



Home Office

Performance and Risk 020 7035 4848
Directorate (switchboard)
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF www.gov.uk

Sean Moran

Via e-mail: request-363731-1b7eea8a@whatdotheyknow.com

Date 7th April 2017

Freedom of Information request – 41381

Dear Mr Moran

Thank you for your e-mail of 28th November 2016 in which you ask for an internal review into the handling of your Freedom of Information (FOI) request 41381 regarding multiculturalism and United Nations Resolution 260. Your request for an internal review is set out in full in **Annex A**. Your original request is set out in full at **Annex B**.

I apologise for the delay in replying to your request for an internal review. The Home Office aims to reply to requests for an internal review within 20 days, or exceptionally 40 days for complex cases. Unfortunately, this is not always possible.

I have now completed the review. I have considered whether the correct procedures were followed and can confirm that I was not involved in the initial handling of your request.

My conclusion is that the Home Office's original response to your request, ref 41381, set out at **Annex C**, was correct in applying section 14(1) (**vexatious request**) of the Act.

It may be helpful if I explain that there are a number of factors that are considered when determining if a request is vexatious: abusive or aggressive language, burden on the authority in responding to the request, personal grudges, unreasonable persistence, unfounded accusations, intransigence, frequent or overlapping requests, deliberate intention to cause annoyance, scattergun approach, disproportionate effort, no obvious intent to obtain information, futile requests. We do not suggest that all or even most of these factors apply to your request, but some of them do. In reaching the decision that your request is vexatious we bore in mind recent case law and the Information Commissioner's guidance.

The Information Commissioner's guidance is on the ICO website at the link below under the section entitled 'What if we want to make a request vexatious'. Follow the additional link to the guidance note 'Dealing with vexatious requests':

<https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-freedom-of-information/refusing-a-request/>

The request has the features of a 'scattergun approach' and appears to be intended to 'fish for information' without any clear idea of what might be revealed or even what recorded information is being requested.

The difficulty with the request is not so much that some parts of might be regarded as giving offence (and I consider the suggestion in the original response that the request could have caused distress rather excessive). Rather, the way in which the request is worded makes it difficult to provide a meaningful response in terms of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), or indeed any response at all. For example, question 4 refers to 'ongoing genocide'. To respond in any way to this question might make it appear that the Home Office accepts that such genocide is taking place. Similarly, questions 5 and 6 refer to a 'terminal decline' in the birth rate of 'indigenous British people'. Again, to respond would involve appearing to accept the terms in which the question is posed.

I note that you signed your original request in the name of Watt Tyler, recognised as the leader of the 1381 Peasants Revolt in England. I can confirm that our response was addressed to Sean Moran, using your correct name indicated on e-mails sent by you to the Department.

I conclude that the Home Office was correct to refuse the request as vexatious under section 14(1) of the FOIA.

This completes the internal review process by the Home Office. If you remain dissatisfied with the response to your FOI request, you have the right of complaint to the Information Commissioner at the following address:

The Information Commissioner
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire SK9 5AF

Yours sincerely

Anne Tomkins
Information Rights Team

Switchboard 020 7035 4848
E-mail FOIRequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

Annex A: Request for internal review in full

I am writing to request an internal review of Home Office's handling of my FOI request 'Multiculturalism And United Nations Resolution 260 Against Genocide'.

These are very serious questions of national importance and to avoid them by calling them offensive is ridiculous.

A full history of my FOI request and all correspondence is available on the Internet at this address: https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/multiculturalism_and_united_nati

Annex B: Original FOI request 41381

Sean Moran [<mailto:request-363731-1b7eea8a@whatdotheyknow.com>]

Sent: 09 October 2016 09:36

To: FOI Requests

Subject: Freedom of Information request - Multiculturalism And United Nations Resolution 260 Against Genocide

Dear Home Office,

The term "multiculturalism" is used in British Politics for the blueprint laid out in "Practical Idealism" by Coudenhove-Kalergi for the European Union and the racial make up of Europe.

A Coudenhove-Kalergi prize is given every two years to whichever politician, or public figure, has done the most to further the goals of "Practical Idealism" - winners have included Angela Merkel and the Pope.

