



Verwaltungsgemeinschaft
Freie Stadt Danzig

**Senatspräsident
Beowulf von Prince**
Schweizer Str. 38
AT-6830 Rankweil
prince.beowulf@outlook.de
www.verfassung.info

Dec. 27, 2021

Beowulf von Prince, Schweizer Str. 38, AT-6830 Rankweil

To the
Indian, South African, Tanzanian, Madagascan and Uruguayan Bar Associations
With the request to appoint an arbitrator

To the Respondents, UN, WHO, World Medical Association WMA, Interpol, NATO, EU, FRG, Austria, Switzerland, Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy and the Vatican City State - see Exhibits.

WHO Headquarters in Geneva
Avenue Appia 20
CH-1211 Geneva
Switzerland

for information
to the International Court of Justice in The Hague;
our Case No.: 149506 of Jan. 9, 2018

to the International Criminal Court in The Hague:
our Case No. OTP-CR-309/08

to the District Court of Columbia in Washington, D.C.,
our Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN

to the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg - on the preliminary request of a judge from the German state of Thuringia whether he may issue arrest warrants -
ECJ Case No. C-276/20 - 1

to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg - on the complaint already lodged
Case number Karin Leffer: ECHR-Ager6 CMW/elf Subject No. 24493/18 of June 8, 2018

to the Administrative Court of Berlin,
our Case No. VG 6 L 95/21 and VG 6 K 94/21

to the German Federal Administrative Court Leipzig
to the Austrian Federal Administrative Court Vienna
to the Swiss Federal Administrative Court St. Gallen
via the Dutch Embassy in Berlin to the Dutch Administrative Court

via the Belgian Embassy to the Belgian Administrative Court,
via the French Embassy to the French Administrative Court,
via the Italian Embassy to the Italian Administrative Court
for information to the Polish Embassy in Berlin and
to the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Berlin,
others will follow.

Note: With the presentation of this lawsuit, all Corona measures are prohibited. No businessman can claim payment for lost earnings through taxes. The ones liable for the loss of earnings are the party members of the ruling parties and those who enforce the Corona measures. These are the business owners themselves first. Those who want to avoid liability reject the Corona measures. This is done by asking the public order office, the police officer or other supervisor to accept personal liability for Corona measures, confirmed by signature. No politician or "expert" assumes personal liability. Every public order office and every policeman can convince himself of this. He must ask. Who refuses the personal liability and nevertheless threatens with punishments, is quite simply a war criminal. "The last one to bite is the dog." - see Exhibit 5.

This lawsuit is necessary because with the German state of Bavaria leading the way, all guarantees of the rule of law have been eliminated and the European and Swiss institutions are following suit.

Action for damages and compensation for pain and suffering (punitive damages) for violation of Art. 102 and 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, respectively Art. 43 and Art. 48 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

There are therefore no immunities.

Table of contents

1. Preface.....	4
2. Review	9
3. Formals	12
3.1 There is still war	12
3.2 Articles 102 and 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty are being violated.....	12
3.3 International relations due to lack of territorial delimitation.....	13
3.3.1 Arbitration due to Violation of Procedural Rights Guaranteed under International Law.....	13
3.3.2 Legal Practice Violates All Rule of Law Guarantees.....	14
3.3.2.1 The Legal Practice of the German Federal State of Bavaria, Followed by all Others.....	14
3.3.2.2 The European Court of Justice.....	15
3.3.2.3 The European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg.....	15
3.3.2.4 The UN Human Rights Committee in Geneva.....	15
3.4 Arbitration on account of international legal relations.....	16
3.5 On the Arbitration Agreement.....	16
3.6 On Liability.....	16
3.7 On the Rules Governing Arbitration.....	18
3.8 On the Suspension by Arbitration.....	19
4. The Parties.....	19
4.1 The Free City of Danzig.....	19
4.1.1 Danzig as an Area of Law, Freedom and Security	20
4.2 The German Reich.....	21
4.2.1 The SS (Schutzstaffel, Sturmsschutz, satanic sect).....	21
4.2.2 Terms "German," Germany, German nationality.....	22
4.3 The legal succession of the Free City of Danzig by the Federal Republic of Germany.....	26
4.4 On Austria.....	28
4.5 On the Swiss Confederation.....	29
4.6 On the Representative of the Free City of Danzig	30
4.6.1 The Plaintiff as a "German".....	32
4.6.2 The Plaintiff as an Enemy of the Nazis.....	32
4.6.3 The Plaintiff in Management without Order for Anyone Deceived.....	35
4.7 On the Defendants United Nations.....	35
4.8 On Defendants WHO.....	37
4.9 On Interpol.....	38
4.10 On NATO.....	38
4.11 On Defendants EU Commission and EU Parliamentarians of the EU Parliament	39
4.12 On the Vatican.....	40
4.13 On the other Defendants, the political parties	41
4.13.1 Status of the Corona Measures.....	41
5. Claims	45

1. Preface:

The Second World War is not over. It is being actively waged. But there is no need to drop bombs when the enemy can be taken in by corruption, coercion, cunning and trickery. On one side stands the Free City of Danzig, on the other the "Nazis" or whatever you want to call them.

In the Free City of Danzig the legislator can decree what he wants. If a law violates the Constitution, this law is null and void, destined for the wastepaper basket. Therefore, the Free City of Danzig stands for each individual citizen vis-a-vis the government. If a citizen insists on his constitutional rights, he thereby also defends the rights of all others. It can be summed up as: One for all and all for one.

