from a protected email address. This can only mean that the EU authorities are about to force me out of the country or find alternative ways to stop me from continuing my hunger strike. This being the case, I am rushing this essay through and I ask for understanding for the loss in quality and for being choppy.

The independence of people to choose for themselves the kind of society they want and to self-determine the nature of their government is also lost. The people already in power no longer act in accordance with the will of the people; they await orders from the global nexus of power.

The elites and the institutions and organizations they lead have been turned into tentacles of the New World Order and are now controlled from a single center of power, the US via the UN. Though delegated from the US the nexus of power has no nationality. It comprises the elites of the globe and has nothing to do with the American people, who have long lost control of their country's governing structures.

The rule of law has been annihilated and replaced by the decisions of the global nexus of power, made up of select individuals who are far above the law and whose worse nightmare is a world in which all men are equal under the law and in charge of their own lives. In their New World Order man's free will has but a 2m radius. We have all been turned into peons who live in illusory freedom at the mercy of their system's needs.

I contend that what has been destroyed is too precious and too vital to give up. These vital and precious features of freedom and democracy have been lost because the New World Order is being pursued from the top down, when it ought to be pursued from the bottom and the top at the same time and at a pace that allows the common man to embrace it and the emerging worldview to be a cross-cultural hybrid and not a Western imposition.

COUNTER-RADICALIZATION IS MERELY A EUPHEMISM FOR RESISTANCE TO AND RETALIATION AGAINST GLOBAL CAPITALISM

The part that SAC plays in the task of entrenching global control is to force every graduate to conform to the policies of the status quo and not to challenge the viability of the New World Order, which is nothing more than corporate capitalism imposed on all and in every corner of the world. They want to ensure that every graduate stays on message, and since the US and the UK educate the vast majority of the world's foreign students and their graduates already overwhelm the world's international organizations, the Anglo-American dominant soft power will be perpetuated and further entrenched.

SAC, therefore, is not for counter-radicalization but for counter-resistance and counter-retaliation; resistance and retaliation to the imposition of global capitalism. SAC is pure and simple class warfare. That is why it is defended at all costs and across the establishment.

SAC is merely one of many measures adopted under the cover of counter-terrorism and counter-radicalization. Other programmes are directed at other segments of the population. But given the central role education plays in accessing positions of influence in this world of acute credentialism we live in, SAC is the jewel in the crown of the counter-resistance plot.

Why is this plot necessary? To quell the increasing resistance to growing inequalities and inequities and the gap between those inside the power establishment and the people who are outside of it. The two camps have lost common ground as soon as capital was allowed to go global while people were imprisoned in nation-states.

Every facet of the counter-radicalization policy is designed to create divisions. Divide and conquer is after all the oldest method of control. The public face of counter-radicalization merely enforces the natural division that exists between the peaceful and the violent, but also greatly deepens the divisions between Christians and Muslims. The confidential face divides the people in positions of influence (newspaper editors, university chancellors, directors of NGOs, etc.) from the populace under the pretext that this is necessary to preserve the integrity and covert nature of the entire program, on which the security of the world depends. And the secret face divides everyone from everyone by creating fear and suspicion, leaving society fragmented and incapable of hanging on to the existing national institutions, institutions that can only be built on trust, respect and integrity. Nations thus weakened are more easily submerged in the global framework of the New World Order.

Why do I say this with such certainty? Because counter-radicalization cannot possibly work the way it is presumably intended. The effect of counter-radicalization is the opposite, for when the State censors a person for his or her deeply felt opinions and values and intrudes in people's lives and inner sphere with surveillance it only exacerbates the lines of division, the result being humiliation and embitterment, which only "radicalizes" a person thus persecuted. When this kind of treatment is meted on an entire group of people who share the same cultural characteristics and who are held together by group cohesion and traditions, the effect is oppression on a grand scale and the withdrawal of that group within itself.

Minorities thus treated will form ghettos to escape the regime of oppression imposed on them as best they can, or they will leave the country, which is apparently already happening in Western Europe. They will also be suspicious of anyone outside the group and will defend their honor, rights, and group cohesion by becoming antagonistic to the greater culture in which they are an island and the subject of constant suspicion.

When every opinion expressed and every action taken is weighed and measured by the prying eye of the State, life becomes unbearable. When innocent, honest and decent people are further persecuted and deprived of their fundamental rights and liberties for freely expressing their views and feelings life becomes unbearable. The entire counter-radicalization programme, judged by the objectives of its public face, is therefore flawed. That it does more harm than good has already been observed by insiders. In cable 09LONDON33 (available at: <http://wikileaks.ste.no/cable/2009/01/09LONDON33.html>), Polloffs, a US official, asks Manley, his British counterpart, "*whether doing nothing would have been better*".

The answer is self-evident, but the program continues to expand and to violate evermore fundamental rights of evermore people. That is the case, because a new industry has been created, the counter-radicalization industry, which employs hundreds of thousands of people worldwide and is the world's best funded industry supported by public money.

Three years after Polloffs has asked his astute question, the counter-radicalization industry is stronger and larger than ever before. Untold amounts of money and human resources are being poured into it and wasted on a global initiative that cannot produce its stated goals and that has caused perhaps irreparable damage to the world's democracies and to those aspiring for freedom.

THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF ABSOLUTE CONTROL IS NOW IN PLACE

In the absence of a counter-force to capitalism, now that Islam and the world's 1.5 billion Muslims has been made irrelevant and China has long been turned into a capitalist one-party state, the world is now fully at the mercy of corporate capitalism's predatory and abusive ways. The counter-radicalization industry has therefore achieved its true goal.

While I do not believe the nexus of power at the helm of the New World Order to be evil or ill-intentioned, it is clear that it is willing – and now thanks to the architecture of control imposed under the banner of fighting terrorism and radicalization also able – to achieve its objectives by heartless and unlawful means.



The global nexus of power does not seek the public's consent, it circumvents it. It does this to achieve goals that meet with broad opposition but that need to be achieved.

The New World Order they have created has many good features and many shortcomings:

1. a global orientation, though not yet a global consciousness or equal respect for the world's people
2. the freedom of capital to operate without borders, but not that of labor to seek opportunity beyond borders
3. it is without religion, but not yet ethical
4. makes nations obsolete, but is not democratic
5. it puts global resources to good use, but it does not distribute them properly or fairly
6. it uses global differences and inequalities to create efficiencies, but it does not consider the interests of labor, just those of capital
7. it concentrates wealth to better transfer it to the developing world, but it has failed to deliver even the promised trickle-down prosperity
8. it creates and enforces universal rules of engagement for trade, finance, and industry, but does not apply them equally

Because the New World Order is failing on so many fronts – and it is failing because it is divorced from democratic processes – it is destabilizing the world. But its greatest failing is that it has abandoned the weak, the poor and the foreign, which nowadays includes the majority of the world's population, and that in fact it seeks to achieve its grand geopolitical objectives in the full knowledge that it cannot and will not include them in the circle of economic security.

In all fairness, the global nexus of power is trying its best, but they are working with an intractable world. Europeans are too prejudiced to open their doors to non-Europeans and to the world; Asians are too submissive to their old systems of authority; Africans are too underdeveloped and undisciplined; Middle Eastern are too intolerant of other people and of change; and South Americans are seeking refuge from the hardships of competition in socialism.

I am not after destroying this New World Order, but after keeping it human by subjecting it to the only balance that can do this, that of the people versus the elites. The people want a place at the table. The world needs the people to have a place at the table, because the people and their cries need to be heard and answered and that is no longer the case.

What the New World Order needs in order to succeed where it has failed is to be overseen by an assembly of popularly elected individuals representing every country on earth. This assembly of globally elected representatives must have the power to overturn any and all decisions or measures taken by the global nexus of power.

The reason the New World Order is being sheltered from democratic control is because those who devised it believe it is still a fragile child, a work in progress that needs to be protected from the common man's lack of understanding who in his ignorance will never approve of it. I believe this is a misguided approach. The people need to be explained and let in on the big plan. When that is properly done, even the most dimwitted bigot will readily offer his help.

Why does it need to be protected? Because a lot more capital needs to be transferred from the rich to the poor world in order to begin to equalize wealth; because borders need to be eliminated to facilitate the free movement of labor and enable the elimination of any and all protectionist tariffs and trade barriers; because education has yet to inculcate the global consciousness needed to create a world with a common purpose; and because infrastructure is underdeveloped and conflict haunts the world.

*

I have always been an avid promoter of a world without borders, but not if it means the tyranny of the rich and powerful of this world over mankind, achieved and sustained by extinguishing men's thoughts before they leave their lips, thus by destroying freewill and the desire and ability for self-determination.

Worse yet, by shutting down the channels of peaceful redress through legal means for injuries done by the State, or States in this case, those who protect SAC, and programmes like it that already span or will soon span the globe, are paving the way for violence on an unprecedented scale, violence being the only option left to save justice and freedom.

What they are achieving through their reckless counter-radicalization policy and measures is not global peace and security but universal control and with it the power to exploit the world's people at will.

Forcing students to self-censor their thoughts in order to graduate will not produce the thinkers and the moral men the world needs to advance. It will only produce sycophants who will not deviate from the orders that come from above, regardless how abject and flawed they may be.



Many of my relatives and friends have said that I should return home to my family, but that would mean capitulating to a system of absolute control and that I cannot and will not do. Living with such disregard for the wider world and the future would show a complete lack of empathy, civic conscience and long-term foresight. For regardless how well I will raise and educate my children, they will be destroyed by the system of tyranny that is being built around us and sold as security and counter-radicalization.

I remind you, Commissioner Hammarberg, that I am on a hunger strike because I cannot accept living in a Kafkaesque world and because I would not be human if I allowed this system of control to perpetrate its injustices on our children, who do not have the strength or the ability to fight back.

I remind you that you are supposed to be the people's last line of defense, and not the establishment's first line of deception.

I remind you that the age of deception is over. WikiLeaks put a lethal bullet in it and the people will bury it.

The time to act and scrap SAC is now.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae
The Man Outside

I ask those who read this document to support my struggle by emailing Commissioner Hammarberg and asking him to condemn and shut down SAC. His email address is: **commissioner@coe.int**. Thank you for your support.

WEEK THREE

EDUCATING THE EDUCATED

2 May 2011.

People of the world,
Commissioner Hammarberg,
Representatives of the media and civil society,

Three weeks have gone by since I first started my hunger strike. The 21 days that I have gone without food have caused me far less distress than I would have thought possible. Were I a religious man I would say it is downright miraculous that I am not yet crawling on the floor with hunger pains, but hunger is truly absent. The only thing that hurts is the heartbreaking longing I feel for my children.

Although I have lost 17kg (c.37 pounds), or about 18% of my initial body weight, I continue to feel strong and healthy and walk at least 10km a day. More importantly, my mind remains clear and focused.

Cravings have surfaced. France is after all second-to-none in its haute cuisine and wonderful aromas waft through the city of Strasbourg at all times of day and night. I find myself phantasizing about crusty baguettes and moist éclairs, succulent shawarmas and smelly cheese, *coq au vin* and *foie gras*, but my determination remains undaunted.

The only complaints are my deteriorating eyesight, light headaches and vertigo, and a few episodes of stabbing pain in the heart. Judging by the slowing rate of weight loss, it is clear that my body has reached a resistance point in that it seems unwilling to let go of the remaining fat, which I estimate to be enough to sustain me for another week without my body having to eat into muscle tissue. In other words, I am here to stay for a while yet. I have extended my return flight home to Canada by three more weeks to ensure that I carry this through and reach my objectives. They are: to compel the Council of Europe to condemn and shut down SAC, to free the media and civil society from the shackles of silence, and to get compensation for the young men and women who have been hurt.

SAC, once again, is the acronym I gave a covert programme of *surveillance and censorship* of students in universities, which originated in the UK, embodies neo-imperialist ambitions, has annihilated freedom of speech and conscience and threatens liberty itself. While it has multiple objectives, its ultimate and most covert goal is to ensure that only those individuals graduate from Europe's universities who respond to the social, political and economic indoctrination necessary to protect the New Global Order, which I define as corporate capitalism imposed on the world, from being challenged intellectually and politically.

*

COMMISSIONER HAMMARBERG'S FIRST RESPONSE

After a long absence from the scene, fourteen days to be exact, Commissioner Hammarberg has replied to me. This is what he had to say and my response to him:

Subject: On behalf of Isil Gachet: message to Commissioner Hammarberg
Date: Tue, 26 Apr 2011 10:15:02 +0200
From: Sandra.FERREIRA@coe.int
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Dear Mr Galalae,

The Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr. Thomas Hammarberg, received your communication and instructed me to reply on his behalf.

The Commissioner for Human Rights is an independent body of the Council of Europe entrusted with the tasks of promoting the effective observance and full enjoyment of Human Rights in Europe. To this end, the Commissioner addresses reports, recommendations and opinions to the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe as well as to the authorities of the 47 member States of the Council of Europe.

Although taking into serious consideration all allegations of human rights violations, the Commissioner is not entitled to deal with individual complaints, as stated in his mandate. This means that our Office cannot take any specific action to address the issue you brought to our attention.

Furthermore, the Commissioner has no jurisdiction as regards the functioning or the rulings of the European Court of Human Rights whose independence he must scrupulously respect.

Wishing you a satisfactory outcome to your situation.

Yours sincerely,

Isil Gachet
Director
Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights
Council of Europe
F - 67075 Strasbourg Cedex
Internet: <http://www.coe.int/commissioner>

Dear Mr. Isil,

Thank you for writing to me on behalf of Commissioner Hammarberg.

The issue I bring to the Commissioner's attention falls squarely within his jurisdiction since he is responsible for, as you yourself have noted, "*promoting the effective observance and full enjoyment of Human Rights in Europe*". It is breaches of human rights committed by EU Member States that I am bringing to the Commissioner's attention. Furthermore, I am not appealing to the Commissioner to intercede on my behalf with the European Court of Human Rights, which I have made perfectly clear in my first letter to the Commissioner, but to ask him to denounce and shut down a covert, illegal and unethical program of surveillance and censorship that is victimizing whole segments of the population and that has undoubtedly destroyed many young lives.

I come before the Commissioner on behalf of Freedom in Education.org and not as an individual seeking help with his particular case. I am fully aware that the Commissioner has no influence with the Court and I would not dream of asking him or any other EU official to influence the Court.

Clearly, the issue I bring before the Commissioner falls squarely within his jurisdiction and there is no escaping this fact. I realize just how dangerous it is to speak publicly or otherwise about the doings of the CTC and the CTED. Nevertheless, this is what Commissioner Hammarberg has to do. He cannot sit the fence and wait for orders from the Council on Foreign Relations or the US State Department. If the EU is to save itself from embarrassment, than the EU must act independently and swiftly. The longer it waits, the greater the damage.

I will be publishing a new letter every seven days of my hunger strike and with every letter the EU will dig itself in even deeper. I take the liberty of enclosing my 14-day hunger strike message in case the Commissioner has not received it yet. He has apparently shut down his email to anyone writing to him about SAC. This is a public endeavor and there is no place for the Commissioner to hide. He must take a stance. I will be here until he does so. In fact I am extending my stay in France until I see this through.

The Commissioner ought to know that the only way I am going back to Canada is in a box or successful; and by successful I mean having fulfilled the three objectives outlined in my hunger strike handout.

Regards,

Kevin Galalae

I will continue to insist that Commissioner Hammarberg takes a stance and that he fulfills his office's primary duty, namely to be the people's last line of defense and not the establishment's first line of deception.

It is high time the Commissioner writes a report with his recommendations to the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe outlining the illegality and abuses of SAC and the counter-radicalization strategy delegated from the CTC and implemented by the CTED³⁵. It is high time that the Commissioner makes his actions and report public. It is high time that the forces of neo-imperialism spreading their poison from Britain, Qatar and other monarchies around the world and threaten the principle of equality among men, corrupt the rule of law, defile our fundamental rights and have wounded our democracies, are caged up and sent where they belong, into the netherworld.

I wish to also point out that Commissioner Hammarberg is not being honest with us when saying that he has no power to intervene. In his recent speech in Izmir, Turkey, where the effectiveness and scope of the European Court has been devastated by the forces of autocracy and imperialism, Commissioner Hammarberg said:

*"The fact that, since the entry into force of Protocol No. 14 to the European Convention on Human Rights, **I have the right to intervene as a third party on my own initiative** highlights this complementarity between the judicial organ of the Council of Europe – the Court – and my nonjudicial functions. The Interlaken Declaration, adopted one year ago, actually stressed the need of a cooperative approach, including all relevant parts of the Council of Europe, in order to assist member states in remedying structural human rights problems."*³⁶

So, Mr. Hammarberg, which is it, do you or don't you have the authority to intervene and to shut down SAC? Make up your mind, for the world is running out of time and we, the people, have run out of rights to give.

Nowhere in his speech did Commissioner Hammarberg denounce SAC and the UN's counter-radicalization fiasco as Europe's primary source of state-sponsored discrimination, illegality and mass destruction of fundamental rights.

Commissioner Hammarberg does make a few valid points and I wish to commend him for the following two:

The number and nature of applications to the European Court of Human Rights give an indication of the status of human rights on our continent today. The number of complaints has increased dramatically; about sixty thousand complaints reached the Court in 2010.

³⁵ CTC stands for Counter-Terrorism Committee and CTED stands for Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate; they are the UN bodies responsible for implementing the global war on terror.

³⁶ Commissioner Hammarberg's speech is available at:

<http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/conferenceizmir/Speeches/Speech%20CommHR.pdf>

...the main question is not why the Court has difficulties to cope, but why so many individuals feel the need to go there with their complaints.