"Practical Idealism" clearly states that the racial goal is to mix Europeans with Africans and Asians to create a mutant race and therefore eradicate the European race.

British politicians, such as Tony Blair, have repeatedly stated they want Britain and Europe to become "coffee coloured" and for the European (White) races to cease to exist.

The questions related to this are:

1. Does the Home Secretary know that "Practical Idealism" is the blueprint for multiculturalism and the European Union?
2. Has the Home Office obtained, or sought, any legal advice regarding multiculturalism and United Nations resolution 260 (1948) against genocide?
3. Does the Home Office have any models for the future racial make up of Britain?
4. Has the Home Office received any correspondence relating to this ongoing genocide from any lawyers or Human Rights organisations? If so please forward copies of all correspondence.
5. Is the Home Office implementing any policies to combat the birth rate of indigenous British people which is now in terminal decline?
6. Does the Home Office believe that they have any legal obligations to implement policies to combat the birth rate of indigenous British people which is now in terminal decline?
7. Is there, or has there ever been, an immunity from prosecution for politicians, journalists, corporations etc. for their role in promoting multiculturalism?
8. Does the Conservative Government still have a policy of "multiculturalism"?

Yours faithfully,

Watt Tyler

Annex C: Response to FOI request 41381

Sean Moran
request-363731-
1b7eea8a@whatdotheyknow.co
m

17 November 2016

Dear Mr Moran

Freedom of Information request: reference 41381

Thank you for your e-mail of 9 October 2016, in which you ask for information about multiculturalism and the European Union. Your request has been handled as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and it can be found in full in the enclosed annex.

We have considered your request and we believe it to be vexatious as it contains language which has caused distress. Section 14(1) of the Act provides that the Home Office is not obliged to comply with a request for information of this nature.

Guidance issued by the ICO on vexatious requests can be found at this link:

<https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/1198/dealing-with-vexatious-requests.pdf>

If you are dissatisfied with this response you may request an independent internal review of our handling of your request by submitting a complaint within two months to the address below, quoting reference **41381**. If you ask for an internal review, it would be helpful if you could say why you are dissatisfied with the response.

Information Rights Team
Home Office Fourth Floor, Peel Building
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF
e-mail: foirequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

As part of any internal review the Department's handling of your information request will be reassessed by staff who were not involved in providing you with this response. If you remain dissatisfied after this internal review, you would have a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner as established by section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act.

Yours sincerely
Martin Riddle
Information Rights Team
Switchboard 020 7035 4848
E-mail FOIRequests@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

Annex A

Freedom of Information request from Sean Moran (reference 41381)

The term "multiculturalism" is used in British Politics for the blueprint laid out in "Practical Idealism" by Coudenhove-Kalergi for the European Union and the racial make up of Europe. A Coudenhove-Kalergi prize is given every two years to whichever politician, or public figure, has done the most to further the goals of "Practical Idealism" - winners have included Angela Merkel and the Pope.

"Practical Idealism" clearly states that the racial goal is to mix Europeans with Africans and Asians to create a mutant race and therefore eradicate the European race.

British politicians, such as Tony Blair, have repeatedly stated they want Britain and Europe to become "coffee coloured" and for the European (White) races to cease to exist.

The questions related to this are:

1. Does the Home Secretary know that "Practical Idealism" is the blueprint for multiculturalism and the European Union?
2. Has the Home Office obtained, or sought, any legal advice regarding multiculturalism and United Nations resolution 260 (1948) against genocide?
3. Does the Home Office have any models for the future racial make up of Britain?
4. Has the Home Office received any correspondence relating to this ongoing genocide from any lawyers or Human Rights organisations? If so please forward copies of all correspondence.
5. Is the Home Office implementing any policies to combat the birth rate of indigenous British people which is now in terminal decline?
6. Does the Home Office believe that they have any legal obligations to implement policies to combat the birth rate of indigenous British people which is now in terminal decline?
7. Is there, or has there ever been, an immunity from prosecution for politicians, journalists, corporations etc. for their role in promoting multiculturalism?
8. Does the Conservative Government still have a policy of "multiculturalism"?