The precedent is there: The Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague, Series A/B No. 65 states:

Consistency of Certain Danzig Legislative Decrees with the Constitution of the Free City

„As regards the second condition, the Court observes that among the principles which the decrees are bound to respect is, as already pointed out, the principle which determines the position of the individual by according him certain fundamental rights (Grundrechte)....“

*„...The problem of the repression of crime may be approached from two different standpoints, that of the individual and that of the community. From the former standpoint, the object is to protect the individual against the State: this object finds its expression in the maxim *N u l l a pœna sine lege*ceptions; **the Danzig Constitution is based upon the former. For this Constitution takes as its starting-point the fundamental rights of the individual...“***

„....To sum up, the Court holds that the decrees of August 10, 1935, are not consistent with the guarantees which Part II of the Danzig Constitution provides for fundamental rights.“

The rights of individual citizens vis-à-vis the state are still not better protected anywhere. Even in the so-called democracies, a constitution can be changed if 2/3 of the deputies agree.

This is not possible in Danzig. Just as little as in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). It should be the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig. The Basic Law (GG) for the FRG has already been amended 60 times. But certain articles still exist, such as:

Art. 120: "The Federation shall bear the costs of the consequences of war and occupation",

Art. 133: "The Federation shall assume the rights and responsibilities of the administration of the United Economic Territory."

as well as Art. 116 GG: "German in the meaning of the GG is...".

This is due to Art. 79 GG *mutatis mutandis*: "The GG cannot be amended insofar as it concerns peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues."

Anyone who wants to can be a Danzig national. And all others are obliged to protect Danzigers, Art. 102 and 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty. Only Nazis do not comply with it. The matter has already been submitted to numerous courts. But all of them are not competent because the Second World War has not ended yet. The representative of the Free City of Danzig is responsible for ending the Second World War. In the military meaning, the representative of the Free City of Danzig orders. Those who have objections must appeal against them. But the orders are concealed from the general public. Therefore, the orders are served in the form of a lawsuit to the affected parties for their comments. Defendants are public bodies. They have to comment on a letter anyway, otherwise the allegations of the letter are accepted. Therefore, one does not have to wait for a court decision. Anyone can present this claim to anyone and point out that it is not contradicted. Anyone who still wants to object will be added as a defendant to this "lawsuit".

It is already clarified that there is no one who takes personal responsibility/liability for the legality/proportionality of Corona measures. German Chancellor Angela Merkel: "The corona virus is changing all our lives." But it is up to each individual whether and how the coronavirus changes his or her life.

World War II began with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig and did not end until a peace treaty was signed with the Free City of Danzig. This should be sealed by the 2 + 4 Treaty from 1990. But this treaty is not fulfilled.

This can be easily verified.

Two plus Four Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany September 12, 1990

(2 = Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and German Democratic Republic of Germany (GDR)) + 4 (powers))

Article 1

.....The confirmation of the definitive nature of the borders of the united Germany is an essential element of the peaceful order in Europe.

*(4) The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic shall ensure that the constitution of the united Germany does not contain any provision incompatible with these principles. This applies accordingly to the provisions laid down in the preamble, the second sentence of **Article 23, and Article 146 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.***

But the governments of the FRG and GDR concluded a Unification Treaty. First the GDR accedes to the Basic Law (GG), Art. 3. Two sentences further, Art. 4 Para. 2 the FRG and the GDR leave the Scope of Application, Art. 23 GG, in which they declare that Art. 23 Scope of Application GG is cancelled.

Thus the GG is formally extinguished. What remains is the "people of the FRG", the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 (1) GG".

All treaties of the Federal Republic of Germany were concluded with the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG". For example, the Double Taxation Treaty with the United States:

"(h) the term "national" means.

(bb) with respect to the Federal Republic of Germany, all Germans within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany...." More on this under Formal.

With the insertion of Section 40a in 1999 in the Nationality Act of the German Reich, execution date July 22, 1913, the "holders of German nationality **in the meaning of Article 116 GG para. 1**" were declared nationals of the National Socialist German Reich. Accordingly, Nazi law is being practiced again step by step.

Nationality Act (StAG)

G. v. July 22, 1913 RGBl. p. 583; last amended by Article 1 G. v. August 12, 2021 BGBl. I p. 3538

Valid from Jan. 1, 1964; FNA: 102-1 Nationality

20 previous versions | is cited in 83 regulations

Article 1 - Fourth Act Amending the Nationality Act (4.StAGÄndG k.a.Abk.)

G. v. Aug. 12, 2021 BGBl. I p. 3538 (No. 54); effective as of Aug. 20, 2021

3 amendments | printed matter / draft / justification | is cited in 1 provision

14. Section 40a shall be repealed.

<https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stag/BJNR005830913.html>

Section 40a (repealed).

Section 40a old

1 Any person who is a German within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law on August 1, 1999, without possessing German nationality shall acquire German nationality on that date.

https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gg/

(1) Unless otherwise provided by a law, a German within the meaning of this Basic Law is a person who possesses German citizenship

Attention. The Nationality Act of the German Reich, date of issue July 22, 1913 has nothing to do with the "possession of German nationality in the meaning of Art. 116 (1)". Logical. There is confusion with the terms, "German" "German national," etc.

When it was pointed out that Section 40a is null and void without the Plaintiff's consent, this Section 40a was repealed without a word of explanation.