I take the liberty of answering the Commissioner's question. So many individuals reach out to the Court because rogue governments are in charge of our destinies; governments that are being goaded on by the CTC and the CTED, who represent the forces of autocracy, to trample the law and our rights and to treat their citizens like terrorists in the making.

WHAT IS AT STAKE IS NOT ONLY FREEDOM IN EDUCATION BUT LIBERTY ITSELF

Let me now sum up what I have communicated in my first two messages, issued at the end of the first and second week of hunger strike, and what I have so far demonstrated.

1. That what is sold to the world as counter-radicalization is actually a counter-resistance ploy to quell any backlash against the spread of corporate capitalism to places where it is neither welcome or beneficial nor fits the character and needs of the people.
2. That those who want to graduate from Western universities are forced to espouse only the economic and political ideas that suit the enforcers of the New World Order, which is necessary to create false consensus so as to ensure that the interests and policies of the global nexus of power behind the New World Order meet with no opposition. In the process of imposing this narrow western worldview, all identities, national or otherwise, are raised off the face of the earth and the intelligentsia's loyalty and allegiance is locked in step with the global nexus of power and not the people.
3. That any New World Order directive has multiple facets in order to deceive the people into working against their own best interests and that counter-radicalization is one such directive; one that preys on people's prejudices and fears. The result is a worsening of the lines of division between religions and universal mistrust between the people. The only "consensus" reached is at the top, between the elites, and it is at the expense of democracy itself.
4. That the picture which emerges from the confidential, classified and secret U.S. cables is that the counter-radicalization strategy has three facades: one for public consumption, one for allied support and the cooperation of civil society, and one for deep interests.
5. That SAC and CR³⁷ are a British deception and embody imperialist aspirations to control the world from the top down by corrupting, bullying and indoctrinating the young and by perverting the institutions of civil society. That it has poisoned the rest of Europe and perhaps even the US. That monarchies are not to be trusted because they embody aristocratic

³⁷ CR stands for counter-radicalization.

conceits that are by nature anti-democratic and that will always try to usurp the principle of equality between men.³⁸

6. That CR gives governments of all colors and orientations the tools and the cover necessary to destroy their people's democratic aspirations and to kill legitimate dissent.
7. That the freedom of the press, the impartiality of NGOs, and the independence of the courts have been annihilated. And that for all intents and purposes we now live in a world of banana republics whose presidents and prime ministers are merely mayors of their nation's capitals.
8. That Commissioner Hammarberg is not our last line of defense, but the establishment's first line of deceit.
9. That SAC is the most important part of CR because it targets the most important segment of the population and that therefore no amount of human suffering will convince the neo-imperialists to give it up let alone compensate the injured parties.
10. That because the objectives of the New World Order are pursued without democratic controls, the people's knowledge and consent, and at too quick a pace the global nexus of power is by its actions destabilizing the world.
11. That nations are crumbling because they are no longer able to seek and find internal consensus and are thus easily subsumed in the New World Order. They are crumbling because their leadership has been severed from their people; a goal achieved in no small part through the UN resolutions imposed under the pretext of countering radicalization.
12. That the West does not intend to coexist either peacefully or equally with the rest of the world. Its intent is to get the world by hook or by crook to accept living by Western rules so the white man and his cronies can continue to lord over the masses.

What is at stake, therefore, is not just freedom in education, but liberty itself. Those who believe that I hunger strike for a rather insignificant matter, better think again.

What have you learned about me?

1. That I support fully a world without borders, but not one in which the poor, the weak, and the foreign are fully at the mercy of the rich and powerful, possess no true rights and liberties other than in name only, and are denied a voice in shaping the world they live in.

³⁸ We must not forget that the UK reached out to Qatar, which is also a monarchy, to institute its illegal program of spying on students, censoring them and depriving those who do not conform to state propaganda in education.

2. That though my immediate goal is to shut down SAC and strip the counter-radicalization lie of its hidden objectives, my long-term goal is to ensure that the people get a seat at the table and have the power to override any and all decisions the global elite makes.
3. That I am serious about fundamentals and that I believe that unless the world returns to fundamentals we are doomed.

DEFENDING THE INDEFENSIBLE

A SHORT AND UNCENSORED HISTORY OF CAPITALISM

The New World Order is being built on the wrong foundation, that of global corporate capitalism. This foundation is too small, too weak, too immoral and too unstable to support the mighty weight of the NWO.

The white man's civilization is on the brink of collapse. Though he has made the profit motive central to his life, everywhere he is in debt and his nations bankrupt, both fiscally and morally. How did he get to this sorry state of being?



The prosperity he purports to have created is illusory; so much so that he now lives on money borrowed from future generations, generations as of yet unborn. Never in the history of man has man been less honorable. The most his children can now hope for, if they are to reach their parents prosperity, is a job in government or the headquarters of the giant corporations that now ravage the earth.

He knows that his heydays are numbered and those close to the seat of power steal as much and as fast as they can from the common man and the public through, because they are fully aware that the game will soon be over and the music will stop. Capitalism will then be as dead as communism and with it the white man's ideologies of socio-economic control will have come to an end and the world will be able to breathe freely from under his yoke.

Although he paints this outcome as the end of the world and the end of history, do not be deceived by his lies. They are designed to scare you from letting go of his leadership and of seeing through his deception. There could be no greater gift to mankind and to planet earth than the collapse of capitalism. The end is near. In fact, all it needs to be pushed over the edge on which it has been desperately teetering for decades is a few hundred thousand people defaulting on their credit card payments. In a twist of faith the likes of which only history can provide, the rich and the powerful are now at our mercy, for if we choose to push their system of control over the edge there is nothing they can do to stop us.

The white man's system now serves only his chosen partners and cronies around the world, a minority within minorities.

How did this happen? With his earlier wealth built on the brutalization of people and on stolen raw materials from the victimized nations of his colonial empires, the white man got used to a position of advantage and to lording it over others and devised a new system of control that did not involve physically occupying other people's lands, which he could no longer do because he could no longer manipulate the commoners to commit atrocities on people far and wide. This he achieved through credit and control of the international organizations he put in place to get the world to operate by his rules.

To stall the demise of his dying system at home, the white man saw it necessary to export it worldwide. His internal markets having reached saturation points – bloated as they are with material goods that far surpass even his rapacious capacity to absorb and consume – companies began to cannibalize each other to produce the profits necessary to maintain a culture of greed. When that reached its limit, he saw that the only way to preserve the profits necessary to keep his Ponzi scheme going is by forcing other people's markets open and then flooding them with his goods and services.

This naturally displaced millions of workers, craftsmen and farmers and destroyed the internal balances and natural equilibrium of countless nations, making them dependent on foreign goods to sustain themselves and then pushing them into debt to be able to afford them. The West's export-led economies became the developing world's nail in the coffin.

The debt was duly serviced with money borrowed from the white man's institutions of international control, debt that could neither be repaid by the borrowers nor serviced with anything other than fictitious money by the lending white man, who himself is indebted over his head. While the white man continues to lend fictitious money, he continues to extract real natural resources and profit from the countries he invaded with his products and destabilized with credit.

The accumulated debt can never be repaid. The monetary system's reluctance to accept this simple reality has decoupled it from any undistorted connection with the real economy. The money markets and stock exchanges have long ceased to reflect the state of the economy. They are a fiction and the fiction can only be sustained with deceit.

We now have a system where a bankrupt white man is lending money that does not exist to a world of beggared nations in order to keep his fraudulent system of profit taking from collapse. His house of cards is now so precariously unstable that anyone who tells the truth is stripped of his rights and place in society. His Ponzi scheme, like any other fraud, can only survive if people are led astray so as to continue to believe the lies they are being fed from all directions.

To save the system from collapse, the global nexus of power the white man has assembled, needed to institute a system of total control. The opportunity was provided by the threat of Islamic fundamentalism. New World Order directives issued under the pretext of combating terrorism and countering radicalization are now vital to the artificial support needed to keep the system breathing. The safeguards, assessments and remedies we are being informed about through the corporate controlled media and official government channels are nothing but lies. The entire system is a sham.

The world is now in vassalage to the superstructure of global control. The EU Member States – formerly strong, wealthy and independent nations – are now mere banana republics, like most other nations on earth, paying tribute and awaiting orders.

Two simple facts reveal the truth that the New World Order is built on fraud: (1) banks, their capital and the capitalists behind them are being saved with taxpayers' money and their children's credit; which is as desperate a copout as any in history; and (2) individuals, states and nations are all indebted and indebted to each other – states and nations being unable to live up to the social programs citizens are entitled to, individuals being unable (because unemployed, underemployed or overtaxed) to pay the taxes necessary to keep nations afloat and in the black, and corporations being unable to provide any real profit returns to people's investments once the corporate leadership and the political elites have taken their share.

But neither our wallets nor Mother Nature lie. Our wallets are telling us we are empty and there are no jobs to be had, while Mother Nature screams from every crack that she can no longer carry our burden, that we have become a curse upon this earth and that our filth is killing every other species with whom we are supposed to share this planet.

No more than one in ten people on this earth have the kind of employment, income and job security necessary to support a family above the poverty line and in economic security. Yet we are being told that capitalism, which monopolizes the means of production and spits out more and more goods with less and less workers, will solve our employment problems. Any idiot can reckon that this calculation does not add up. For the more productive and gigantic corporations become, the more unemployed people there will be on earth. This in turn means that the more goods capitalism produces – and that it is supremely good at – the fewer people, in proportional terms, there will be who can afford to buy those goods.

The brand of corporate capitalism that is presented to us as our salvation is in fact our destruction because wealth and labor are not even distributed wisely, let alone fairly, and because the profit motive requires it to be increasingly better at producing more goods with less people; and this in a world of rapidly growing population and a global distribution market.

The only thing corporate capitalism achieves globally – the only thing it can achieve, given its asymmetrical distribution of wealth and labor and its profit motive – is to preserve the wealth of those who control the capital and the power of those who make the rules, thus the wealth of capitalists and the privileges of politicians. The exploitation of the weak, the poor and the foreign, as well as the exploitation of the earth is the price we all pay.



Capitalism is a soul-killing ideology that elevates products above life, profit above people, excess above humanity and the system above nature. It is no longer just an economic system meant to address the people's material needs; that is, to make the goods and provide the services people need to survive and to improve their lot, it is now also a political system of economic oppression. It cannot be humanity's answer to 21st century problems. It is a relic we have inherited from our forefathers and the time has come to bury it once and for all. Free enterprise yes; corporate capitalism no! The world needs a real plan and not a justification for hanging on to the old ways of raping and pillaging. Refurbishing and rebrandishing capitalism as the New World Order just ain't gonna do it.

The white man has run out of ideas. His actions show us that what came first was not the plan, but the justification for a New World Order. That is, capitalism having reached crisis point at home it needed to expand to prevent its collapse. The New World Order is the white man's justification for the globalization of corporate capitalism and its accommodation by an international framework designed for this purpose. The world needs a real plan, not an accommodation for a relic.

Considering the damage the white man's ideology of greed has done to the world, the least he can do is keep his borders open to provide refuge to the desperate and act as a pressure valve for the countries he has ruined and robbed of a future. But that is not what he is doing. He is instead erecting walls and forging ahead with his destructive plans of world domination and heartless exploitation. To defend his indefensible system, he is devising evermore complex methods of control and deception. The counter-radicalization strategy is just that.

Immigration and immigrants, the poor and the destitute, the disenfranchised and the unemployed are not a threat to the West, they are symptoms of the destruction and havoc the white man's system of economic control wreaks on the world.

Fifteen million families and counting made homeless and set out on the street in the USA alone; that is terrorism.

Tens of millions thrown into unemployment and made destitute throughout the world; that is terrorism.

Desperation, fear, insecurity, the dismantling of our fundamental rights, civil liberties and protection under the law; that is terrorism.

Unbearable debt burdens transferred onto the unborn; that is terrorism.

Systems of absolute global control that stifle men's thoughts before they leave their lips; that is terrorism.

These are the harvests of the wielders of economic control and the fear they have struck in men's hearts from Patagonia to Timbuktu and from sea to sea is tenfold greater than the unlikely chance of losing one's life in a bomb attack launched by Al Qaeda, ETA, the Tamil Tigers or other desperate groups around the world.

The proof is in the pudding, for the people and the organizations that are supposed to tell the truth and defend our rights and values have gone into hiding as soon as they were asked to denounce the world's true terrorists. Neither the press nor civil society is anywhere to be seen anymore. They have abandoned and betrayed us so that they can stay in the good books of the global oligarchy that has taken over the world. We are now on our own.

THE NEW WORLD ORDER'S DEPARTURE FROM DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY CAN NO LONGER BE HIDDEN

Mr. Hammarberg has blocked my emails and any emails coming in that bear the heading Galalae or hunger strike. In his impotence – for he is still waiting for orders – he believes that by covering his eyes, plugging his ears and taping his mouth the problem will go away.

Human Rights Organizations are missing in action as soon as they are asked to expose the violations of the counter-radicalization deception. They are however more than eager to look far and away for violations, as long as the truth at home stays well hidden.

The so-called free media and the so-called free world are a now thing of the past. The media is now fully complicit in the power establishment's culture of secrecy and misinformation. The only remaining characteristic of the western world is hypocrisy. Its soul remaining reason for being is to preserve its standard of living and system of global domination regardless who pays the price.

The media and human rights organizations remain missing in action, fulfilling their part as full partners in the conspiracy of silence, forgetting that free speech is the most fundamental right and that when it falls everything else falls. Our society is now in free fall and only we, the people, can stop it from reaching bottom. Our elites have betrayed us.

There is no hope from our governments. They are full collaborators in the creation of an industry of absolute control. Having created this industry, they will want to keep it. The industry of absolute control that now operates around the globe under the pretext of countering radicalization will only want to grow so it will seek to justify its existence by finding radicals behind every bush. Funding will depend on it. Cushy jobs will depend on it. The stability of our ever decaying political and economic structures depends on it.

I believe I have clearly demonstrated that the system of central and total control that now engulfs us has killed everything that was good in man and that a global society built on the premise that it is necessary to ignore any and all human suffering in order to save a flawed system is a disaster in the making and will lead mankind nowhere.

Capitalism was bearable only so long as man's fundamental rights were respected and man had room to breathe and vent. Those were the days when capitalism was localized in the West and was stable because it sold a limited number of goods into the undeveloped world; enough to create prosperity at home without disrupting the internal balances of other nation's markets.

The moment it began invading and gaining control of the world's virgin markets, capitalism began self-destructing. The brand of corporate capitalism that is being pushed onto the world in the shadow of the New Global Order serves only a minority within minorities and cannot bring either stability or prosperity to the world's soon to be 7 billion people.

The real danger we the people of this earth now face is not Islamic, nationalist, leftist, rightist or any other kinds of terrorism, but the corruptive influence of corporate money on the political process, which has created an incestuous relationship between capitalists and politicians. This incestuous relationship is allowing massive private gains at public loss, and the cover up of rampant speculation fueled by greed that serves only the moneyed and political elites whose self-serving decisions and misguided actions are destroying the world's cultures and landscapes, robbing us all of economic security and dignity, and rendering us all powerless, divided and terrified of what the future holds.

The New World Order, now hijacked by the forces of autocracy and imperialism, is so perverse that it requires every man and woman on this planet that we prostitute ourselves, our values and our morals; if any there are left in this world ravaged for so long by the ideology of greed.

THE LAST BASTION OF DEFENSE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC ASPIRATIONS HAS BEEN MORTALLY WOUNDED BY THE GLOBAL OLIGARCHY

If you follow the smoke you find the fire, regardless how many walls of deceit our politicians and their spokesmen erect. Having already burned our fundamental rights and civil liberties in the fire of legal relativism and the conditionality imposed on the law to purportedly defend “*national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary*”³⁹, they have now launched a full-scale attack on the independence, impartiality and effectiveness of the European Court of Human Rights.

With national courts now fully corrupted and perverted by the UN resolutions that were sold as absolutely necessary to combat radicalization worldwide, and with the press and civil society silenced, the only place left to seek justice for individuals stripped of their rights and abused by State Parties in the greater Europe was the European Court of Human Rights.



³⁹ All these conditions are grounds to curtail the right to freedom of expression as defined in the latest version of the European Convention of Human Rights.

Though the compensation amounts the Court awarded were miniscule and amounted to no more than a slap on the fingers for the offending States, it was nevertheless fair, impartial and effective in its judgments. Moreover, its judgments were binding, meaning the States found guilty had to comply with the Court's rulings. It was in other words, too great a threat to the imperialist and autocratic forces that are now in control of the New World Order.

It was also a depository of evidence of crimes and abuses perpetrated on the defenseless and the innocent by nation states emboldened by the UN's counter-radicalization lie to break the law, abuse its citizens and stifle any and all democratic aspirations. Moreover, this evidence was accessible to the wider public from the Court's database. That is something the global oligarchy could not tolerate if they are to be able to fully cover up their tracks for crimes they are about to commit now that the system of absolute and global control is in place and is about to be fully activated.

Planning for the perversion of the Court began in 2001, the same year Al Qaeda attacked the USA. The first attack came under the pretext of reforming the Court so it could guarantee its long-term efficiency, to which end the screening and processing of applicants was changed by forcing upon the Court the adoption of Protocol 14. Applications that are deemed to have less chances of succeeding, that are similar to others previously brought against the same member state, as well as those whose applicants have not suffered "significant disadvantage" are screened out and never make it to Court. The measures adopted under Protocol 14 therefore greatly reduced the number of admissible cases. Insiders report that applications are summarily thrown in the paper basket. Only one out of ten applications now makes it through the screening process.