This is a full admission of guilt that this law is contrary to international law. Therefore, the repeal or elimination of this law does not restore the old legal relations. That is clear from the overwriting of Section 15.

Isn't it funny that a national of the German Reich, is president of the EU Commission, who doesn't recognize the current borders of Europe and has used a false identity to obtain this position?

On the other hand, Mrs. Karin Leffer is wanted with an arrest warrant. What has Mrs. Karin Leffer done?

She has co-founded the Association for the Law and has demanded, among other things, the verbatim recording of court hearings and the signature of judges under judgments, as all this is required by law. Finally, it has sent individual peace agreements to the United Nations as proof that the 2 + 4 Treaty is individually recognized.

Is there much need to explain that the European institutions are dominated by the Nazis?

If one asks the Europeans the question, whom they trust more, Mrs. Karin Leffer or the European Commission president, then 95% would certainly decide for Mrs. Leffer.

A Nationality Act belongs to a constitution. Nationality includes a national law/ordre public, the international treaties of the state and state assets.

A constitution, a nationality act and the ordre public must contain since when and where it came into force.

The nationals of the German Reich refuse to adopt a constitution according to Art. 146 GG and hold on to their Nationality Act, date of execution 22 July 1913, with scope from today's Alsace-Lorraine to the Russian border, with Nazi law between 1933 - 1945.

Thus a clear legal separation is declared between the "holders of German nationality in the meaning of Article 116 GG Paragraph 1", that is the nationals of the Free City of Danzig on the one hand and the nationals of the German Reich by the Nazis on the other.

The Nazis thus clearly declare to continue the World War and actively continue it. Militarily, this is not necessary, because the indirect surrender by deception in legal relations has already taken place.

Already since the Versailles Peace Treaty, the governments of the "Germans" have been playing a confusing game with the terms "German", "Germany" and "German nationality".

Representatives of the Weimar Republic signed the Versailles Peace Treaty. But the Weimar Constitution has no scope and no Nationality Act. The Nationality Act of the German Reich, issued on July 22, 1913, was adhered to. Once again, its scope applied from today's French Alsace-Lorraine to the Russian border. For the own population and towards foreign countries it was always spoken of the Weimar Republic.

For the own population and opposite the foreign countries the Federal Republic of Germany is the "German state", with the nationality of the Federal Republic of Germany. In truth, the Nationality Act is still valid, date of execution 22 July 1913. In addition, in 1933 the ordre public of the German Reich was replaced by Nazi law.

The German state of Bavaria is de facto a dictatorship again. If the Bavarian Police Tasks Act of 2018 were in force, the perfect SS state would again be established (SS officially means "Sturmschutz", unofficially "satanic sect").

All procedural guarantees for a fair trial are only on paper. European and Swiss judges enforce Bavarian judgments unseen and have thus completely subjected themselves to a dictatorship. Equal rights for all. Whoever wants to judge as a state judge must first ensure that the international treaties on jurisdiction are observed, or that everything is properly judged. The prerequisite for extraditions and recognition of court judgments is that the common obligations under international law for a fair trial are observed. This is what the separation of powers is for. A state judge who claims to be independent of political decisions must ensure that all judges comply with common law. Otherwise, he simply takes sides with judges who do not abide by it. There is an urgent suspicion of bias against all European and Swiss judges and they are therefore fundamentally not competent.

It does not need to be emphasized that all this is happening behind the backs of the population. 90% of the Germans are convinced that they have the nationality of the FRG and consider the FRG to be a free democratic state under the rule of law. Only by the Corona measures one begins to become critical.

In principle, international legal relationships exist. Arbitration courts are therefore obligatory. If proceedings are to be held before a state court, this must be expressly agreed.

Civil law takes precedence over state law. Coercive measures are only permissible in an emergency or dangerous situation. The mildest means must be used. Additional costs are to be borne by those responsible and those carrying out the measures.

The first lockdown was justified correctly; it was necessary to slow down the spread of the coronavirus so that the health care system would not be overburdened. But then it turned out very quickly that only 0.6% of the population was seriously threatened.

No emergency clinics were set up and no threat allowances were paid. Thus, coercive measures are illegal. Everyone can protect himself as he wants, wear 3 masks on top of each other or put on a diving suit with oxygen masks right away, and everyone can be tested and vaccinated as he wants.

The Plaintiff bought 20kg of vitamin C for himself and his relatives and friends when the spread began, and later bought Ivermectin. The Plaintiff has now cared for a person suffering from Corona. In doing so, the Plaintiff has done everything possible to become infected. But the Plaintiff did not become ill. After a week of fever, the Plaintiff administered Ivermectin to „his„ patient. Immediately, the fever went down. The Plaintiff also distributed Ivermectin to acquaintances. Of these, some fell ill. After taking Ivermectin, the fever of others also dropped abruptly.

It is bizarre, absurd, that one vaccinated person demands that another be vaccinated.

The Plaintiff is immune to all corona mutations. The Plaintiff gladly makes himself available to science as a test subject when the so-called „experts„ have no explanation as to why superimmunity exists. For the Plaintiff, the explanation is simple. He has obviously already been infected several times. But the Plaintiff can only prove this if he ingests a portion of coronavirus under supervision. This possibility is not offered.

The introduced mandatory „vaccination„ forces action. This „vaccination„ is negative for at least 90% of the population. The Plaintiff has been deliberately infected and is immune. Nevertheless, the Plaintiff is supposed to be „vaccinated„ and thus take an incalculable risk for which no one takes responsibility. These are the SS methods.

The weak point in the fight against the coronavirus of the health care system. In Austria, medical experts have already demanded an increase in the budget of 1'000'000'000,-€ in 2019. None of this has been paid to date. But for Corona measures were spent in 2020 alone at least 33'000'000'000,-€. While there were 30'000 intensive care beds available in Germany at the beginning of 2020, there were only 20'000 left at the end of 2020. No additional funds were made available for the health care system. In the meantime, 5'000 nurses have quit their jobs because the pay is not adequate. But Germany spent 400'000'000'000,-€ on Corona measures in 2020. That makes, as in Austria, an average cost of 4'000 – 5'000,-€/person.

It is despicable, disgustingly criminal, that someone pays via taxes for not being able to enjoy his life. An innkeeper who refuses to entertain cannot demand loss of earnings from tax revenues. Whoever wants the innkeeper not to entertain must compensate for the loss of earnings, but not the taxpayer who may not be entertained, etc. -violation of Article 48 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

With the denunciation of the Basic Law and the „nationality„ „German in the meaning of Art. 116 para. 1 GG „ the Nationality Act of the German Reich and thus the nationality of the Free City of Danzig has again full validity.

The Peace Treaty of Versailles and the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare apply again without restriction.

Action is therefore brought.

The Free City of Danzig, represented by Mr. Beowulf von Prince and in management without mandate according to Section 677 of the German Civil Code (BGB) on behalf of all those who are deceived as to the true legal relations,

against all those who are directly or indirectly involved in the deception in legal relations,

on compliance with treaties; here: on Art. 102 and Art. 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, or Art. 43 and 48 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare (HLWC)

against the Defendants: (see specifically in the Appendix, which will also be expanded).

UN, WHO, World Medical Association WMA, NATO, Interpol, EU, individual governments.

2. Review:

World War II began with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig, Art. 100 - 108 of the Versailles Peace Treaty.

The Versailles Peace Treaty was intended to prevent further wars. For this purpose, the League of Nations with the Permanent International Court of Justice in The Hague was created, the Free City of Danzig and the International Labor Organization ILO.

Inseparably connected with the League of Nations is the Free City of Danzig. According to Article 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Free City of Danzig is under the protection of the League of Nations. In return, no Danzig national is allowed to defend himself. Even the acceptance of medals is forbidden. According to Article 103, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is agreed between representatives of Danzig with the League of Nations. Thus, the Danzig Constitution is a treaty under international law between Danzigers and the League of Nations. Under Article 49 of the Constitution, the Danzig Constitution cannot be amended without the express consent of the League of Nations and is guaranteed by the League of Nations. In Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution, German law, ordre public/state law at the time of 1920 is guaranteed. The state property was the Danzig Gulden. This was backed by gold stocks. The Free City of Danzig was the first area of law, freedom and security in Europe. Anyone could enter without a visa. About 620,000 citizens of Jewish faith fled through Danzig. It is said that without the Free City of Danzig there would be no state of Israel.

Nazi law could be enforced in Danzig only by military force. With the invasion of the Free City of Danzig at 4:45 a.m. on Sept. 1, 1939, World War II began - Indictment No. 1 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. The Danzig nationals were forcibly deprived of the nationality of the German Reich, i.e. the ordre public, Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution, and the arbitrary law of the German Reich was imposed. At the same time, because of the Nazi law introduced in 1933, the German Reich was already no longer legally identical with the "German Reich". The male population of Danzig was pressed into military service against its own protecting powers and thus enslaved - Indictment No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. Those who held on to their nationality in Danzig were sent to the Stutthof concentration camp. There, only 35% of the inmates survived. Only now is there a trial of an employee at the Stutthof concentration camp for aiding and abetting mass murder. Danzig was declared a fortress and the escape of the population was forbidden. The population was to be a living shield against the Soviets. The extermination of the population was thus ordered - Indictment No. 3 of the

Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. (The Soviet general had assured the Danzigers of life and property. An SS general refused).

The League of Nations was too weak to fulfill its obligations to Danzig under international law. Therefore, the United Nations was created as the legal successor to the League of Nations. The 4 powers were the deputies of the United Nations in Europe. It can be seen that the Allies conducted the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials in management without mandate for the Free City of Danzig.

The rule of law guarantees of the Free City of Danzig were to be guaranteed to all citizens - see: Formals of the Free City of Danzig. For this purpose the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was created. The FRG was to become the legal successor of Danzig. The state people of the FRG are the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116, paragraph 1 of the Basic Law", in the clue of Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution: "German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed." Thus, the *ordre public* of the Free City of Danzig is the *ordre public* of the FRG. The guarantees of fair trial - independence of judges, lawful magistrate, etc., were taken verbatim from the Danzig Constitution.

The right of the individual to his *ordre public* (Art. 49 and 116 of the Danzig Constitution) was laid down in Art. 25 GG. Art. 25 GG: *"The general rules of international law shall be an integral part of federal law. They shall take precedence over the laws and directly create rights and duties for the inhabitants of the federal territory."* The Versailles Peace Treaty is part of the general rules of international law and so is the Danzig Constitution.

So even if 99% of the inhabitants of the FRG are in favor of a law, this is completely irrelevant if it violates the *ordre public*. The separation of powers is part of a democratic state under the rule of law. The legislature is only one state power, which is controlled by the other state powers for compliance with the constitution.