The second salvo was fired at the European Court at the Interlaken Conference in February 2010, when the screening process for admissible cases was tightened even further, making it impossible to have one's case heard by the European Court unless all means of appeal have first been exhausted at the national level. With the national courts fully corrupted by the CR deception and the legal cost of going through three or four juridical levels being impossible to meet by any single individual, the European Court was made unreachable to 99.9% of the world's people.

The Council Europe, an organization infiltrated and fully corrupted by imperialist forces, as evidenced by the impotence and/or reluctance of the Council's Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr. Hammarberg, to do anything about SAC, has fired the lethal salvo at the Court's very foundation with the Izmir Declaration, just a few days ago. Once again the timing is no coincidence, for the imperialists are trying to prevent me and others like me from exposing the crimes committed under the banner of countering radicalization by taking our complaints to the European Court.

With the adoption of the Izmir Declaration, the European Court is being slowly strangled to death. The rope used is the principle of subsidiarity, which means that matters ought to be handled by the smallest, lowest or least centralized competent authority, the very authorities, in other words, that have been fully silenced and corrupted by the counter-radicalization deception, if they were not already thoroughly corrupted by dint of poverty and political culture.

But that is not all. The asphyxiated body of the European Court is also beaten to a pulp with an array of nasty clubs: advisory opinions instead of binding Court rulings (which allows states to follow or not to follow the Court's judgments), priority policy (which allows political pressure to influence what cases the Court should take on), effective implementation of the European Convention at the domestic level (which means that individuals are left at the mercy of national courts), full and strict application of the admissibility criteria in respect to the requirement that the applicants exhaust all domestic remedies (which means that under no circumstances will a case be accepted that has not first gone through the never-ending maze and unbearable costs of fighting all the way to the Supreme Court; and who has the money and resilience for that), and the operation of the single judge procedure when applying the new admissibility criterion (which means that pressure can be applied on individual judges to debase their impartiality).

All of these measures grossly curtail the Court's ability to defend our fundamental rights and will in time make the European Court into just another kangaroo court.

The system of absolute and global control is now fully in place. Its administration, the CTC and the CTED at the UN, has received another three year term to entrench it in the world. And the last bastion of defense for human rights, the European Court of Human rights, has just been annihilated in Turkey by the Izmir Declaration.

BEHIND SECRECY HIDES ILLEGALITY

Hardly a month goes by without a new measure of surveillance being announced in the western world, despite the fact that incidents of terrorism have all but disappeared and those that are foiled once in a blue moon are the impotent acts of lone lunatics. The Internet, once open and free, is now the greatest spy machine for governments and corporations, who have taken the liberty of prying into every aspect of our lives in the name of security and profit, the West's great obsessions. But for every new measure of surveillance made public two more are being implemented in secret because they are in brazen violation of the law and of disservice to the common good. SAC is one such example.

We are being watched because the governments of the New World Order are afraid of their citizens and paranoid about their own stability; hence surveillance measures have proliferated like mushrooms after the rain. We are being silenced because the truth would meet with universal disapproval and controlling the message is the only way to manufacture consent in a world of growing inequity and desperation; hence censorship is the defining characteristic of the corporate controlled media conglomerates and publicly-owned but state-controlled radio and television channels.

We are being lied to and excluded from decision-making because the capitalist socio-economic organization is concentrating evermore power and wealth in fewer hands while reducing the rest of mankind to a state of precarious economic insecurity and political irrelevance; hence secrecy is the order of the day in government chambers and corporate boardrooms.

National, European and transnational institutions have become fortresses of secrecy and exclusive privileges that neither welcome nor tolerate the common citizens from setting foot in these buildings let alone having a say in the way their affairs are run.

This bunker mentality shows that there is no longer a connection between the insiders, those who run the show, and the outsiders, the masses who must live by the rules set without their knowledge and consent. Bunker mentalities evolve only when the elites have become disconnected from the masses and when the decisions they make run counter to the interests and aspirations of man's best instincts and serve primarily the establishment. This knowledge keeps them living in fear of the moment when the walls they have erected between themselves and the masses break down and the mob's pent up anger gets channeled into the only outlet left possible, blind revenge and destructive rage.

How far this bunker mentality is from the birthplace of democracy, ancient Greece! In Athens debates occurred in the most public of places, the agora or marketplace, giving every citizen a seat and a voice.

SURVEILLANCE AND CENSORSHIP POWERS IN THE HANDS OF GOVERNMENTS OF SECRECY ARE A DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

Those who sanction a system of surveillance and censorship, in the false belief that it is aimed at Muslim extremists who deserve to be robbed of their rights, get what they deserve, a taste of their own medicine. For the tools of oppression and discrimination set in place to "defend" us from extremists are also used against our own best interests to safeguard and entrench the interests of those in power and the elites.

Having created a society of overseers and overseen, through covert legislations that sanction mass surveillance and censorship measures, the select few insiders who make up the economic and political elites are now unencumbered by legal constraints to abuse their new extrajudicial powers as they please. In this new environment there is no equality under the law, no due process and thus no rule of law.

This leaves the weak, the poor and the foreign, who are the main targets of state-sponsored discrimination, with only two options: (1) accept the status of second class citizens, a condition characterized by lack of free speech, free conscience, and only a limited number of study and employment opportunities or, (2) fight for equality and tolerance by all means necessary. On the latter point, legal and political remedy to any and all grievances is no longer possible since all political and civic institutions have been co-opted to deny those injured their fundamental rights, civil liberties and protection under the law by virtue of their economic condition, political orientation, religion, ethnicity or cultural values.

The double-edged sword of the politics of surveillance and censorship is cutting deep wounds not only in the hard-won brotherhood of men and their peaceful coexistence but also in the aspirations for justice, equality and freedom.

This double-edged sword is used to cut Muslims and foreigners from equal status in society, but it is also used to deny us all the right to self-determination, the rule of law and economic security. Those who control the levers of surveillance and censorship deny non-Europeans equal status lest they should demand the free expression of their thoughts and values and acceptance of their uniqueness.



But the same censors deny us our rights, lest we should demand that society reflects our views too, so it can be more humane, more inclusive, more economically stable, and more mindful of the fact that human beings are not machines and consumers, but organisms and souls, and that the wellbeing of people and not profit margins ought to be the guiding principle of our social and economic organization; lest we should remind those in power that we count too and that we have as little interest in the policing of our thoughts as in the franchising of our lives; lest we should dismember the

doctrine of capitalist greed by allowing a simple truth to be aired, namely that in a world fully monetized a job and a living wage must be fundamental rights and not hard-won privileges; lest we should charge that a system which mortgages our children's children in order to save the profits of banks and the multi-million dollar bonuses of millionaire bankers is obscene; lest we should point out that the immoral concentration of wealth enabled by the present system of income distribution is robbing us of dignity, economic security and equality under the law and is destabilizing the world; lest we should teach that in a world of increasing population coupled with decreasing need for labor in a global economy bent on continuously improving production efficiencies with only profit in mind societies can no longer cope, rendering ever more people unemployed and desperate and condemning society to an irreversible split between have and have-nots; lest we should refute a world of the Security Council and demand a world of the General Assembly; lest we should insist that earth's resources are not wasted on weapons, wars and security but spent on healing the world's wounds; lest we should envision a borderless world where every human being counts equally and security is ensured through prosperity and justice, not militarization and monopolization.

What Europe's and the West's policies of surveillance and censorship are primarily trying to achieve is not our safety from terrorist attacks and extremist influences, though the latter two are secondary by-products, but the preservation of a global system of greed and inequality that is obsolete and immoral and that can only be sustained through lies and deception and through the scapegoating of others for its abuses and failures.

What foreigners and natives are increasingly missing is opportunities to work, to be educated, to be heard by the media and the political establishment, and to be in charge of their own destinies, these being the causes of malcontent and disillusionment, of social instability and personal insecurity.

In Europe, foreigners in general and Muslims in particular face discrimination and exclusion. Increasingly, however, chronic unemployment and growing social inequalities leave an increasing number of native Europeans just as deprived of opportunity and excluded as their fellow citizens of foreign extraction.

The problems are structural and attributable to the disruptions of globalization on the economies of nation states that previously did not have to compete with the world in the manufacturing of goods and the provision of services or to open their markets to global production and distribution networks dominated by corporations that seek the cheapest labor, wherever it may be. Even more fundamentally, the problem lies in the availability of too much excess labor at a time when manufacturing and services require less human resources because of improved efficiencies through advanced mechanization and digitization.

Fewer people are needed to produce increasingly more goods for a global market, leaving more people unemployed and superfluous while the global population is still growing and the earth's capacity to supply the raw materials and energy needed for universal prosperity has long reached its limits. The solution can only be the adoption of a radically different distribution of wealth and labor from the existing capitalist system, coupled with a rapid decrease in population growth, the promotion of a global consciousness in every citizen to supplant nationalism, and universal rules of not just political and economic but also of social engagement that make the nation state irrelevant.

In the absence of these radical changes nations continue to decay, the world continues to destabilize, and the result is universal malcontent among conflicting demands that only aggravate social and economic divisions and speed up the financial non-viability of states, which is why even America, the heartland of the ideology of profit, is bankrupt and hopelessly indebted.

In this environment those who have complain that society is crumbling around them and are calling on their government to tighten security to defend what is left; and the have nots scream that society is increasingly deaf to their problems, insensitive to their suffering, and egotistical in the way labor and wealth are shared; while Europe's and America's technocrats continue to tinker with a moribund and obsolete capitalist system of various national shades in the false belief that structural adjustments can re-establish the bygone socio-economic stability of nation states within an all-encompassing global economic equilibrium. And while Europe and the US are pointing fingers at one another, they forget that they are rowing the same boat full of holes and whisper in each other's ears that they are not sinking.

Incapable of addressing this dilemma, governments, goaded by the global economic elites, resort to the easy half-measures of more security, more policing, more surveillance, more incarceration, more secrecy, more rules, more restrictions, more hidden taxes for the common citizens, more cuts in services, more censorship and more lies, while pursuing a greater concentration of wealth in ever fewer hands in the hope that capitalism can move fast enough to achieve a global distribution of productive capacity and sufficient trickle-down prosperity throughout the globe to prevent instability, conflict and a return to protectionist national economies.

And to mitigate for the fact that 'fewer people are needed to produce increasingly more goods for a global market, leaving more people unemployed and superfluous while the global population is still growing and the earth's capacity to supply the raw materials and energy needed for universal prosperity has long reached its limits' all hope is on human ingenuity to come up with the science and technology needed to make less energy and resources go further in order to cover the needs of a global population expected to peak at 9 billion by 2050. Faith in science will take us only as far as the social justice by which we live.

Spying on students, censoring their opinions and selectively excluding young people from education on account of their race, religion or political opinions in the name of counter-radicalization, the prevention of chemical and biological weapons proliferation, and the manufacturing of consent to create a false sense of purpose and cohesion for the sake of those who want to keep the world under their thumb only deepens the alienation and exclusion foreigners and natives alike fall victim to and rightfully resent.

Those who have been abandoned as the collateral damage of the New World Order are being ironically and tragically scapegoated for Europe's social and economic ills. On the other side of the social spectrum, the elites and higher upper class, stay firmly on the side of the establishment of power, inert with fear that they too will fall outside the circle of security in a world of growing insecurity in capitalism's societies of exclusion.

What is needed is an entirely different premise for the New World Order, one based on need and dignity not profit and excess. Capitalism, a system that thrives on its ability to exploit weaknesses and differences cannot possibly bring stability and environmental sustainability to the world. Private enterprise must return to its roots and stay small and local. The global distribution channels now open only to giant corporations must make way for private enterprises of any size.

What is needed is not more outreach programs. They will do nothing to reduce alienation and exclusion. People need purpose and dignity which only a job and full participation in society as equal citizens can provide. While Europe and America bicker over technicalities and try to change one another in their own image, the underprivileged waste away in the cities and our social structures decay around us.



If we allow our prejudices to inform our actions and to empower our organizations to go outside the law, then we will all fall victim to prejudice.

European prejudices exacerbated by rigid labor rules create the micro problems that lead to social decay while American globalization efforts via expansionary capitalism create the macro problems that bring us closer to global collapse. European industries have become uncompetitive because Anglo-Saxon corporate capitalism has created a race to the bottom in terms of wages, work conditions and benefits forcing everyone to move their production to the developing world or perish.

INTEGRATION HAS FAILED BECAUSE SOCIETY IS FAILING

Integration has failed not because minorities and Muslims are incompatible with or incapable of adapting to the European system, but because Europe's economies are far too rigid and Europe refuses to be an open society, excluding foreigners through prejudicial treatment. A second barrier is raised by capitalism's inability to accommodate the existing human resources in a labor market that has gone global and is now tapping into the vast and young populations of the developing world. The first cause, Europeans refuse to address; the second, Americans. Both European protectionism and American globalism are usurping the employment opportunities of any and all people who are at the bottom of the establishment's concerns and, increasingly, of the great majority of the population. They are also depriving our young, regardless of color or creed, of opportunities to become full members of society, their entrance in the labor market being delayed until they are in their thirties and half their productive life is over.

As capitalism expands and Western-controlled corporations intrude upon new markets they destabilize the existing economic balances and displace more people who are then forced to seek their luck elsewhere and immigrate to the rich West. At the same time, as western corporations shift their production to the developed world they leave chronic unemployment behind, destabilizing the balances of these nations that are then facing unbearable burdens on their social systems.

Emboldened by the pandemic of fear and racism sweeping Europe, its political leaders have gone on record to declare that multiculturalism is dead, which is the polite way of saying that foreigners are no longer welcomed in Europe and that those who are here must either convert to European ways or leave; preferably leave. Europe now is a closed society and its institutions, both at the national and European level, have been given the green light to purge the continent of any Muslims and foreigners who are not willing to keep their heads down, mouths shut and be socially invisible, thus who are not willing to accept second class status.

The same treatment is now also meted on millions of native Europeans whom the European socio-economic system can no longer accommodate and has left behind to fend for themselves.

Huntington's warning is visible in the commonly shared aversion and resistance to the foreigners among us, which has triggered a concerted effort to erect walls and to purge the continent of any and all non-European elements – a clash of civilizations that no one wants to admit to and that is enabled by secrecy.

Human rights, equality under the law, tolerance, expressional rights and academic freedom must be defended at all costs in education and in society and cannot be negotiated away for the sake of alliances of convenience and false truces reached at the lowest common denominator.

I can only imagine the damage done to young students who have been treated at 18 or 19 the way I was treated at 45 years of age. The degree of demoralization, helplessness and worthlessness they would have felt once forced to quit their studies or debase their views in order to pass a course scrutinized by SAC agents would have deep repercussions on their psyche and life-long consequences for their self-worth or their economic viability and marketability. An 18-year-old could not stand his ground in the face of criticism from his teachers, pressure from government authorities, silence from the press, indifference from civil society, implied accusations of fraternizing with the enemy from friends and family, and isolation treatment from peers.

Surveillance and censorship plus secrecy lead to lawlessness and rogue governments. Europe has arrived at the stage of lawlessness but can still pull back from rogue government. The West's current leadership has proven itself inept at preserving the democratic and human rights gains of our forefathers and has succumbed to mankind's worst instincts to preserve an unsustainable status quo, that of a morally and financially bankrupt capitalist social and economic order.

Freedom is something every generation must win for itself and ours is not. More than this, our generation is squandering the net gains fought for by all those who come before us. They act contrary to the law in the false belief that they can limit the damage. But this is a fool's dream, for government's tools are blunt instruments and the damage calculated in the confines of boardrooms and assemblies is amplified one hundred fold in the real world by the incompetence, bigotry, and small-mindedness of the foot soldiers empowered to implement discriminatory policies and who are free to act as they please in the absence of real oversight, equality under the law and due process.

A country that hides the truth is only as safe as its secrets. As soon as the first secret is blown open the whole edifice of lies crumbles like a house of cards. The corruption of the rule of law is now a universal feature across the western world. The countries that remain silent in order to protect their allies who are in outright violation of international law are accessories to crime.

Is this what my fellow Canadians have fought and died for at Dieppe and Vimy?

Those governments that are now breaking the law and trampling on their citizens' rights ought not forget that those who live outside the law will be judged outside the law.

EXTREMISM IS THE NEW HERESY

The charge of holding extreme views is the current equivalent of being accused of heresy during Europe's dark ages or the Inquisition. Yet every new idea that came to change the world was first met with repression by the powers to be who declared it heretical. The truly intelligent among us have never been understood by the common man and should never be judged by the common man.

If the State insists that there is a “mainstream” and that we all ought to live according to it, than the State itself must live by it. Alas the record shows that government policy is more often than not completely at odds with mainstream opinion.

To take the UK as an example, since they have poisoned us with their counter-radicalization lies, the UK went to war in Iraq despite overwhelming public opinion against it. The British people went out on the street to protest in the greatest numbers and public opinion polls showed that 90% of the population was adamantly opposed to the invasion of Iraq. Nevertheless, the government of Tony Blair ignored the mainstream and committed Britain to an unjust and illegal war with dire consequences. The same disregard of mainstream opinion occurred when the UK government bailed out private banks whose reckless and greedy decisions caused the collapse of the financial system. Once again the overwhelming majority of the people did not approve of the bailout and most certainly did not approve of allowing millionaire bankers to receive million dollar bonuses from taxpayers’ money.

There are hundreds such examples. In fact, our governments are the greatest offenders of mainstream opinion and often trample the will of their people.

Europe’s counter-radicalization policy, which purports to protect vulnerable individuals from being influenced by radical Muslims, bears a striking and disturbing resemblance to the Alhambra Decree of 1492, issued by the Catholic Monarchs of Spain to protect vulnerable Christians from being influenced by “*Jews trying by whatever manner to subvert our holy Catholic faith and trying to draw faithful Christians away from their beliefs*”. Jews were given a choice between converting to Christianity and leaving the realm. That of course was a cover for robbing Jews of a place in society and of their possessions.

Conversely, the first objective of Europe’s counter-radicalization policy is purportedly “*to challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices*”. That too is a cover for robbing Muslims in particular and foreigners in general of equal status in society and thus putting them at a lethal disadvantage in a cutthroat competitive world. It is understood that violent extremism is to be found among Europe’s Muslims and that the mainstream voices that need supporting are Europe’s Christian majority. What this means in effect is that Muslims must convert to Christian norms and values or else be deprived of a place in society or even expelled from the realm. The overt religious nature of this prejudicial policy is hidden behind secular language, but the message is the same, ‘be like us or leave’. It is a choice that robs Muslims of equal status in society, a choice that forces them to pretend to be like Europe’s Christians.

Coupled with declarations by various European member states that multiculturalism is dead – which is the polite way of saying that the age of tolerance towards foreigners has come to an end – and with laws that make the wearing of the veil illegal (presumably to protect French secularism), the building of mosques impossible (Switzerland), access to jobs by Muslims restricted throughout Europe by overt racism, and expressions of solidarity with oppressed Muslims elsewhere a professional death sentence, Muslims who want to stay in Europe must accept second class status or leave.

ASK YOURSELF: IS THIS THE WORLD YOU WANT TO LIVE IN?

Commissioner Hammarberg, I ask you, are you the people's last line of defense or the establishment's first line of deception?

Ladies and gentlemen of the press, NGOs and civil society, I ask you, are you free human beings or poodles on short leashes?

Students and citizens worldwide, I ask you, do you want to live in bondage or in freedom?

Before answering these questions for yourselves consider the words of wisdom of the giants on whose shoulders we ought to stand. Consider also your own consciences and not just your own interests.

*The Roots of Violence:
Wealth without work,
Pleasure without conscience,
Knowledge without character,
Commerce without morality,
Science without humanity,
Worship without sacrifice,
Politics without principles.*

(Mohandas K. Gandhi)

Historically, the most terrible things -- war, genocide, and slavery -- have resulted not from disobedience, but from obedience. (Howard Zinn)

If... the machine of government... is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. (Henry David Thoreau)

As nightfall does not come all at once, neither does oppression. In both instances, there is a twilight when everything remains seemingly unchanged. And it is in such twilight that we all must be aware of change in the air however slight, lest we become unwitting victims of the darkness. (William O. Douglas)

NOTHING STRENGTHENS AUTHORITY SO MUCH AS SILENCE. (Leonardo **Da Vinci**)

This may be the last chance we have to reestablish freedom, democracy and the rule of law, before the world falls irrevocably into darkness and tyranny. You have been warned.

I can only open your eyes and let the light shine in. It is now up to you to take control of your destinies by destroying the forces of autocracy that have reared their ugly heads.

I conclude this letter by quoting one of Strasbourg's own sons who at the tender age of eighteen gave his life in defense of freedom from fascism. I do so in the hope that Strasbourg's students today will be inspired to do their part. So far, the student union of the University of Strasbourg, the ASSOCIATION FÉDÉRATIVE GÉNÉRALE DES ETUDIANTS de STRASBOURG (A.F.G.E.S.), has behaved contrary to their republic's ideal of "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité".

Si je dois mourir, je meurs avec un cœur pur. (Marcel Weinum, 1942)

Regards,

Kevin Galalae

WEEK FOUR

LAST CHANCE

9 May 2011.

Thorbjørn Jagland

Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Thomas Hammarberg

Commissioner for Human Rights at the Council of Europe

Mats Johansson

Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly

Standing Rapporteur on Media Freedom.

Gentlemen,

Twenty-eight days have passed since I first started my hunger strike and in the absence of action on your part have taken an apartment in Strasbourg to dig in for a long battle with you. With the life I have left in me I will expose you for what you are.

I am now 20Kg lighter, 20 years wiser and 20 times stronger than when I began. I say 20 years wiser because the last four weeks I spent at the gates of EU power have been an eye-opening experience. Europe is not a pretty sight. Proximity has revealed the true nature of Europe's institutions, which I have previously idealized, but that I now know to be riddled with hideous blemishes, both in character and appearance.

This is what I have learned:

1. That Europe has no values to preserve other than greed and hypocrisy, the hallmarks of decadent societies, and that its bad habits, amplified by a self-serving leadership and an indifferent and meek people, are infecting the world.
2. That the democracy Europe's EU leaders pretend to possess and be ardent guardians and promoters of is no more.
3. That the system of European integration they promote and the New World Order they impose on the world in cooperation with its allies are dead at birth because democracy and democratic processes and institutions have been taken over by the executive branch of the EU's member states and by the EU itself.
4. That Europe's good Christians are more than willing to let me suffer for their conceits and die for their sins.
5. That Europe's politicians have sold us and our children into slavery and have shut tight all doors to justice.

6. That the vast majority of the world population – which I describe as the weak, the poor and the foreign – have been shut out of the ever-tightening circle of economic security; a circle controlled by Europe and its western allies.
 7. That Europe has once again crossed a line by taking the first step towards tyranny and that it is lying to itself and to the world to keep appearances. The discontent and suffering that are now artificially suppressed will eventually break out into full-fledge conflict and class warfare.
 8. That global oppression has been institutionalized, legitimized and legalized in Europe and by Europe by legalistic, underhanded and deceitful ways, which have sanctioned not only the moral prostitution of our society, but also the indoctrination of our children.
 9. That the EU institutions set up by the previous generation to unite Europeans into common purpose and universal respect for dignity and freedom have been destroyed from within by a spoiled generation that has no vision, no leadership and no moral compass.
 10. That the EU is no longer a viable project, having succumbed to its Member States' worst instincts and settled on the lowest common denominator in order to reach consensus and keep together a crumbling edifice. That it corrupts and allows itself to be corrupted and that British imperialist machinations have made the EU subservient to Anglo-Saxon interests.
 11. That its nations, once proud and independent, are now mere banana republics whose populations are apathetic and disconnected from the political process.
 12. That Europeans are content to hide in the shadows of their forefathers and that the technocrats and bureaucrats entrusted with moving Europe forward have no vision and, as a result, Europe is being eaten away by decay and corruption.
-

On May 3, Mr. Jagland, you made a joint statement with the President of PEN International, John Ralston Saul, my countryman, to mark World Press Freedom Day and to express concern over the growing threats to freedom of expression:

"Journalists and writers across the world are imprisoned and silenced every year for saying or writing things that did not please those in power... It has never been easier to exercise our rights to expression and information, but it has also never been easier to interfere with them.

When freedom of expression cannot be exercised fully by media professionals or by writers, the freedom of each of us, of every citizen, is endangered. Our rights to receive information and to freely form and to hold views and opinions are limited. Our right to informed participation is eroded. Ultimately, democracy is compromised.

Freedom of speech is one of the essential pillars of a genuine democracy, it requires extraordinary protection. This is enshrined in Article 19 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

We urge all governments, civil society actors, technical communities and the private sector to work together to protect freedom of expression in our common interest."

Mr. Johansson, you added your own statement for the occasion:

"World Press Freedom Day is a moment to celebrate the right to freedom of expression and information through the media as one of the most fundamental political rights for every individual and for the functioning of democratic societies.

Recent months have shown to the world the power of the free word, and the world has changed and continues to do so. In an era of media based on the Internet and mobile phones, censorship has become virtually impossible. Non-democratic governments, corrupt practices and violations of political rights cannot be kept in the darkness of oblivion any more.

At the same time, I deeply regret that alarming numbers of journalists are imprisoned or attacked physically in Europe, and that laws are passed which aim at restricting the media. It is no coincidence that the free word is targeted and threatened by many regimes. This makes it all the more important that Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights is respected, in order to ensure that democracy and political rights can benefit from media freedom. Therefore, governments and parliaments in Europe should do more today – as we celebrate World Press Freedom Day 2011." (Press release – 382/2011)

Your words, gentlemen, though worthy, sound rather hollow when one considers that I have contacted the Council's leadership and press office on multiple occasions with the request that my presence in Strasbourg and the reasons and objectives of my hunger strike – of which you are all well aware – are reported by your official channels of communication with the public. Four weeks later and the Council's press office and leadership are still actively suppressing the news of my hunger strike.

You are suppressing my words and evidence because they reveal that the institutions and offices over which you reside are fully complicit in the destruction of free speech, in the annihilation of human rights and civil liberties, and in the maintenance of a façade for a hollow democracy.

FREE SPEECH OR FREE LIES, YOU BE THE JUDGE

The Council's commitment to human rights is simply not credible if you, Commissioner Hammarberg, refuse to protect our children from political indoctrination and severe reprisals from speaking their minds on the hallowed ground of Europe's universities.

The Council's commitment to human rights is discredited if you, Secretary General Jagland, make lofty public declarations in defense of free speech and press freedom while failing to encourage the Council's press office to report on the reasons and objectives of my protest, right here at your office's door, which not only strikes at the heart of free speech and freedom of conscience but does so to defend an environment where expressional rights must be actively promoted by law.

The Council's commitment to human rights becomes but a farce if you, Mr. Johansson, who are charged with the sacred responsibility of upholding the right to free speech in the media and in society, have for the past four weeks failed to come and meet me and congratulate me for making personal sacrifices to defend free speech and other fundamental rights. "*Democracy and political rights can benefit from media freedom*" is what you said, Mr. Johansson, on the occasion of World Press Freedom Day. Democracy and political rights can also benefit from allowing my voice to be heard through the Council's media channels so that the evidence I bring forth of free speech and other human rights violations by State actors becomes widely known and can be swiftly remedied.

Had you all meant what you said about free speech and human rights, I would have been a special and honored guest in your offices and institutions and you would have tripped over each other to show me to the world as an example worth following. Alas, nothing could be further from the truth, because neither one of you has the slightest interest in promoting and defending free speech if your special interests are at stake and if your involvement in autocratic decisions is exposed to the world. That much is clear from your actions, which stand in clear contradiction to your rhetoric.

The only way to lead, gentlemen, is by example. Practice what you preach. Say what you mean and mean what you say. Start by giving the Council's press office a free hand and by encouraging its reporters to publish more than just the carefully calibrated messages emanating from the corridors of power of the three EU institutions that are located here in Strasbourg.

The world needs to know what happens in front of the Council, the Court and the Parliament, where people who are destitute and desperate scream for help only to be ignored. The people have a right to know why I have come all the way from Canada to defend rights and liberties that you are supposed to defend. The cause is just and my evidence well documented. You have no excuse for suppressing the truth.

Let my voice be heard. That would show the people you are supposed to be serving that you actually care about free speech and are not just paying lip service to it to give the public a false impression and to do your part in the ongoing deception that Europe and the countries of the West are still democratic and respectful of human rights when that clearly is no longer the case.

LAST CHANCE

FOR THE COMMISSIONER BEFORE CALLING FOR HIS DISMISSAL

I believe four weeks of hunger strike is more than ample time for you Commissioner to act. You have nevertheless refused to fulfill your office's most solemn duty, namely to be the people's last line of defense, even though you have the authority and indeed the responsibility to do so on your own initiative according to Protocol 14. Furthermore, since the Interlaken Declaration, you have been empowered to act cooperatively with the judicial side represented by the European Court and all relevant parts of the Council "*in order to assist member states in remedying structural human rights problems*"⁴⁰, to quote your own words. The fact that you have not done so shows that you are derelict in your duties.

Should we not hear by the end of my fifth week of hunger strike that you, Commissioner Hammarberg, have taken concrete steps to halt the covert program of **surveillance and censorship (SAC)** I have uncovered, free the press and civil society to expose its violations, and compensate those hurt by it, I will start a petition asking the public's support for your immediate dismissal from office for negligence in the exercise of your duties and for misrepresenting yourself to the public.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Quote taken from Commissioner Hammarberg's speech in Izmir, Turkey, given April 26, 2011, and available at: <http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/conferenceizmir/Speeches/Speech%20CommHR.pdf>.

⁴¹ I submit your email dated April 26 and sent by Isil Gachet, the Director of the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights, as evidence to this effect. I submit also the speech you delivered in Izmir, Turkey, on April 26, as evidence of contradictory statements. For explanations see: <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae3.pdf> or https://wikispooks.com/w/images/f/f8/Educating_the_educated.pdf , pp. 3-5.

For the time being, I ask of you, Secretary General Jagland, to initiate a corruption probe into Commissioner Hammarberg's conduct. If the Commissioner is serving special interest groups then the public is entitled to know. The Commissioner's suspect behavior deserves to be scrutinized by an independent panel, openly and swiftly.

The probe must investigate if Commissioner Hammarberg is working for Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani, the Emir of Qatar, whose agent, Carla Liuzzo, I have exposed spying on students at Leicester University, and whose reputation and vast investments in Europe are at stake if he is uncovered to use his kingdom's security services to conduct espionage on Europeans.

The probe must ask who is the Commissioner protecting and why? Is he receiving bribes from the wealthy absolute monarchies of the Arabian Peninsula? Is he an agent of the British Crown? This question is particularly relevant since the UK is behind Resolution 1624 (2005), which enabled the hijacking of the counter-radicalization struggle for imperialist purposes, and behind the program of surveillance and espionage unleashed on its universities in cooperation with the secret service agencies of absolute monarchies like Qatar.

It is in the public interest and vital to the Council's reputation as an institution of integrity that a corruption probe is launched at the earliest date possible and that the office and records of Commissioner Hammarberg are immediately sealed for this purpose.

WHAT COMMISSIONER HAMMARBERG CAN AND SHOULD DO

To avoid the fate of being disgraced and kicked out of office for dereliction of duties or corruption, I suggest the following plan of action for you, Commissioner Hammarberg. Use the authority to intervene at your own initiative, conferred to you by Protocol 14, to ask the Court to use the priority policy set in amended Rule 41, as of June 2009, to respond to the Court's increasing case-load by more rapidly examining cases which disclose the existence of widespread problems capable of generating large numbers of additional cases.

The Court's statistics bear out the fact that the UK has experienced an influx of applications allocated to a judicial formation between 2007 and 2010, so much so that it is now ranked 7 among the worst 15 offenders.⁴²

This is clear indication that structural and systemic problems have cropped up in Britain's political and legal systems, problems that are with certainty related to the way its Prevent strategy is being applied.

⁴² See paragraph 4.2.2 on p.7 of the AS/JUR/INF (2011) 05rev2, available at: http://assembly.coe.int/CommitteeDocs/2011/ajinfdoc05%202011rev_EN.pdf.

Furthermore, if one considers the sophistication with which the UK has redesigned its adjudication system in order to create inescapable legal dead-ends, it is conceivable that the UK is actually the worse human rights offender, but that the majority of its victims, at least as far as SAC is concerned, have been buried by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), an organization fully corrupted by secret government directives.⁴³

This course of action will allow you to save face and to bring credibility back to the office of the Commissioner for Human Rights, credibility that has been severely bruised by your inaction in respect to my hunger strike and to the violations of the secret British program of surveillance and censorship (SAC) I brought to your attention, a program that continues to ravage the lives of countless students in Britain and the EU and that has turned Europe's universities into propaganda and indoctrination machines.

I remind you that every day you waste is a day that irrevocably changes the lives of an unknown number of young men and women that fall victim to the oppressive mechanisms of censorship devised by SAC's creators. This is something I cannot allow you to do and unless you act quickly the gloves are coming off and you will be disgraced and thrown out of office.

REGAINING CONTROL OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

The time has come for us citizens to clean up house at the EU institutions, where corruption, self-interest, and gross negligence have become endemic and deeply rooted in an autocratic and hypocritical culture of privilege.

The time has come to regain control of our institutions to ensure that henceforth there will be dire consequences for those who fail to fulfill the duties of their offices, who deceive the public and who use their positions to serve special interest groups.

Since there is no democratic mechanism set in place for this purpose, the consequences for corrupt or duplicitous behavior must come directly from the people via votes of no confidence transmitted through signed petitions. In time, we, the people, must impose our will on our governments when they choose to adopt autocratic measures and depart from democratic processes. For this purpose we must obtain supervisory and veto powers over any and all decisions reached at the EU level, where we have no effective representation.

I ask the readers to bombard Commissioner Hammarberg, Secretary General Jagland and Mr. Johansson with letters, emails and telephone calls to do their duty or resign.

These are their contact details:

⁴³ How the UK has perverted the rule of law and created legal dead-ends I have described in detail in my article *The Great Secret: Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU*, see pp. 3-9, at: <http://cryptome.org/0003/great-secret.pdf>.