Article 49 of the Danzig Constitution was adopted *mutatis mutandis* in Article 79 (1) sentence two of the Basic Law. Meaning: The GG cannot be amended insofar as it concerns peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues.

Under international law, however, the FRG will only become the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig if the people of Danzig agree to a constitution in accordance with Article 146 of the Basic Law. Only in the course of a constitutional discussion can decisions be made on peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues. This requires the consent of the Danzig nationals. With a consent the nationality of the Free City of Danzig expires and the Second World War is over.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is only a declaration of intent and not an enforceable right unless contracting parties expressly agree to it.

The European Convention on Human Rights made the right to a fair trial enforceable.

The International Covenant on Civil Rights makes a fair trial enforceable.

With the Charter of the European Union, human rights have been expanded and are enforceable.

But what does the reality look like?

Until 1990, the German Constitutional Court had to accept every complaint. The Plaintiff sued for damages because of the German-Polish Border Treaty in 1990. This lawsuit was left to lie until the Federal Constitutional Court Act was amended to the effect that lawsuits do not have to be accepted, and the lawsuit was dismissed.

Under the Code of Civil Procedure, you can force a lawsuit. However, as a remnant from the Nazi era, there is the obligation to be represented by a lawyer. Only a lawyer can file proceedings to force criminal prosecution. The first lawyer of the Plaintiff, Mr. Olaf Pfalzgraf, initiated such proceedings to force criminal prosecution in 2007. As a result, he was disbarred and claimed that no proceedings to force criminal prosecution had been initiated.

Mrs. Karin Leffer and the Plaintiff filed a lawsuit in Washington D.C. against the FRG, Switzerland, the Kingdom of Belgium and the EU. Initially, on the grounds that we cannot bring a lawsuit in the whole of Europe in which we are guaranteed the rights to a fair trial guaranteed under international law. In the course of this lawsuit, the Plaintiff looked at the Nationality Act of the German Reich. This law has never interested him. The Plaintiff's father, although not bound by international law, expressly rejected the nationality of the German Reich.

It was only because of the lawsuit in Washington D.C. that the Plaintiff came across the fact that in 1999 Section 40a was inserted into the Nationality Act of the German Reich, execution date July 22, 1913. There the nationals of the German Reich actually make the nationals of the Free City of Danzig unmasked nationals of the German Reich - Indictment No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

This makes everything clear. With the insertion of Section 40a, Nazi law was again introduced step by step.

The insidious thing about it is that all guarantees of the rule of law are still on paper, but have actually been completely eliminated.

The scope of the GG was abolished and with it the GG as binding law. There still existed the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG" with the right to the ordre public of the FRG and the international treaties of the FRG. For example, the Double Taxation Treaty with the USA only applies to the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 Para. 1 GG". Then one inserts Section 40a into the Nationality Act of the German Reich, declares the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG" to be nationals of the German Reich and one acts logically and consistently again according to Nazi law. What else? But who knows?

Despite the lawsuit in Washington D.C., the nationals (correct is, the governing of the nationals of the German Reich, because the population itself does not know what game is being played) of the German Reich refuse to recognize the present borders. They reject the nationality of the FRG, the FRG and Europe as an area of law, freedom and security. They clearly declare to continue the war.

The FRG is history with it. The nationalities of the Free City of Danzig and the National Socialist German Reich fully exist again. The legal differences could not be greater.

The ordre public of the Free City of Danzig, the Danzig Gulden as currency, the International Traffic Agreement with DA as country license plate on the cars, etc. are still valid for the Danzig nationals.

But in the meantime, the Corona measures are obviously becoming downright insane.

Everything that is beneficial to health is banned.

Instead, mandatory vaccination is being introduced. Thereby it shows up downright demonstratively that vaccinations are completely useless. There is the urgent suspicion that it is not about health, but about economic interests of the pharmaceutical industry.

But all guarantees of the rule of law have been systematically eliminated beforehand, planned for the long term, so that it is no longer possible to file an effective complaint against it.

This proves that it is not about economic interests, but about the victory of SS over the rest of the world.

Nowhere is the systematic dismantling of rights reported.

Yet this dismantling of rights is easy to check - see Formals.

3. Formals

Arbitration proceedings are to be conducted.

Justification:

3.1 There is still war

On one side is the Free City of Danzig, on the other side the SS has never surrendered.

The Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare applies.

Because of Art 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Free City of Danzig can never be a belligerent in the meaning of Section 1 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

Therefore, in war against Danzig, section three of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, especially Art. 43 ordre public and Art. 48 taxes, must be observed by every side, whether friend or foe.

International courts have jurisdiction over violations of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare - see Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare:

Art. 43

The authority of the legitimate power having in fact passed into the hands of the occupant, the latter shall take all the measures in his power to restore, and ensure, as far as possible, public order and safety, while respecting, unless absolutely prevented, the laws in force in the country.

Art. 48

If, in the territory occupied, the occupant collects the taxes, dues, and tolls imposed for the benefit of the State, he shall do so, as far as is possible, in accordance with the rules of assessment and incidence in force, and shall in consequence be bound to defray the expenses of the administration of the occupied territory to the same extent as the legitimate Government was so bound.

In the event of a dispute, an international court shall have jurisdiction.

3.2 Articles 102 and 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty are violated

According to Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is a treaty between representatives of Danzig and the League of Nations.