Mats Johansson
Standing Rapporteur on Media Freedom
Parliamentary Assembly
Communication Unit
Tel: +33 3 88 41 31 93
Fax: +33 3 90 21 41 34
pace.com@coe.int
assembly.com@coe.int

Thomas Hammarberg
Commissioner for Human Rights
Council of Europe
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex
Tel: +33 (0)3 88 41 35 38
Fax:+33 (0)3 90 21 50 53
press.commissioner@coe.int
commissioner@coe.int
CommissionerHR.Communication@coe.int

Thorbjørn Jagland
Secretary General of
the Council of Europe
Avenue de l'Europe
F-67075 Strasbourg
Tel:+33(0)3 88 41 20 00
cm@coe.int



WEEK FIVE

APPEAL TO REASON

Your High Excellencies

President Obama, Président Sarkozy, Bundeskanzlerin Merkel, Prime Minister Cameron,

It is with a heavy heart and a deep sense of responsibility that I deem it necessary to write to you on my 28th day of hunger strike at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, France, where I have so far failed to compel Commissioner Hammarberg and the Council of Europe to exercise their authority to condemn and shut down a covert program of **surveillance and censorship (SAC)** of students in universities that operates in the UK since 2007 and in the EU since 2010 under the cover of Resolution 1624 (2005), with the blessings of the UN's Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and under the supervision of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED).

The very existence of this unlawful, unethical, divisive and discriminatory program demonstrates that the safeguards put in place to prevent violations of international law and the European Convention are ineffective and that neither the people in charge of the greater counter-radicalization agenda nor the supervisory bodies charged with enforcing respect for the law and democratic values are willing to admit that human rights, civil liberties and protection under the law are being trampled on with impunity and without accountability for questionable objectives that fall far outside the scope of the counter-radicalization strategy.

The powers accorded to the CTC and the CTED are being grossly abused with dire consequences for free speech, freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of association, the right to privacy and family life, and academic freedom, to name but a few. Their brazen actions show that nothing is sacred for the self-serving cabal of international corruption and global autocracy that has taken root at the UN and that has begot a global industry of absolute control and oppression.

The damage they have done is incalculable. The freedom of the press, the integrity of civil society and the independence and impartiality of the courts have been annihilated to protect the operations, violations and secrecy of illegal and immoral programs like SAC that have been let loose on our societies, on our values, on our freedoms and on our children. Unless stopped, there will be nothing left of our democracies except empty shells and hypocrisy.

The forces of autocracy – empowered and emboldened by the self-serving indifference and incompetence of UN and EU high officials, who refuse to fulfill their duties; by the silence of the press and civil society, who are afraid to tell the truth; and by the perversion of the judiciary, who have been coerced to stand idle while violations are endemic – have most recently launched a vicious attack on the people's court of last resort, the European Court of Human Rights, in an attempt to make justice unreachable to the ever-growing number of victims of abuse by State Parties that routinely violate their people in order to stifle legitimate dissent and democratic aspirations, defend the interests of the elites, silence criticism of misguided policies and political corruption, and reduce the poor the weak and the foreign to second class status under the cover of countering terrorism and radicalization.

I ask you as a father, as a Canadian and as a global citizen to halt the onslaught on our democracies and democratic aspirations, the debasement of our fundamental rights and liberties, the annihilation of good will among peoples and nations, and the destruction of our children's futures committed by State actors in the name of countering radicalization.

The powers granted by Resolution 1624 are too great to be controlled, too broad to be contained and too intrusive not to be abused. If the UK could not help but fall victim to its own creation, Resolution 1624, and Britain's legal system and civil society could not confront its violations and defend the innocent, who are but children, then what hope is there for nations that lack democratic institutions and a legal culture or that are torn by ethnic divides, poverty and ignorance?

Now that Osama bin Laden is dead, the time has come to turn a new page and return to the values and norms we have abandoned and on which our freedom and dignity rest; values and norms that we have no right to proclaim and promote in the world when we no longer abide by them.

Not resurrecting democracy and freedom, truth and decency, the rule of law and due process would be pure folly since the damage done to our rights and freedoms and to our democracies by the bodies meant to protect us is far greater than the damage done by terrorists or the threat they pose. The only way to stop terrorism and radicalization is by tempering the excesses of capitalism and by creating societies of inclusion that are respectful of our inalienable rights, tolerant of differences, mindful of clashing worldviews and that welcome each and all in the fold of economic security and political self-determination.

Do not let institutional repression intimidate and deceive you as they have intimidated and deceived us and sully your reputations and legacies the way they have sullied our values and rights. You have the power to act and are the only people left who can restore our democracies and the rule of law.

Disband the CTC and CTED, scrap the counter-radicalization deception, and condemn and punish those responsible for debasing free speech and freedom of conscience on their most sacred ground, the universities, where they must be protected like humanity's greatest treasures. As heads of state and close allies you have the authority to coordinate such a change of direction. You have tied the Gordian knot, you must now untie it. History will look harshly upon you if you don't.

I shall stand guard at the gates of power, ragged and hungry, until you do.

THE PEOPLE'S DECLARATION

9 MAY 2011

THE PEOPLE'S DECLARATION ON RESTORING THE POWERS OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(A gift from those who have nothing to give but themselves and of themselves.)

Drafted by Kevin Galalae
At 28 days of hunger strike, on May 9, in the city of Strasbourg, France.



From left to right: Francisco da Silva (Portugal), Kevin Galalae (Canada), Emilia Borková (Slovakia), Gheorghe Frunză (Romania), Andrzej Jańczyński (in the wheelchair, Poland), Didier Jacque Dulepa-Gilles (France), Ismaili Nazlija (Germany).

The European Court of Human Rights is the people's institution of last resort when their rights and liberties have been violated by State Parties. Any change in its structure and operation must therefore be sanctioned by the people by referendum. The following is the people's view of how the Court must be reformed so it can remain effective in the face of an onslaught of applications, an increase that gives clear indication of deteriorating conditions in the social and legal fabric of Europe.

Any new measures of reform must in the people's view rest on the following fundamental principles, principles on which the Court was established and from which it cannot deviate:

- I. That the responsibility for bearing the costs of the Court and addressing its overburdened system must fall not on those who suffer but on those who cause the suffering.
- II. That the Court's accessibility to individuals is of paramount importance since human suffering must take precedence over the political interests and bruised reputations of State Parties that routinely violate the European Convention and wish to limit access to the Court.
- III. That the Court's primary function must remain the protection of individuals from abusive State Parties and not the protection of State Parties from individuals who abuse or misunderstand the Convention.

In the measures adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe through the Izmir Declaration (26-27 April 2011), the people's principles of what the Court must represent and was indeed meant to represent since its inception have been turned upside down. This is an attack on the people's Court and an affront to justice committed by representatives of select State Parties to usurp the people's court of last resort. It cannot be tolerated, as it was executed without the consultation and approval of the people, indeed without even parliamentary oversight.

*

HOW THE CHICKEN COOP WAS ROBBED

This hijacking of the Court's fate and powers by the Committee of Ministers, who are appointed by the executive branches of their respective governments – governments of State Parties that want to erode the powers and jurisdiction of the Court – is a process that started at Interlaken.

That much was observed by Rapporteur Bemelmans-Videc, who was charged to report on the "*Effective implementation of the European Convention on Human Rights: the Interlaken process*", in April 2010.

*"I found it a pity that no opportunity was provided for a genuine discussion or exchange of views on subjects of importance; the texts prepared ahead of time were simply adopted by consensus."*⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Full report available at: <http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/WorkingDocs/Doc10/EDOC12221.pdf>.

Ms. Bemelmans-Videc, also noted with dismay the absence of the Parliamentary Assembly from the Interlaken process and thus the absence of a democratic process in deciding how best to reform the European Court.

The Assembly, like the Committee of Ministers, is responsible for protecting the values of the Council of Europe and in ensuring compliance, by member states, of ECHR standards. It was the Assembly which, despite initial reluctance of the Committee of Ministers, was at the origin of the Convention as we know it today, and it is the Assembly which provides „democratic legitimacy“ to the judges on the Court whom it elects (Article 22, ECHR). Hence, the somewhat puzzling feature of the documents adopted in Interlaken which make no mention of the Assembly and contain scarcely a word on the role of national parliaments. The Assembly must therefore reflect upon how best the „parliamentary dimension“ should be fed into the Interlaken process.

A year earlier, in 2009, the former Chairperson of the Legal Affairs Committee, Ms. Däubler-Gmelin, bemoaned the fact that the Organization’s executive, instead of having “*the courage to „bite the bullet“ to confront the real human rights issues and problems facing member states and the Council of Europe*” resorted to the politically expedient method of restricting access to the Court by tightening the qualifications criteria and thus making the Court harder to reach by individuals who are victims of state abuse.⁴⁵

That the offenders, i.e. State Parties, are being allowed to reform the Court without the input and approval of those offended, i.e. the people, is tantamount to allowing a pedophile dictate the rules by which he is to be tried and the eligibility criteria for his victims to qualify for justice. But this should come as no surprise when decisions are made by State Parties only – the pedophiles in my metaphor – while the people have no seat and no say whatsoever at the decision-making table.

Not surprisingly, the Izmir Declaration’s sole achievement is to trap victims of State abuse between justice denied in the national courts and justice unreachable at the European Court. Instead of 9 out of 10 applications being refused for failing to meet the eligibility criteria adopted at Interlaken, there will now be 999 out of 1000 screened out by the more stringent rules set in Izmir.

How did this come to be and who is behind this autocratic hijacking of a previously democratic decision-making process? Let us follow the smoke to find the fire.

The Izmir Conference was organized within the framework of the Turkish Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, so the first instinct is to blame the Turks. It is easy to suspect them since they have the worst human rights record and are constantly upbraided by the European Court for failing to uphold even the most basic human rights.

If Turkey is the mastermind, then it has given Europe a curse that will haunt it for generations and will put European justice at par with Turkish justice, and we all know what that looks like. The European

⁴⁵ See “3rd Annual Report of the Committee of Ministers for 2009 on the Supervision of the Execution of Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights” at:

http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/execution/Source/Publications/CM_annreport2009_en.pdf.

Court's statistics show that in 2007 Turkey ranked easily as the worst offender. 319 judgments finding at least one violation were issued against Ankara, 8 of which involved "torture" and 23 "inhuman or degrading treatment". Russia was a distant second with 175 violations. From 2007 until today, Turkey has remained a top violator vying for first place with Russia and without equal in the gravity of its crimes.

But is Turkey the brain behind the annihilation of the European Court of Human Rights?

Not by a mile. Turkey lacks the legal know-how and the sophistication to conceive and execute such an audacious and Machiavellian destruction plan. The Turkish government, to use another metaphor, could not tie its own shoes when it comes to policy making and legal maneuverings on the international arena. It is therefore wise to conclude that Ahmet Davutoglu, the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, is merely the bearer of someone else's plan.

But whose plan? Here is the answer:

"At its 1080th meeting on 24 and 26 March 2010, the Ministers' Deputies agreed to set up an open-ended ad hoc working party (GT-SUIVI. Interlaken), to be chaired by the United Kingdom Ambassador, in order to steer the follow-up process to the Interlaken Declaration as a whole. When so doing, the Deputies also took into account a document prepared by the Secretary General (document CM (2010) 31) on the modalities of implementation of the Declaration and Action Plan. It is this working party, which had its first meeting on 13 April, that is expected to propose an initial series of draft decisions for adoption at the ministerial session on 11 May.

The Secretary General's document, a "road map" that is to be updated regularly, will permit the Committee of Ministers, through this newly created working party, to steer the process. Relevant activities of civil society organizations will be appended to future updates."⁴⁶

So the mandate to steer, under their exclusive authority, the ad hoc working party of the Committee of Ministers' Deputies to follow up the reform process of the European Court was given by none other than the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr. Thorbjørn Jagland.⁴⁷ More than this, he handed the chairmanship of the ad hoc working party to the United Kingdom Ambassador, Ms. Eleanor Fuller. And that is how the Brits have put themselves in charge of shaping European policy once again.

Not only are they responsible for the UN Resolution 1624 (2005), which robbed the world and the UK of democracy under the pretext of countering radicalization, and for the Europe-wide adoption of secret programs of surveillance and censorship of students in universities through the back door of

⁴⁶ See "Effective implementation of the European Convention on Human Rights: the Interlaken process", pp. 4 & 5, available at: <http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/WorkingDocs/Doc10/EDOC12221.pdf>. See also <https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1605757&Site>.

⁴⁷ No wonder he refuses to allow the Council's press office to utter a word about my hunger strike here in Strasbourg!

the Stockholm Programme, which robbed the entire continent of Europe of the rule of law, media freedom and an independent civil society; now they are also in charge of annihilating the powers and jurisdiction of the European Court so as to be able to cover the tracks of their egregious violations of human rights at home and throughout the world.⁴⁸

The puppet assembly of the Ministers' Deputies, manipulated by the higher authority of the British Ambassador who chaired their meetings, has propose a series of draft decisions that were cheered on at Izmir and are to be fully adopted at the ministerial session on 11 May, next week, in Istanbul; draft decisions that were undoubtedly dictated by the Brits who have the legislative and legal sophistication to give the unsophisticated and abusive Eastern European governments what they most want, namely a way to get the European Court off their backs so they can continue to treat their citizens with utter disregard for the human rights enshrined in the European Convention.

So what we have here is a coordinated attack on the European Court by the following actors: the Secretary General of the European Council, Mr. Thorbjørn Jagland; the British Government and its Ambassador at the European Council, Ms. Eleanor Fuller; and the Turkish Government, which has the Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers at the Council of Europe and is represented by Ahmet Davutoglu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey.

With these forces aligned for a common purpose (i.e. the annihilation of the European Court's powers, jurisdiction and effectiveness) it was very easy to get the disgruntled nations of the former Eastern Bloc, who are the main clients of the European Court, because they have not abandoned the totalitarian habits ingrained in their political and legal systems during communism, to vote for the reform package the Brits designed for this purpose, have the Deputy Ministers rubberstamp it during the ad hoc working party meetings, and the Committee of Ministers adopt it through the Izmir Declaration.

That is how the Brits orchestrated the destruction of the European Court from within the Council of Europe, a goal they announced unabashedly in the British media once the European Court slapped Britain for depriving its prisoners of the right to vote⁴⁹ and in advance of taking over the Council of Europe's Chairmanship.⁵⁰

Now that we have seen how the European Court was annihilated by an unholy coalition of autocrats, imperialists and corrupt EU officials, let us take a look at how the measures put in place have deprived the Court of power and jurisdiction.

⁴⁸ The combined effect of Britain's doings show that the UK is bent on destroying social democracy to reshape Europe in its own image, a Shangri-La for elites whose hereditary rights will destroy the principle of equality between men, will reduce the populace to the inferior status of subjects and will throw Europe back to the dark ages of monarchy.

⁴⁹ See <http://www.thetrumpet.com/?q=8185.6831.0.0>.

⁵⁰ See <http://www.euronews.net/2011/02/21/britain-promises-european-human-rights-debate/> and <http://www.guardian.co.uk/law/2011/may/06/david-cameron-european-law-allergy>.

*

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S REFORM OF THE EUROPEAN COURT IS A SMOKESCREEN FOR ANNIHILATING ITS POWERS AND JURISDICTION

As a result of Izmir and Interlaken, the number of applicants to the European Court will continue to increase, though hardly anyone will get through the screening process, and the nature of the abuse described by victims will be worse than ever because these individuals will have been victimized longer and by more courts than ever before.

To add insult to injury, the individuals who have gone through years of abuse by their national courts will arrive at the European Court destitute and desperate only to find that this too is just another court where justice is denied and the law is but a travesty. Swimming across a treacherous legal ocean, almost drowning, the victims of state abuse arrive in Strasbourg only to find that the oar of European justice is used to push them under rather than help them out onto the land and safety.

The Izmir Declaration stresses the principle of subsidiarity as the primary means by which to limit the cases accepted by the Court and thus reduce its workload, but in so doing it makes the Court inaccessible to 99.9% of the population.⁵¹ Subsidiarity means that the European Court must apply fully and strictly the admissibility criteria set out in the Convention, in particular the requirement that applicants exhaust all domestic remedies.

Applications are eliminated because they do not fulfill artificial criteria and not because they are devoid of substance or do not represent legitimate complaints. The perversion of justice is scandalous and merits the most severe opprobrium.

If the reform measures of the Izmir Declaration adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe are implemented, the European Court will cease to function as it was intended because it will no longer be accessible to anyone other than the wealthy and the well connected.

Who has the resilience, the time and the means to waste on the futile endeavor of going through three or four judicial courts at the national level only to achieve nothing? It is a well-known fact that 9 out of the 47 Member States that are members of the Council of Europe have major structural and/or systemic problems and are incapable of dispensing justice through their courts.⁵²

It is a well-kept secret that the counter-radicalization strategy has polluted the legal environment and made respect for human rights but a memory in nations where the rule of law used to mean something. The UK is the primary example of such decline in standards.

⁵¹ Next week, I will issue a word by word translation and interpretation of the Izmir Declaration's text to demonstrate how nearly all of its measures undermine the power, jurisdiction and effectiveness of the Court.

⁵² Read "States with major structural/systemic problems before the European Court of Human Rights: statistics", available at: http://assembly.coe.int/CommitteeDocs/2011/ajinfdoc05%202011rev_EN.pdf. The states in question are: Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Moldova, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine.

The statistics compiled by the European Court bear out this fact more clearly than any article on the subject. They show that in the three years (i.e. from 2007 to 2010) since Britain introduced its counter-radicalization strategy as the Prevent strand of its greater counter-terrorism legislation, the number of cases pending against the UK jumped from 1,363 in 2007 to 3,172 in 2010. In other words, the UK nearly tripled its human rights violations against its citizens.

The rights that are being violated by the UK also fully reveal that the damage done to its legal and human rights environment is the direct result of a counter-radicalization agenda carried out through covert and discriminatory programs of surveillance, censorship and repression, programs that fail to respect expressional rights and freedom of conscience even on the sacrosanct ground of the nation's universities, where these rights are to be promoted and defended by law to a far greater extent than anywhere else in society. The rights that are being violated are: prohibition of discrimination, right to respect for privacy and family life, right to liberty and security, right to an effective remedy, right to a fair trial, and lack of effective investigation.

Let us take a look at how the Court should have been reformed in order to stay true to its original principles described on the first page of this paper.

A good faith reform of the European Court would have to look like this. Bear in mind that I have drafted this entire document in just three days and that I have no legal training whatsoever and no prior knowledge of the Interlaken and Izmir reform packages or the inner workings of the Council of Europe. But this is not rocket science and any reasonably intelligent man or woman could come up with a similarly decent plan.



*

THE PEOPLE'S PLAN FOR REFORMING THE PEOPLE'S COURT OF LAST RESORT

PRINCIPLE I: The bad must pay

Measures meant to ensure that the responsibility for bearing the costs of the Court and addressing its overburdened system must fall not on those who suffer but on those who cause the suffering:

1. Lawyers, attorneys and judges who are found to have acted in bad faith, contrary to the interests of justice and who have miscarried justice must be forced to compensate the victims from their own pockets, disciplined or disbarred, depending on the grievousness of their offence.
2. Those who arrive at the Court's doors destitute and desperate must be provided with accommodation and food and have their applications fast-tracked. The cost must be borne by the State Party accused of violating the victim's rights.
3. 10% should be added to every compensation awarded to victims by the Court as penalty for repeat offenders to cover the operational costs of the Court caused by State Parties whose judiciaries have failed to apply the letter and spirit of the European Convention. This ensures that the worst offenders pay the lion's share of the Court's costs. The State Party has the option of recuperating those costs from the complainant if the Court rules in its favor. Conversely, if the Court rules in favor of the complainant, the State Party has the option of recuperating its costs from the judge or judges who have miscarried justice.

PRINCIPLE 2: The door stays open

Measures meant to ensure that the Court's accessibility to individuals is of paramount importance since human suffering must take precedence over the political interests and bruised reputations of State Parties that routinely violate the European Convention and wish to limit access to the Court:

4. Applicants from countries known to have structural and/or systemic problems or from countries that apply covert methods of surveillance, censorship and oppression which deny citizens knowledge of the original source of their abuse must be exempt from the strict application of the eligibility criteria since the risk involved in sending them back to their country's legal systems that have been corrupted to miscarry justice or co-opted to create legal dead-ends and to ignore violations is too great and thus unconscionable.
5. Applicants from countries that have refused to or have delayed the full implementation of one or more earlier judgments by the Court must be exempt from the strict application of the eligibility criteria. This will act as leverage against State Parties that are repeat offenders and show little intention of honestly following the European Convention or implementing the Court's rulings.

6. Humanitarian concerns must supersede legal and technical considerations. This means that judges charged with assessing the legitimacy of an application must have the widest possible latitude to decide if a case merits the Court's attention.

PRINCIPLE 3: People must come first

Measures meant to ensure that the Court's primary function must remain the protection of individuals from abusive State Parties and not the protection of State Parties from individuals who abuse or misunderstand the Convention:

7. Governments of State Parties that change or corrupt the law to serve their own interests rather than adhere to the universal principles espoused by the European Convention and international law must be stripped of diplomatic immunity and prosecuted accordingly by the International Criminal Court at The Hague.
8. Periodic blanket amnesties must be used to resolve the plight of individuals who endure hardships that are uncommon while protesting and pleading with the Court in person. It is not without reason that the Convention rights are called "human" rights and not "legal" rights. The human aspect of the law must prevail over the legal. To this end, broad use of friendly settlements where State Parties are encouraged to be generous and humane towards its people, whether their complaints are strictly rooted in law or not, provide the most civilized and cost-effective manner.
9. As a matter of policy, the Assembly must suspend "*the voting rights of a national delegation where the national parliament does not seriously exercise parliamentary control over the executive in cases of non-implementation of Strasbourg Court judgments*".⁵³

PRINCIPLE 4: No justice without hope

In addition to the above nine measures, I propose a tenth measure, the human effect measure. It has been my experience that the European Court conducts itself in a most insensitive and rude manner with the people who come to it for justice and who are demoralized, shunned, and desperate. At no time does the Court go through the trouble of granting applicants face-to-face interviews or of informing them periodically of the status of their applications. At no time do the Court's employees condescend to make use of their good manners to offer encouragement, advice or a simple smile to those who day after day wait and hope and beg at the Court's fortified gates. At no time, is protocol eased to account for the fact that human beings have feelings and are guided by emotions and that a word of kindness goes a long way in sustaining those who have long surpassed their limits.

⁵³ This measure was proposed by Mr. Christos Pourgourides, the Chairperson and rapporteur of the Legal Affairs Committee on the implementation of judgments of the Court.

Measure meant to ensure that justice has a human face:

10. The Court, its employees and its protocols must be mindful of and sensitive to the human suffering that applicants have endured, the hope that the Court represents, and of the devastating effect negative closure can have on those who believe with every fiber of their being to have been wronged.

In addition to addressing the Court's budget problems and overburdened system, these ten simple measures will also effectively and fairly address four other major problems that have plagued the Court for the past decade: they will provide a powerful incentive to remedy the structural and systemic problems of states that are repeat offenders; they will lead to the full and expeditious compliance with the judgments of the Court by pressure from within the legal systems of nations that are malfunctioning due to corruption, incompetence or political interference; they will strengthen implementation of Convention rights at the national level, and they will give justice a human face and thus resurrect the dismal record and reputation of the legal system.

I am not a jurist but I can guarantee you that the people's reform plan would win by a margin of ten to one in a referendum.

*

CANDLE LIGHT VIGIL UNTIL THE COURT IS RESURRECTED

This is our court to defend not theirs to destroy. And defend it we will. We, the injured and the downtrodden, pledge to hold a candle light vigil every evening from 9 to 10 PM until the Court is resurrected. The only way to bring it back to life and to the principles on which it was founded is to fully adopt the People's Declaration.

We invite the Court's employees and judges, as well as members of the public, to join us.

THE MAN TURNING THE TIDE

1 July 2011

To answer the question of what I have achieved, I had to leave my legal battles aside and return to my work as political activist by gathering information about what had occurred on the British, European and international arenas in the four months since I started my hunger strike. I was thrilled to discover that my impact has been wide and far-reaching and that it is ongoing, for the slow wheels of the British government, the EU institutions and the United Nations have just started turning in the direction I pointed.

MY IMPACT IN BRITAIN PRIOR TO THE HUNGER STRIKE

The first success I scored in Britain was long before my hunger strike in France. It occurred in fact shortly after I published my first paper “*Covert Censorship at Oxford and Leicester University: CONTEST and State-Sponsored Discrimination*”⁵⁴ in the Romanian newspaper “*Flacăra lui Adrian Păunescu*” in the April and May 2010 issues. In that article I was the first to expose Britain’s misdeeds by providing:

*“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 (SAC)** 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.”*

The response was swift and across the board: Oxford took Dr. De Grandis, the tutor of the political philosophy course from which I was expelled, off his teaching duties; Leicester sent its Academic Registrar, Kathy Williams (who had threatened me with a libel lawsuit and who would have been responsible for enrolling government agents into university courses as legitimate students) into early retirement; the Home Office fired Ivor Middleton, the spy/censor imbedded at Oxford and Carla Liuzzo, the spy/censor imbedded at Leicester; and the British press published for the first time since CONTEST’s inception in 2007 articles foreshadowing the demise of the Prevent strategy.

On 14 July 2010 *The Guardian* wrote that “*Prevent is Dead*”:

*“The public announcement that Theresa May, the Home Secretary, is undertaking a **review of counter-terrorism legislation comes** as welcome news for those of us who have witnessed the evolution and regression of the government’s “**Prevent**” policy. Originally envisioned as a form of counter-radicalization, it quickly became an unruly project that spread beyond security concerns. Eventually, it was as much about the government-inspired social engineering of integration as it was about stopping terrorist attacks.”*⁵⁵ (*The Guardian*, “Prevent is Dead. What next?”)

⁵⁴ Available at:

https://wikispooks.com/w/images/0/06/Covert_Censorship_at_Oxford_and_Leicester_University.pdf.

⁵⁵ Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/belief/2010/jul/14/prevent-counter-radicalisation-terrorism-islam>.

My second victory in Britain came shortly after I published "*The Great Secret: Surveillance and Censorship in Britain and the EU*"⁵⁶, which I wrote in October 2010 but did not publish until the first week of January 2011. In it I identified how SAC operates, how it was forced onto universities, how it employs foreign and domestic agents, how instituting it required the annihilation of Britain's human rights organizations and the perversion of its legal system, how its mechanisms of censorship are hidden behind legislative and judicial trickery, and how human rights and civil liberties are violated with impunity.

A month and a half later, Universities UK, the umbrella organization that represents the interests of all British universities, published a report entitled "***Freedom of Speech on Campus: rights and responsibilities in UK universities***"⁵⁷. The Report was a direct response to my article's criticisms and revelations. The Working Group responsible for the report was chaired by **Professor Malcolm Grant**, Provost of University College London. It had started the report a year earlier but it was waiting for the right moment to release it.

Embarrassed in front of the world at their failure to protect freedom of speech and at the ease with which British universities had succumbed to the government's pressure to illegally spy on and censor their students, the vice-chancellors who make up the body of Universities UK jumped at the opportunity I provided them with to get the secret service out of their lecture rooms and save face in front of the world and especially their foreign students. They wasted no time publically informing the British government that it was not the job of universities to impede freedom of speech "*through additional censorship, surveillance or invasion of privacy*".⁵⁸ The choice of Professor Grant's words is significant because they are a clear reference to the name I gave the programme. It is also an open admission that British universities censor the academic environment, when their duty and legal responsibility is not only to protect but to promote freedom of speech and conscience in universities.

Shocked at the way the tide had turned, the reaction from the government was one of anger. Lord Carlile, who at the time was in charge of overseeing the government's Prevent strategy at the Home Office, was scathing in his criticism of the report by Universities UK.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/4/4d/The_Great_Secret.pdf and at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46050686/The-Great-Secret-Surveillance-and-Censorship-in-Britain-and-the-EU>.

⁵⁷ Report available at: <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/Publications/Documents/FreedomOfSpeechOnCampusRightsAndResponsibilitiesInUKuniversities.pdf>.

⁵⁸ Professor Grant reiterated the Report's conclusions in a BBC interview: <http://www.iengage.org.uk/component/content/article/1-news/1231-report-urges-freedom-of-speech-on-uk-campuses>.

⁵⁹ *The Guardian*, 18 February 2011, As vice-chancellors reject 'surveillance' of students Lord Carlile demands colleges must identify radicals: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/feb/18/counter-terrorism-watchdog-universities-fail-fight-extremism>.

He found it very hard to accept that a single Canadian from across the ocean had shut down SAC, which is the most important component of the Prevent strategy, by breaking the hard-won coalition of the willing, those willing to break the law, that had taken root between government agencies, civil society, the courts and the universities. To achieve such a broad collaboration had taken the government of the UK under the Labour Party years of arm-twisting, drastic and unpopular legislation and vast sums of money.

MY IMPACT IN BRITAIN AFTER THE HUNGER STRIKE

Having exposed the hidden agenda of Britain's Prevent strategy and the multiple objectives of SAC, Prevent's jewel in the crown, as well as the destructive and manipulative effects of Britain's Resolution 1624 (2005) and of Britain's attack on the European Court of Human Rights, the government of the UK found itself naked in front of the world. Thomas Hammarberg, the Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights, who had been the focus of my pressure since my arrival in France, as well as human rights organizations that I had kept informed by sending them my weekly articles, began to openly criticize the British government on multiple fronts and to demand action.

This had multiple ramifications in Britain and beyond. First, it forced Britain to reconsider the entire Prevent strategy. The current British government had no choice but to abandon the hidden ideological objectives of Prevent, which I had exposed for the first time⁶⁰, and to cut funding for groups and programmes that violate human rights and civil liberties while purportedly combating radicalization⁶¹, SAC being one such programme.

In being forced to abandon Prevent for a new and diluted version the government admitted that it had deviated from a counter-terrorism strategy to an ideological one that wrongly pushed social cohesion rather than preventing terrorism and that in the process serious damage has been done to Britain's democratic foundation. This is exactly the analysis I was the first to make since no one else had dared to challenge the government. As a result, henceforth, any groups that *“did not support democracy, human rights, the rule of law and mutual respect and tolerance of different faith groups would lose funding”*.⁶²

⁶⁰ See pp. 6-8 and 9-13 in *“Message from The Man Outside at 14 Days of Hunger Strike”*, 25 April 2001, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/3/31/Message_from_the_man_outside_after_14_days_of_hunger_strike.pdf and at Cryptome as view only; Google *“Cryptome, Galalae, Freedom in Education 2”*.

⁶¹ BBC, *“UK counter-terror strategy no good”*, 7 June 2011: http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid_9506000/9506417.stm.

⁶² *Politics. CO.UK.*, *“May incorporates Cameron's Munich speech into anti-extremist strategy”*, 7 June 2011: <http://www.politics.co.uk/news/2011/6/7/may-incorporates-cameron-s-munich-speech-into>.

The new Prevent is now a shadow of its former self and the government, now shut out of universities thanks to my efforts, is desperately knocking on the doors of Universities UK begging to be allowed back in by accusing universities of being “*complacent*” about Islamic extremism and of not taking the issue seriously.⁶³ In its desperation, Britain’s new government has hired the Quilliam Foundation – which is the first counter-extremism think tank, a dubious distinction – to apply pressure on universities to once again do the British government’s bidding and engage in unlawful and unethical activities.⁶⁴ So far there are no takers and Britain’s universities are turning a cold shoulder to their government.⁶⁵

A second positive ramification of my efforts concerns Britain’s gag orders on the media and injunctions on the courts. On April 19, the very same day I published my “*Hunger Strike Appeal Letter to Mr. Hammarberg, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights*”, in which I show how the British government has perverted and corrupted the institutions of democracy, the freedom of the press, the impartiality of the courts, and the humane activities of NGOs and civil society through gag orders and injunctions, the London-based human rights organization “Article 19”, whose mandate is to defend and promote freedom of expression, issued a press release entitled “UK: “*Super-Injunctions*” *Illegitimate Limit to Free Speech*”, in which it mirrors my assertions about the illegality of gag orders by saying “*that the imposition of super-injunctions constitutes a serious threat to both freedom of speech and democracy. It constitutes an extreme form of censorship which should not be tolerated by the British democracy.*”⁶⁶

Until I exposed Britain’s super-injunctions in respect to SAC and Prevent, British society tolerated gag orders just fine and no human rights organization, Article 19 included, dared take the government to task. Once again I provided the impetus for action by having the courage to expose this dark secret of the UK⁶⁷ and indeed the entire Western world since the same silence prevails throughout the West on this subject.

⁶³ BBC, “Do universities do enough to tackle extremism on campus?”, 6 June 2011: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-13670397>.

⁶⁴ BBC, “Steady increase’ of extremism at university”:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid_9505000/9505496.stm.

⁶⁵ University campuses are not “hotbeds of radicalisation”, 31 May 2011:
<http://www.iengage.org.uk/home/1-news/1383-university-campuses-are-not-qhotbeds-of-radicalisationq>.

⁶⁶ Freedom 19, press release, 19 May 2011: <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/press/uk-super-injunctions-illegitimate-limit-to-free-speech.pdf>.

⁶⁷ The first time I tackled the subject of gag orders was in my direct communication with Air Vice-Marshal Andrew Vallance, the man in charge of muzzling the British media, which I posted on the Internet and became an instant hit. See: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/3/38/Andrew_Vallance_on_surveillance_and_censorship_in_British_universities.pdf.

Miraculously, the next day, May 20, Article 19 announced that a special review, chaired by Lord Neuberger (the most senior civil law judge in the UK) was released that day by a UK panel which “*recommended that limitations be placed on “super-injunctions” which prohibit all discussion of gagging orders*”.⁶⁸ This special review had obviously been collecting dust in a drawer until I provided its writers, Britain’s judges, with the opportunity to release it. Britain’s judges, like its university vice-chancellor and its newspaper editors, had found the courage to turn against their government only once I opened the path by exposing the truth and taking a public stand through my hunger strike.

MY IMPACT AT THE E.U. LEVEL

Having shut down SAC in Britain and cut funding for much of the Prevent programme, I averted the implementation of an identical programme in the EU. Although it had been approved by the Stockholm Programme⁶⁹ in secret, once I brought it out in the open I put an end to it. If Britain burned its fingers by illegally censoring the academic environment the rest of Europe would not follow suit. Had the EU gone ahead with its own SAC programme, it would have cost taxpayers billions of Euros and would have gradually spelled the end of democracy and freedom throughout Europe. It would have also destroyed countless young lives by being subjected to the same kind of treatment I was. Many of these young lives would have been Canadians attending British universities. Many more would have been from all corners of the world.

My second success at the European level came with respect to my defense of the European Court.

The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe met in Istanbul on May 11 to approve the measures agreed upon at Izmir, Turkey, through the Izmir Declaration, as to how to reform the European Court of Human Rights. The Ministers could not come to an agreement because three days earlier I had published an article entitled “*The People’s Declaration on Restoring the Powers of the European Court of Human Rights*”⁷⁰ and had sent it to over 350 members of the European Parliament, who had just arrived in town for parliamentary sessions.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Freedom 19, press release, 20 May 2011: <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/press/uk-review-calls-for-limits-on-super-injunctions-.pdf>.