The Permanent International Court of Justice was a constituent part of the League of Nations and could only act and has acted in an advisory capacity in the matter of Art. 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty - see above page 4: Series A/B No. 65. If the opinion of the Permanent International Court of Justice had been disputed, then an ad hoc convened international court would have had to decide.

The International Court of Justice in The Hague is the legal successor of the Permanent Court of International Justice - see Article 37 of the Statutes. But as an organ of the United Nations, it has no jurisdiction either.

The representative of the Free City of Danzig considers the Versailles Peace Treaty to have been violated with regard to Art. 102 and 103. Damages and compensation for pain and suffering are claimed.

The United Nations, as the legal successor to the League of Nations, is responsible for ensuring that Article 103 of the Peace Treaty is observed. All states of the United Nations are obliged, in accordance with Art. 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, to guarantee the people of Danzig their national rights.

This is valid until the legal succession of the Versailles Peace Treaty, concerning the Free City of Danzig, condition Art. 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty, is realized.

The matter is arbitrable.

Arbitration proceedings shall therefore be conducted.

3.3 International relations due to lack of territorial delimitation

By Art. 102 and Art. 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the nationality of Danzig is a cosmopolitan one. Anyone can enter without a visa.

At the instigation of the nationals of the German Reich, Danzig was completely destroyed and was practically uninhabitable in 1945. This is another reason why the ordre public of the Free City of Danzig is not limited to a specific territory. Especially not after the FRG was de facto eliminated by the nationals of the German Reich.

On the other hand, the SS was a belligerent in the meaning of Section One of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare. However, the SS was also subject to the police and Interpol, so it was not a war party in the meaning of the HLWC. Already in the last century, 30 different nationalities belonged to the SS.

This also means that international legal relationships exist and arbitration is obligatory.

3.3.1 Arbitration due to Violation of Procedural Rights Guaranteed under International Law or indirectly self-declared lack of jurisdiction of state courts and thus lack of jurisdiction of state organs

The locally competent official always has jurisdiction. However, if the latter is not willing or able to fulfill his duty, no legal vacuum is created. It is acted according to Section 677 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch). This also applies across borders in the case of non-compliance with international treaties. The acting party is entitled to the wage.

The same applies to judges. Judges who do not ensure that EU law is observed in other EU states are themselves violating EU law and therefore have no jurisdiction.

The state courts in Europe and Switzerland do not observe the obligations under international law to ensure fair trials and have thus declared themselves without jurisdiction.

The international treaties and constitutions in states of the EU and also the Swiss Constitution are no longer respected by the rulers and the judges.

Some EU citizens are aware of this and do not agree with it. In Switzerland, the People's Initiative for Judicial Reform with 130,000 signatures has confirmed that the entire state apparatus has been appropriated by the "political class" at the expense of the citizens and that judgeships have been bought, which would already be a punishable offense today. Most do not suspect that all law is violated by those responsible. Most are fraudulently deceived. According to the territorial principle, joint and several liability arises in the event of a violation of international law. But this is justified only if the population must know that it is being violated. If state organs violate international law under deception in legal relations, there is in principle a division of society. In case of doubt, state organs are no longer nationals of their own, but enemy agents, to the detriment of the "people of the state".

Once again: Since state organs and, above all, courts tacitly no longer abide by agreed law, they have withdrawn their jurisdiction from themselves.

In principle, there are only economic organizations left. The provisions on state liability no longer apply.

The provisions of the German Civil Code (BGB) apply:

The BGB is structured hierarchically. The preceding §§ are more important than the following ones.

Therefore, § 226 prohibition of chicanery must always be observed: „*The exercise of a right is not permitted if its only possible purpose consists in causing damage to another.*”

Therefore, for example, Section 113 (3) Resistance to Officials, abbreviated: "*Resistance to officials is permissible if the official acts unlawfully.*"

Therefore, proportionality must always be considered in all state measures. In case of doubt, it must always be examined which measure causes the lowest costs.

3.3.2 Legal Practice Violates All Rule of Law Guarantees

A detailed description of the legal conditions is available to the Court in Washington D.C., Ref. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN.

Mrs. Karin Leffer has presented the circumstances even more concretely in a class action to the UN Human Rights Committee, Ref. UR/CCPR/21/DEU/21.

With the Judges and Prosecutors Act of 2005, judges and prosecutors were subjected to the disciplinary law for soldiers. This should make the hairs on the back of everyone's neck stand up. Those who think nothing of it should consider the Bavarian situation. The Bavarian prime minister appoints and dismisses the minister of justice and gives instructions. The Minister of Justice issues instructions (orders) to the public prosecutors. According to the judgment of the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg (ECJ) of May 27, 2019, these are therefore not judicial authorities in the meaning of EU law and may not issue arrest warrants. As a result of the ECJ ruling, 5,000 German arrest warrants had to be reissued. A judge from the German state of Thuringia therefore filed a preliminary inquiry (complaint) with the ECJ, claiming that he is not allowed to issue arrest warrants. His reasoning is that the powers are not separate, but intertwined. He is appointed and promoted by political officials. In addition, he was also appointed as an official bound by instructions, Case No. C-276/20 - 1. The ECJ has not ruled on this to date. Obviously, the ECJ is dominated by Nazis.

3.3.2.1 The Legal Practice of the German State of Bavaria, Followed by All Others

The Bavarian Minister of Justice appoints, promotes and transfers judges and prosecutors. He issues directives (orders). One and the same person changes position at the same court from prosecutor to judge and then back to prosecutor.