⁶⁹ The Stockholm Programme is a five-year plan that contains guidelines for common policies for the Member States of the European Union for the years 2010 through 2015.

⁷⁰ “*The People’s Declaration on Restoring the Powers of the European Court of Human Rights*”, 9 May 2011, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/e/e0/THE_PEOPLE%27S_DECLARATION.pdf and at <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae6.pdf>.

⁷¹ Europe’s secret service agencies tried their utmost to prevent me from attaching the three articles I released on May 9 to the emails I sent to the 350 members of parliament. In order to succeed I had to rename the attachments, use a different email account and someone else’s pass to access the Internet at a different computer at the cybercafé I used.

In my article I showed how the UK and Turkey had hijacked the reform process from the Parliamentary Assembly in order “to trap victims of State abuse between justice denied in the national courts and justice unreachable at the European Court.”⁷² I demonstrated that as Europe’s worst offenders of their citizens’ rights and liberties, the British-Turkish coalition intended to annihilate the powers of the European Court so as to hide their political and legal deterioration at home, deterioration that was deliberate and a direct result of Resolution 1624 (2005) which Britain had proposed at the UN Security Council and was unanimously approved because it gave abusive States the cover needed to annihilate their citizens’ constitutionally protected rights by using the fight against radicalization as a pretext to commit serious crimes against their citizens. Thus exposed, the UK and Turkey lost any and all credibility and the subversive measures of reform they had proposed through the Izmir Declaration were abandoned in Istanbul. Publically, of course, the failure to come to an agreement was ascribed to a “row between Georgia and Russia”.⁷³

Had I not exposed the Izmir Declaration as a British-Turkish attack on the powers of the European Court, the reform measures would have been approved by the Ministers and the European Court would have ceased to be a functional body of law. Europe would have lost its people’s court of last resort and more than 65.000 applicants to the court every year would have had nowhere to turn to for justice.

Starting on May 9, I organized candlelight vigils every night from 9 to 10PM in front of the European Court. The vigils were attended by the supporters of the People’s Declaration⁷⁴ from May 9 to May 12. We hung a large banner in front of the Court which read: SAY NO TO IZMIR. SAY YES TO THE PEOPLE’S DECLARATION. This helped us achieve maximum visibility. Though we were ignored by the media, the message of my article and the visibility of our vigils were heard loud and clear by the Ministers.

My third success at the European level came with respect to my stand against intolerance towards immigrants and Europe’s integration problems. I spelled out the sources of intolerance and the root causes for Europe’s perceived integration problems in my article “*Educating the “Educated”: Message From The Man Outside at 21 Days of Hunger Strike*”,⁷⁵ which I published on May 2.

⁷² “*The People’s Declaration on Restoring the Powers of the European Court of Human Rights*”, 9 May 2011, p. 3, at : <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae6.pdf>.

⁷³ *Georgia-Russia row mars Council of Europe meeting in Istanbul*, 12 May 2011: <http://www.todayszaman.com/news-243658-georgia-russia-row-mars-council-of-europe-meeting-in-istanbul.html>.

⁷⁴ They are: Francisco da Silva (Portugal), Emilia Borková (Slovakia), Gheorghe Frunzã (Romania), Andrzej Jańczyński (Poland), Didier Jacque Dulepa-Gilles (France) and Ismaili Nazlija (Germany).

⁷⁵ “*Educating the “Educated”: Message From The Man Outside at 21 Days of Hunger Strike*”, 2 May 2011, available at : https://wikispooks.com/w/images/f/f8/Educating_the_educated.pdf and at <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae3.pdf>.

It is no coincidence that on May 11, less than ten days after I published my scathing criticism of Europe's intolerance, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mr. Thorbjørn Jagland, and a group of leading politicians and activists used the Istanbul meeting to release a publication entitled "Living Together".⁷⁶

Their analysis and conclusions echo those in my articles:

They catalogue the events that show the rise of intolerance - hostility to immigrants and asylum seekers; the rise of extremism fuelled by insecurity in a crisis-ridden society; attacks on believers of all faiths - and including both Islam and Christianity; the continuing plight of the Roma - the biggest minority with the least access to rights. They highlight the mechanisms at work: the insecurity that Europeans feel, despite living in one of the most comfortable and secure parts of the world; the perceived fight for jobs, even though European societies desperately need a new influx of labor to replace an aging population, and the tendency of the media to misrepresent and stereotype the "other" that feeds these misconceptions. Most tellingly, they single out the lack of leadership. There must be leaders out there, somewhere, they plead, who will have the clarity and foresight "to articulate a clear vision of Europe's destiny and a convincing strategy for getting there".⁷⁷

Most tellingly, the report places the burden of responsibility on the European governments' failures to respect the law and the discriminatory ways in which they apply or ignore the European Convention in order to disadvantage minorities, immigrants and the poor and helpless. The remedies they suggest mirror those in my article:

"that all laws must be obeyed...including the European Convention on Human Rights, which is increasingly seen to be flouted. No one should be coerced, but persuaded; and the most vulnerable should get the most attention. Governments need to place democracy at the core of their society and ensure full citizenship and voting rights for all - with non-citizens of whatever origin given the chance to vote in local and regional elections as is the case for EU citizens living in other EU countries."

As was the case in Britain, the European Council too was waiting for the right opportunity to address structural problems in Europe's systems of governance derived from political failures and an absence of leadership at the national and European levels. I gave the Council of Europe the cover and impetus they needed to come out swinging. They hid behind my courage and followed my lead excoriating Europe's politicians for failing to stand up to their citizens' prejudices and racism and for failing to provide leadership.

⁷⁶ "Living Together: Combining Diversity and Freedom in 21st Century Europe", Report of the Group of Eminent Persons of the Council of Europe, available at: <http://book.coe.int/ftp/3667.pdf>.

⁷⁷ *Courageous leadership and new directions needed to beat intolerance in Europe*, 15 May 2011, available at: <http://www.neurope.eu/articles/Courageous-leadership-and-new-directions-needed-to-beat-intolerance-in-Europe-/106395.php>.

Forced to act on the issues of xenophobia, Islamophobia and racism – issues I had pounded Commissioner Hammarberg with every week and in every article I wrote – the Commissioner took as firm and unequivocal a stand as I did through both my writing on the subject and my hunger strike in defense of Europe’s oppressed minorities in academia and in society. The impact I had on the leadership of the Council of Europe in respect to protecting the weak, the poor and the foreign from prejudice and racism, is undoubtedly the most important contribution I made to the restoration of tolerance and to the principle of equality under the law in Europe and beyond. By showing that programmes like SAC, strategies like Prevent, policies like CONTEST, and international agreements like Resolution 1624 (2005) are rooted in state-sponsored discrimination and have a destructive impact on families, communities, nations and on the international community, I shed light on what is the darkest side of our times.

I spoke truth to power and poked my fingers in the eyes of Europe’s racist populace, shaming Europe’s leaders and common citizens for exporting their prejudices and poisoning the world with bigotry and hatred. My criticism echoed throughout the West for I put a mirror in front of every government and every citizen who sanctions and justifies discrimination and who accepts a global regime of surveillance, censorship and oppression in order to satisfy their basest instincts of racism, retribution and fear.

Commissioner Hammarberg, I am happy to see, has found the courage to follow my lead. On the 31st of May, 20 days after I finished my hunger strike, he went on record with the strongest indictment from a public official of Europe’s “*crisis situation*” because of rising xenophobia and Islamophobia.⁷⁸ Echoing my words, the Commissioner identifies “*a lack of courage among the politicians to stand up and defend the values that we have agreed upon in Europe, since quite some time*” as the reason why Europe failed to stem Islamophobia and xenophobia. As a result, he went on to say:

“This is seen by some people as legitimizing their prejudices, which in turn has unfortunately led to the growth of some extremist movements who feel that their position, their propaganda has actually been more or less approved by the leading politicians. So there is a combined crisis here when it comes to basic values, fear among the people and the lack of principled positions by the politicians.”

Echoing my words and analysis Commissioner Hammarberg laments Europe’s failure to develop a sensible migration policy, a refugee friendly policy towards migrants, and to create an environment where minorities are not afraid and feel respected. As I did in my articles, the Commissioner recognizes that the economic crisis engenders fear among the populace due to hardship and insecurity and that this has made foreigners who are the most vulnerable members of society the scapegoats of everyone’s problems.

⁷⁸ Europe faces crisis because of rising Islamophobia, 31 May 2011: <http://www.todayszaman.com/news-245708-europe-faces-crisis-because-of-rising-islamophobia-says-coes-hammarberg.html>.

That my hunger strike was not fruitless is shown by the fact that the Council of Europe now recognizes that “*human rights are absolutely crucial*” and as a result this is now “*high up on the political agenda*”. Thanks to my efforts and writings there is now “*also recognition among the wealthiest European countries that they too have human rights problems*”. There was no such recognition and priorities in Europe before to my arrival on the European political scene. Europe has yet to acknowledge my achievement.

My impact in Europe went beyond the subjects of justice and discrimination. One week after I began my hunger strike at the Council of Europe, it called an Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Cross-border Internet to draft Internet Governance Principles for a declaration by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers.⁷⁹

Aware that the issue I brought before the Council of Europe strikes at the heart of Internet freedom, since SAC applies first and foremost to online courses; the Council of Europe was preparing itself for action.

While this may have been just a coincidence and had nothing to do with my presence in Strasbourg, what happened two months later, on June 17 was certainly no coincidence. Attending a conference organized by Article 19, the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr. Thomas Hammarberg, used the occasion to pull together all the issues I had challenged him to act upon over the course of the four weeks that I hungered at his door and bombarded him with weekly written and public requests.

The issues in question are: protecting freedom of expression on the Internet, UN responsibility for combating state-sponsored censorship, media freedom, the illegality of super-injunctions, Britain’s ideas on reforming the European Court of Human Rights, Britain’s submission to the European Court’s rulings, Turkey’s and Britain’s future in the Council of Europe, and the filtering and blocking of material on the Internet that governments find embarrassing.

⁷⁹ Council of Europe, April 18-19, Internet Freedom: from principles to global treaty law? <http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/media-dataprotection/conf-internetfreedom/Internet%20Governance%20Principles.pdf>.

Commissioner Hammarberg now speaks my language. He criticizes the United Nations and especially UNESCO, as the relevant UN body, for failing to live up to its responsibility for protecting freedom of expression on the Internet and urges it to deal with the problem by setting up a commission. This is a direct reference to my criticism of the UN and to the unchecked powers given to the CTC and the CTED at the Security Council level.⁸⁰ No such interagency blaming was ever evident prior to my attack on the technocrats and Eurocrats who populate the UN and the EU institutions.



Thomas Hammarberg, the Council of Europe's commissioner for human rights, said the UN should pay more attention to the internet.
Photograph: Olivier Morin/AFP/Getty Images

On media freedom Commissioner Hammarberg urges Europe's politicians to become engaged in favor of media's freedom of expression rather than continuing to pass laws that restrict the free flow of information on the Internet.

⁸⁰ The CTC (*Counter-Terrorism Committee*) and the CTED (*Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate*) are the UN bodies responsible for coordinating and supervising the global war on terror. Resolution 1624 (2005), introduced by the UK, gives these bodies the legal authority to allow governments to arrest and incarcerate their citizens for legitimate dissent by branding them radicals simply because they dared exercise their right to freedom of expression. How many hundreds of thousands of dissidents, opposition party members and innocents rot in prisons throughout the world as a result of Britain's Resolution 1624 (2005) is unknown and will never be known because Resolution 1624 (2005) also forces the media, human rights organizations and the courts to remain silent. The damage done to democratic aspirations throughout the world is incalculable and is the reason why democracy is on the retreat the world over. See pp. 3-13 in my article "*Message from The Man Outside at 14 Days of Hunger Strike*": https://wikispooks.com/w/images/3/31/Message_from_the_man_outside_after_14_days_of_hunger_strike.pdf

He criticizes super-injunctions as a violation of the right to freedom of expression. These are direct references to the corruption of the press and courts that I exposed in two articles I published during the hunger strike.⁸¹

The Commissioner asks the UK to contribute positively to reforming the European Court, which is the polite way of saying “stop destroying the court” and upbraids the UK for failing to comply with the Court’s rulings and for threatening to ignore the Court’s jurisdiction, which jeopardizes the very existence of the Court and Council:

“I hope the UK authorities would go into this [positively] and not try to tear it down. Any discussions about leaving would be damaging, not only to the people who want to use the court but to other structures of Europe. Why should Russia and Turkey remain in [the Council of Europe] if not even the UK stays?”⁸²

Before I exposed Britain as the brain behind the attack on the Court, the Council of Europe was praising Britain as a pillar of European justice. Due to my revelations the Council of Europe now understands that Britain had built and planted a Trojan horse inside the Court in the form of the Izmir Declaration, whose reforms, if approved in Istanbul, would have annihilated the Court and made justice a fiction in Europe.⁸³

On the issue of filtering and blocking of material on the Internet that governments find embarrassing, Commissioner Hammarberg diplomatically mirrors and addresses the concerns I brought before him in the context of online censorship of students debating political issues as part of their course requirements, as well as the media silence in respect to covert and illegal programmes instituted in the name of countering radicalization. This is the very crux of SAC. To solve this problem, Commissioner Hammarberg wants the UN to act since there is “*a need for an international dimension*”.

⁸¹ See p. 11 in my article “*Educating the “Educated”: Message From The Man Outside at 21 Days of Hunger Strike*”, 2 May 2011, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/f/f8/Educating_the_educated.pdf and at <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae3.pdf>. See also pp. 3-8 in my article “*Is Commissioner Hammarberg Protecting the Emir of Qatar? Is the Council of Europe Subservient to British Interests?*”, 9 May 2011, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/2/28/Is_Commissioner_Hammarberg_Protecting_the_Emire_of_Qatar.pdf and at <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae5.pdf>.

⁸² *The Guardian*, “Internet freedom ‘is a matter for UN’”, 17 June 2011: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/law/butterworth-and-bowcott-on-law/2011/jun/17/internet-freedom-matter-un>.

⁸³ See pp. 12-13 in my article “*Educating the “Educated”: Message From The Man Outside at 21 Days of Hunger Strike*”, 2 May 2011, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/f/f8/Educating_the_educated.pdf and at <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae3.pdf>. See also my full article “*The People’s Declaration on Restoring the Powers of the European Court of Human Rights*”, 9 May 2011, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/e/e0/THE_PEOPLE%27S_DECLARATION.pdf and at <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae6.pdf>.

Having publically upbraided Britain for its responsibility in undermining the founding principles of the EU and for violating the rights enshrined in the European Convention, the Council of Europe needed to mend bridges with the government of the UK. For this express purpose, Thorbjørn Jagland, Secretary General of the Council of Europe, travelled to London on 7 June 2011 to meet with Britain's Foreign Secretary, William Hague.



Foreign Secretary William Hague meeting Thorbjørn Jagland, Secretary General of the Council of Europe in London, 7 June 2011.

MY IMPACT AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

The United Nations is a behemoth that suffocates the life of even the most important and urgent issues in its monolithic and rigid bureaucracies. What it has not been able to stifle, however, is the introduction of four simple words into the report of the UN Special Rapporteur, Frank La Rue, on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression.⁸⁴

These words are “*criminalization of legitimate expression*” and were it not for my two year struggle for freedom in education and my 32 day hunger strike in Strasbourg they would have never made it into the rapporteur’s document. They signify a recognition by the UN’s watchdogs that the violations of free speech and freedom of conscience committed under the pretext of countering radicalization and enabled by Resolution 1624 (2005) could no longer be allowed to continue. Britain and the governments of the world that have used and abused the powers given by Resolution 1624 (2005) and similar instruments have now been warned that their actions are outside the law and that they have to mend their ways.

⁸⁴ “*Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Frank La Rue*”, UN General Assembly, 16 May 2011:

<http://www.article19.org/pdfs/reports/report-of-the-special-rapporteur-on-the-promotion-and-protection-of-the-right.pdf>.

Whether Britain will retreat or will once again impose its will by hook or by crook on the politicians of continental Europe, on the Eurocrats in Brussels and Strasbourg and on the bureaucrats of the UN remains to be seen. If Britain succeeds in reviving its controls of free speech and freedom of conscience on the Internet, in universities and in the media, the world's citizens will wake up one day to the ugly realization that they have been reduced to the status of mere subjects of the British crown and their lesser royal allies from Qatar to Timbuktu and that they have to accept the hereditary privileges of the nobility as a God given right and the policies of the British government as infallible truths or else pack up their bags and move to the moon.

Similar stereotypical outcomes await the citizens of nations who assume the same control of expressional rights as Britain. Few however have the ability to influence more people, governments and organizations than Britain given the dominance of the English language and the central role British schools and universities play in educating the sons and daughters of the global elites.

Frank La Rue's report was presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the 16th of May 2011. On the criminalization of legitimate expression the report reads:

72. The Special Rapporteur remains concerned that legitimate online expression is being criminalized in contravention of States' international human rights obligations, whether it is through the application of existing criminal laws to online expression, or through the creation of new laws specifically designed to criminalize expression on the Internet. Such laws are often justified as being necessary to protect individuals' reputation, national security or to counter terrorism. However, in practice, they are frequently used to censor content that the Government and other powerful entities do not like or agree with.