This is already impossible because of the different oath of the prosecutor and judge.

It may be that on Friday a person works on a case as a prosecutor and on Monday decides on it as a judge.

Dr. Koch, for example, is first a public prosecutor at Coburg Regional Court, then a judge at Coburg Regional Court, and then a public prosecutor again at Coburg Regional Court.

Prosecutors of the courts are appointed as disciplinary superiors of judges. For example, the General Prosecutor of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court Lückemann is appointed President of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court. The Chief Public Prosecutor of the Coburg Regional Court Lohneis is appointed President of the Coburg Regional Court. If one wants a retrial before the Regional Court of Coburg, the case is referred to the Regional Court of Bamberg. In the meantime, Mr. Lohneis has been appointed President of the Regional Court there. He has been succeeded at Coburg Regional Court by Mrs. Haderlein. She was previously a prosecutor at Coburg Regional Court.

So the judges are now to decide on cases for which their superiors are responsible. Section 339 of the German Criminal Code (Perversion of Justice - 5 years in prison) and Section 344 of the German Criminal Code (Persecution of Innocent Persons - 10 years in prison) come into play. Did the prosecutor's office initiate a criminal prosecution even though it is obvious that the person is innocent? The judge must examine this. If he comes to the conclusion that a criminal prosecution has been initiated although the proof of innocence is immediately available, or there is no suspicion of a crime at all, then the judge must ensure the prosecution of those involved. That is, against his disciplinary superior. The disciplinary superior, however,

claims that the judge is committing perversion of justice, and he is acting on the instructions of the ruling CSU Party, etc....

The independence of judges was thus completely eliminated, contrary to Article 97 of the Basic Law.

The provisions on the appointment of lawful judges are no longer observed, violation of Article 101 of the Basic Law.

Court records are not kept verbatim, violation of Section 273 (3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 103 of the Basic Law. It is only recorded: "The witness has testified." What he testified, whether or against a defendant, is not recorded. It is no longer possible for anyone to understand on what basis the judge made his decision.

Judgments are not signed by the judge, contrary to all legal provisions; rather, it is certified that no judge signed. In the "judgement" can then stand what wants. The proof is missing that someone is responsible for it.

"Judgments" are stamped with " District Court of Bavaria" or "Higher Regional Court of Bavaria". Such courts do not exist. It is the proof that Bavaria is a dictatorship. All authorities act on the instructions of the Bavarian prime minister.

3.3.2.2 The EU Court of Justice

If a defendant wants the ECJ to examine whether EU law is being observed, then the judge must submit this question to the ECJ. But, of course, Bavarian judges do not pass on such questions, and if a lawyer urges them to do so, his or her license will be revoked.

The preliminary inquiry (complaint) of the judge from Thuringia has been lying unprocessed at the ECJ for more than 1.5 years (Ref. C-276/20 - 1), but Poland is continuously condemned by the ECJ because of the Polish judicial reform. After the judicial reform, Polish judges are still more independent than Bavarian judges ever were.

At the same time, Germany should not be a member of the EU simply because of the practice of court reporting.

3.3.2.3 The European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg

At the Court in Strasbourg, a complaint does not end up before a judge, but first before a national employee. The latter rejects the complaint because the legal process has allegedly not been used.

In Switzerland, for example, applications for bias against judges/revisions are not processed. This means that the legal process has not been exhausted. However, at the lower level, one ignores the *lis pendens* and allows execution.

3.3.2.4 The UN Human Rights Committee in Geneva

Mrs. Karin Leffer filed a complaint there consisting of 40 pages + about 300 pages of evidence. She received a one-page letter claiming that the legal process had not been exhausted. This letter is not signed and also no person is indicated, who sent this answer. Obviously, this Human Rights Committee is not responsible for "Germany". What is the reason for this?

Ref. UR/CCPR/21/DEU/21 of 1 October 2021

3.4 Arbitration because of international legal relations

Contractual autonomy includes the choice of arbitrator in the event of a dispute. In the case of national legal relations, the legal provisions on the appointment of the judge are part of the general business provisions. Everyone has an equal share in the appointment. No one can claim that the state judge decides in favor of his own national. If the case is to be heard by a court of arbitration, this must be expressly agreed.

In international legal relations, the case is exactly reversed. A party has no stake in the appointment of the judge. There is a fundamental suspicion of bias that the judge will rule in favor of his own national. Arbitration proceedings are therefore mandatory/compulsory. If arbitration is to take place before a state court, then this must be expressly agreed.

As early as 1955, Section 15 of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG): "Courts are state courts." was dropped. Thus, formally, all courts are arbitration courts.

This also corresponds to Section 20 GVG: extraterritoriality. The Plaintiff is only in Europe at the instigation of the nationals of the German Reich on behalf of the British (the British acted as representatives of the League of Nations). Pursuant to Section 20 of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG), this means that no national courts have jurisdiction.

With the insertion of Section 15 in the Nationality Act of the German Reich, execution date July 22, 1913, as of Aug. 21, 2021, it was clarified that Danzigers are not nationals of the German Reich and cannot become nationals upon application.

Thus the personal sovereignty/statute is officially confirmed and with it the arbitration. However, Nazi law is still applied towards Danzigers. Mrs. Karin Leffer, for example, is still wanted by arrest warrant.

Anyone can be subject to Danzig law and anyone can be suspected of being an SS member or at least an SS sympathizer.