73. The Special Rapporteur reiterates the call to all States to decriminalize defamation. Additionally, he underscores that protection of national security or countering terrorism cannot be used to justify restricting the right to expression unless it can be demonstrated that: (a) the expression is intended to incite imminent violence; (b) it is likely to incite such violence; and (c) there is a direct and immediate connection between the expression and the likelihood or occurrence of such violence.⁸⁵

Emboldened by the UN Rapporteur's report, the organization Article 19 expressed its concern on 26 May 2011 that the G8, led by French President Nicholas Sarkozy, is attempting to impose tighter controls and unjustifiable restrictions on the Internet instead of respecting its obligations not to violate freedom of expression.⁸⁶ Article 19 quotes the UN rapporteur's findings to stem the political tide towards more control and in so doing criticizes the G8 for the very infringements I exposed, infringements that are taboo in the press because governments use them to hide the suppression of legitimate dissent.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 20.

⁸⁶ "G8: New Unjustified Internet Restrictions Would Hamper Free Flow of Information", 26 May 2011, available at: <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/press/g8-new-unjustified-internet-restrictions-would-hamper-free-flow-of-informati.pdf>.

The UN Special Rapporteur expressed “deep concern” about “increasingly sophisticated technologies to block content, monitor and identify activists and critics, criminalization of legitimate expression, and adoption of restrictive legislation to justify measures,” as well as the lack of transparency surrounding such measures, particularly when they appear to be used to prevent the dissemination of information that is embarrassing to governments.

On May 9, I had written an open letter entitled “*Appeal to Reason*”⁸⁷ to President Obama, President Sarkozy, Bundeskanzlerin Merkel and Prime Minister Cameron in which I pleaded with them:

I ask you as a father, as a Canadian and as a global citizen to halt the onslaught on our democracies and democratic aspirations, the debasement of our fundamental rights and liberties, the annihilation of good will among peoples and nations, and the destruction of our children's futures committed by State actors in the name of countering radicalization.

Disband the CTC and CTED, scrap the counter-radicalization deception, and condemn and punish those responsible for debasing free speech and freedom of conscience on their most sacred ground, the universities, where they must be protected like humanity's greatest treasures. As heads of state and close allies you have the authority to coordinate such a change of direction. You have tied the Gordian knot, you must now untie it. History will look harshly upon you if you don't.

I shall stand guard at the gates of power, ragged and hungry, until you do.

I received no response from any of the four heads of state but six days later, shortly after my return to Canada, I was arrested.

On the 1st of June 2011, the four international special rapporteurs on freedom of expression released their annual Joint Declaration on *Freedom of Expression and the Internet*.⁸⁸ They call on national governments and other parties to respect freedom of expression in internet communications and they remind governments that international human rights rules on freedom of expression apply to internet communications.

On the 3rd of June 2011, Frank La Rue's Report was presented to the UN Human Rights Council.

To what extent I contributed to this cascading activity on freedom of expression at the highest international bodies is hard to tell. What is certain is that my uncensored articles and center stage hunger strike helped turn the tide. No one else made greater personal sacrifices or drew more attention to a subject that is actively suppressed by governments throughout the world.

⁸⁷ “*Appeal to Reason: Letter to President Obama, Président Sarkozy, Bundeskanzlerin Merkel and Prime Minister Cameron*”, 9 May 2011, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/5/5e/APPEAL_TO_REASON.pdf and at <http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae4.pdf>.

⁸⁸ International Mechanisms for Promoting Freedom of Expression, JOINT DECLARATION ON FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AND THE INTERNET, 1 June 2011, available at: <http://www.article19.org/pdfs/press/international-mechanisms-for-promoting-freedom-of-expression.pdf>.

What is also certain is that I would have achieved absolutely nothing were it not for WikiSpooks and Cryptome and their courage to publish my articles in full and without amendments. They helped me bring the truth out into the open when the media, the courts, NGOs and civil society skirted their responsibilities and acted as obedient arms of the state in the full knowledge that their silence constitutes accessory to crime.

I will now sum up what I have accomplished with my hunger strike and writings. In shutting down SAC in the UK and the EU I saved Europe's universities from censorship and surveillance and the poor, the weak, the decent and the foreign (who refuse to debase their opinions, values and consciences in order to conform and acquiesce) from state-sponsored discrimination. This has positive repercussions on the very fabric of democracy throughout the West, on media freedom, on freedom of expression on the Internet, on tolerance towards minorities and immigrants, on greater transparency in the courts, on the curtailment of super-injunctions, on equality under the law, and on integrity in government and international institutions. Had I not made personal sacrifices and shown the courage to expose Europe's attack on freedom of speech and conscience the cancer of surveillance and censorship would have spread to universities throughout the world and would have infected the international community as a whole, as indeed the British example has shown.

In exposing the hidden ideological objectives of Britain's Prevent strategy and to a lesser extent of the EU, I have forced the British government to cut funding for groups and programmes that violate human rights and civil liberties while purportedly combating radicalization and the EU to abandon plans to forge ahead with following Britain's lead and making the same mistakes. This will save Britain's and Europe's taxpayers billions and will save their societies from internal disintegration due to the corruption of the rule of law and the cooption of the press and civil society to remain silent to the cries of those who fall victim. I have also prevented the perversion of relations between religions and within communities as well as the sectarian violence that would have ultimately ensued.

In identifying the UN Security Council's Resolution 1624 (2005) and the CTC and CTED as the source and enablers of state crimes committed under the cover of combating radicalization I have exposed and temporarily halted the advance of global autocracy. I have also sounded the alarm bells that the New Global Order has deviated unnecessarily far from democratic principles and that if it continues on this path it will fail to deliver global security and economic prosperity let alone create a world without borders and will instead cause social and economic disintegration in both the developing and the developed world.

In exposing the British-Turkish attack on the European Court of Human Rights I have reengaged the European Assembly to exercise democratic oversight on the reform process that is to help the Court meet its responsibilities. If the Council of Ministers heeds my warnings and follows the prescriptions I outlined in the People's Declaration rather than adopting those of Britain's Izmir Declaration then the Court could be saved from becoming irrelevant.

Last but not least, I have shown that a single person can have a great impact on the political process and on shaping the world we live in. All it takes is the courage to speak truth to power.

*

Europe and indeed the world owe me a great debt of gratitude that they have yet to acknowledge. Instead of accolades, however, I was subjected to a most vicious attack as soon as I returned home on May 13.

Between May 15 and 18, I was forced into a hospital's psychiatry ward, denied access to the patient advocate, and subjected to a psychological evaluation. Unable to find me insane or deficient in any way, two hours before my release from hospital I was then charged with a crime I did not commit (criminal domestic harassment), prevented from calling a lawyer, denied bail, and thrown in prison. Upon my eventual release on bail on May 24 I was cut off from my children, thrown out of my own home; robbed of my laptop computer by the police; prevented from accessing my office, reference books, manuscripts and database; forced to abide by a midnight to 7 AM curfew, and stripped of my passport.⁸⁹

The Canadian police and the Crown have also forced me on threat of imprisonment to give up evidence that exonerates me from any wrongdoing and which shows unequivocally that the accusations against me are malicious and premeditated.

Timed to coincide with my forcible incarceration in a psychiatric ward (May 15-18), was the response of the European Court of Human Rights, which arrived at my home in Canada on Monday, May 16, two days after I was thrown in the psychiatry ward of Hotel Dieu Hospital in Kingston.

Even though the Court's decision was made on April 19 and the letter is dated April 26 it was not sent to me until three weeks later.

Why the European Court did not give me the letter while I was in France so I can terminate my hunger strike and go home, and instead let me suffer from hunger for an additional 24 days, can have only one logical explanation. The European and Canadian authorities needed the time to coordinate an attack on me and decided that the best way to do it is by declaring me insane, this being the most effective way to discredit my allegation that the UK and the EU engage in the unlawful surveillance and censorship of students in universities.

⁸⁹ For a detailed account of what happened to me after the hunger strike, including my imprisonment and the destruction of my family, please read my article "*The Man Inside: Incipient Totalitarianism in the Western World*", at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/3/34/THE_MAN_INSIDE_INCIPIENT_TOTALITARIANISM_IN_THE_WESTERN_WORLD.pdf.

They were given the ammunition they needed to make their case stick by none other than my wife, who has been irrational due to postpartum depression aggravated by what I believe to be bipolar disorder from the day our second son was born a year ago, and who wrote an email to the Court of Human Rights on April 20 telling them that I have “*some mental issues*” and that my brother “*Dr. Razvan Galalae has confirmed this*”, both allegations being totally untrue and typical of her aberrant behavior when gripped by a psychotic episode.⁹⁰

Nevertheless, the European Court acted upon my wife’s email and contacted the French-German police in Kehl who then visited my brother in Germany, and asked him to dissuade me from continuing my hunger strike. When this failed, the authorities then began planning my demise.

⁹⁰ To prove my mental health, I have undergone two independent psychological evaluations upon my release from prison on bail. The first was on June 6 and issued on June 14 (https://wikispooks.com/wiki/File:Bruce_Cook_forensic_report_2011_06_14.pdf) while the second was conducted on June 3 and issued on June 20 (https://wikispooks.com/wiki/File:Dr_Beharry_Report_2011-06-24.pdf).



EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Mr Mugur K C Galalae
Room 22
Hôtel des Princes
33, rue Geiler
F-67000 Strasbourg

ECHR-LE11.00R (CD1)
CO/ma

26 April 2011

Application no. 13386/11
Galalae v. the United Kingdom

COPY

Dear Sir,

I write to inform you that on 19 April 2011 the European Court of Human Rights, sitting in a single-judge formation (V.A. de Gaetano), decided to declare inadmissible your application lodged on 25 February 2011 and registered under the above-mentioned number. The Court found that the requirements of the Convention had not been met.

In the light of all the material in its possession, and in so far as the matters complained of were within its competence, the Court found that they did not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms set out in the Convention or its Protocols.

This decision is final and not subject to any appeal to either the Court, including its Grand Chamber, or any other body. You will therefore appreciate that the Registry will be unable to provide any further details about the single judge's deliberations or to conduct further correspondence relating to its decision in this case. You will receive no further documents from the Court concerning this case and, in accordance with the Court's instructions, the file will be destroyed one year after the date of the decision.

The present communication is made pursuant to Rule 52A of the Rules of Court.

Yours faithfully,
For the Court

Clare Ovey
Head of Division

Cc: 412 Emerald Street; Kingston, Ontario; Canada K7P 3E3 ✓

I contend that the European Court's decision to reject my application as inadmissible because it "*did not disclose any appearance of a violation of the rights and freedoms set out in the Convention and its Protocols*" was politically motivated and in no way reflects the facts.⁹¹

I come to this conclusion for the following reasons:

First of all, the judge assigned to my case, V. A. de Gaetano⁹², could not have possibly read my application in its entirety and therefore could not have made an informed decision. I say this because the European Court did not know about my hunger strike until the day I obtained a hunger strike permit from the police prefecture in Strasbourg, which happened on April 13.⁹³ I did not deliver the hunger strike permit to the Court of Human Rights until the day after, April 14, which means that a judge could not have been assigned to my case until, at the earliest, Friday April 15. Since April 16 and 17 were Saturday and Sunday respectively and judges do not work on the weekend, judge V. A. de Gaetano, had only two days, Friday April 15 and Monday April 18, to read and consider hundreds of pages of evidence that I had attached to my file. This is an impossible task because the documents supplied are extensive and dense and require time to fully comprehend. The judge, therefore, arrived at his decision without having an understanding of the case.

Secondly, April 19, when judge de Gaetano passed his verdict on my application, is also the day I published my first article in France, article in which I provided conclusive evidence in the form of an embassy cable sent by the US embassy in London to the U.S. State Department, which proves that Germany and France deny young people from suspect countries the right to study chemistry in Europe's universities.⁹⁴ The European authorities panicked and must have applied pressure on the European Court to act immediately by rejecting my application.

The rejection of my case indicates that the highest court in Europe is subject to the same limitations and political pressures as the highest national courts and that in cases that concern national security or pan-European embarrassment, which open governments to extraordinary liabilities and politicians to legal responsibility and possible imprisonment, the European Court is not allowed to accept such cases. This restriction goes beyond super-injunctions and gag orders, for it is a predetermined and absolute decision not to allow such cases to come to trial, period.

⁹¹ "*Kevin Galalae vs. the United Kingdom. Application no. 13386/11, European Court of Human Rights*", 1 March 2011:

https://wikispooks.com/w/images/1/19/Kevin_Galalae_vs._the_United_Kingdom%2C_European_Court_of_Human_Rights.pdf.

⁹² Judge V. A. de Gaetano comes from Malta and was elected judge of the European Court of Human Rights for a period of nine years starting on 22 June 2010: <https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1640113&Site=COE>.

⁹³ Hunger strike permit from Strasbourg police prefecture:

https://wikispooks.com/w/images/f/f6/Strasbourg_Permit.pdf.

⁹⁴ See p. 4 in "*Hunger Strike Appeal Letter to Mr. Hammarberg, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights*", 19 April 2011, available at: https://wikispooks.com/w/images/2/2f/Kevin_Galalae%27s_hunger_strike_appeal_letter.pdf and at

<http://cryptome.org/0003/kevin-galalae.htm>.

Further reasons leading me to conclude that I am the victim of a political attack are provided by the bail conditions I was given.

The bail conditions imposed on me are without a doubt amongst the most severe ever imposed on a Canadian who does not have a criminal record, a history of violence, who has not threatened anyone, who has not breached bail conditions and who is merely charged with domestic harassment, which is among the lightest offences in the criminal record. Had I been a common citizen I would have been released on my own recognizance. One must ask why have I not been released on my own recognizance and instead was given nearly impossible bail conditions?

These absurd conditions make no sense in the context of my domestic harassment charge or my personal record as a law-abiding citizen, loving father, primary caregiver for my children, devoted husband and peaceful person. They do however make perfect sense if the objectives of the police and Crown are:

1. to destroy me by destroying my family and alienating me from my wife and children (hence the no contact order either directly or indirectly with my wife and children, even though my wife subsequently asked the police to drop the charges, and has shown signs that she wants to reconcile);



My son, Oliver, in my arms, deprived of his father by the forces of autocracy.

2. to prevent me from publishing articles critical of the government or researching further state misdeeds (hence the police's refusal to return my laptop computer from police custody and to allow me to take my desktop computer, scanner, printer and fax from my office at home,

where I have always worked from);

3. to stop me from travelling abroad and continuing my hunger strike in Strasbourg, France, or engaging in further activism (hence the confiscation of my Canadian passport and the prohibition that I use or apply for any other passport, such as my Romanian passport, since I hold dual citizenship, Romanian and Canadian);
4. to show me that the Canadian state can and will take away my children despite my and my wife's wishes (hence the prohibition that I get anywhere near my children despite being their primary caregiver and despite the fact that my wife needs me to come home and take care of the children so she can go to work – a prohibition that is a slap in my face given that my hunger strike pamphlet in Europe was entitled “**HANDS OFF OUR CHILDREN**”);
5. to undermine my ability to work as a writer for the Asian company I work for and leading me to job loss and bankruptcy (hence the confiscation of all my computers and office equipment, work database, and reference books, manuscripts and materials which are critical to my work).

In analyzing the conditions of bail imposed on me by the Crown vis-à-vis my alleged crime of domestic harassment it becomes evident that the police and Crown have ulterior motives, motives that have nothing to do with protecting my family or from the potential of further harassment.

The actions of the police and Crown are also suspect because they defy the purpose of my arrest and because they cause far more harm to me and my family than their purported intent to protect my wife and children from my alleged inability to care for myself and for them. During the past two years I spent c. \$10,000 on my political activism and two trips to Strasbourg, France, to sue the British Government at the European Court of Human Rights and, respectively, to protest at the Council of Europe. By contrast, the false and malicious charges the police laid have cost me and my family more than \$15,000 in just one month and unless dropped will bankrupt us and will cause us to lose our jobs, our house and thus end up penniless in the street.

In October 2010, I signaled my intention to pursue legal action against the government of the UK at the European Court of human rights and at the UN in order to “*shame and punish those who rob us of our rights*” and to ascertain if “*these institutions are still untainted and not yet beholden to autocratic interests and forces*”.

In light of the European Court's decision and continuing silence from UN institutions, I can now assert with a great degree of certainty that the systems of European and global governance have been fully co-opted by autocratic interests and forces and that the common man has no recourse to justice if he or she challenges or exposes a program or policy that is crucial to the global elite's interests and to their entrenchment of power.

At the same time, in light of my personal success in exposing and shaming individuals, organizations and governments responsible for acting outside the law and for violating human rights and civil liberties, I can also assert that all is not lost and that democracy, freedom and the rule of law can be defended with global effect by a single individual who is “crazy” enough to say “here I cross a line in the sand and will die defending the future of our children regardless how awesome the enemy or great the dangers.”

CONCLUSION

The battle against the newest incarnation of tyranny, structural violence, continues.

As of February 2015, the British government has issued no apology to any of the tens of thousands of young lives it has destroyed in the name of combatting radicalization and has yet to pay a single pound in compensation.

More alarmingly, new legislation has come into effect to strengthen the global police state. This legislation, as its precursors, is based on false flag events orchestrated for the purpose of encroaching even further on our basic rights and liberties.

On the bright side, the British government has lost all credibility with its own citizens as well as citizens around the world and is now treated with the same disdain by an awakened populace as any rogue state deserves.

The deception surrounding the illusion of democracy and the rule of law has fallen. The establishment, blind to their condition, refuse to admit their failures and make room for a new generation of leaders and for a new and better system.

The longer they delay the inevitable the smaller the change for a peaceful transition of power.

If violence erupts they will have only themselves to blame.