Therefore, there is a personnel statute/sovereignty everywhere. Thus arbitration proceedings are obligatory/compulsory.

Until the Second World War is over, there are no immunities. Neither for international organizations, rulers or even judges.

Those who want to claim immunity must first do their own part to end the Second World War, or that international treaties are respected.

3.5 Concerning the Arbitration Agreement

An arbitration agreement is an agreement that is arbitrable. An agreement is made in writing, orally or by act. If the matter concerns property law, the matter is arbitrable. Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty is an agreement. In it, the provisions of the Civil Code are agreed as the law to be applied jointly.

The provisions of the Civil Code (BGB) on liability apply.

The BGB is structured hierarchically. The preceding §§ are more important than the following ones.

Therefore, § 226 prohibition of chicanery must always be observed: *„The exercise of a right is not permitted if its only possible purpose consists in causing damage to another.“*

Therefore, for example, Section 113 (3) Resistance to Officials, abbreviated: *"Resistance to officials is permissible if the official acts unlawfully."*

Therefore, proportionality must always be considered in all state measures. In case of doubt, it must always be examined which measure causes the lowest costs.

3.6 Concerning Liability: German Civil Code (BGB)

Section 823 Liability in damages

(1) A person who, intentionally or negligently, unlawfully injures the life, body, health, freedom, property or another right of another person is liable to make compensation to the other party for the damage arising from this.

(2) The same duty is held by a person who commits a breach of a statute that is intended to protect another person. If, according to the contents of the statute, it may also be breached without fault, then liability to compensation only exists in the case of fault.

Section 826 A person who, in a manner contrary to public policy, intentionally inflicts damage on another person is liable to the other person to make compensation for the damage.

Section 830 (1) If more than one person has caused damage by a jointly committed tort, then each of them is responsible for the damage. The same applies if it cannot be established which of several persons involved caused the damage by his act.

(2) Instigators and accessories are equivalent to joint tortfeasors.

Section 831 Liability for vicarious agents

(1) A person who uses another person to perform a task is liable to make compensation for the damage that the other unlawfully inflicts on a third party when carrying out the task. Liability in damages does not apply if the principal exercises reasonable care when selecting the person deployed and, to the extent that he is to procure devices or equipment or to manage the business activity, in the procurement or management, or if the damage would have occurred even if this care had been exercised.

(2) The same responsibility is borne by a person who assumes the performance of one of the transactions specified in subsection (1) sentence 2 for the principal by contract.

Section 839 Liability in case of breach of official duty

(1) If an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party, then he must compensate the third party for damage arising from this. If the official is only responsible because of negligence, then he may only be held liable if the injured person is not able to obtain compensation in another way.

(2) If an official breaches his official duties in a judgment in a legal matter, then he is only responsible for any damage arising from this if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This provision is not applicable to refusal or delay that is in breach of duty in exercising a public function.

(3) Liability for damage does not arise if the injured person has intentionally or negligently failed to avert the damage by having recourse to appeal.

Under Danzig law, the official is solely responsible for the legality of his actions. He has taken an oath to uphold the law. No power on earth may force an official to violate its interpretation of the law. Only a court can convince the official of the correct interpretation of the law. Upholding the law also includes upholding international treaties. An official cannot be dismissed.

In 2009, police officers in Switzerland were demoted to employees so that they could be dismissed. The official justification is to save money. According to Swiss police officers, they no longer check the legality of their actions in order not to be fired.

At the same time, Civil Service Laws in Germany were changed into Civil Service Status Laws. The same probably applies to other countries.

These policemen are thus not civil servants in the meaning of international law, but only vicarious agents.

This means that the politicians (legislature) complained of here can only refuse liability if they prove that judges (judiciary) and civil servants (executive) are independent and subject only to the law. Law means that a law is only permissible if it complies with the overriding international treaties and constitution. Checking this is precisely the task of judges and civil servants.

These tasks are not performed at the instigation of politicians. Thus Section 839 is ruled out.

Since the politicians have in fact eliminated the separation of powers, there is always the suspicion that a law is a prohibited act.

Sections 823, 826 and 830 of the German Civil Code thus apply, i.e. joint and several liability for all politicians, "civil servants," "judges" and managing directors.

In the case of unnecessary costs for Corona measures, all those who enforce and support these measures are jointly liable. That is everyone from the government, to the party members of the governing parties, to the vaccinated.

The alternative to Corona measures was to set up emergency clinics, pay hazard pay for caregivers, and use Ivermectin for treatment, for example, and even offer targeted infections to end Corona flu in a targeted controlled way.

3.7 Concerning the Regulation of Arbitration Proceedings

Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty is an arbitration agreement in the meaning of the Swiss Private International Law Act (sIPRG) Chapter 12.

Arbitration proceedings must therefore be conducted in accordance with the 12th chapter sIPRG. Excluded from this, is the Swiss Federal Court as an appeal authority. Instead, a complaint must be decided by another arbitration court.

The Plaintiff proposes Geneva as the seat.

Reason: Geneva was the seat of the League of Nations. The real estate has been transferred to the United Nations.

The WHO is represented in Geneva.

The Swiss Private International Law Act simply regulates how arbitration proceedings are conducted in international legal relations.

Lawyers selected by the respective proposed bar associations are to serve as arbitrators.

India has achieved sovereignty without violence and is a democratic federal state.

South Africa has undergone a process of democratization. Madagascar is a peaceful country that needs help, partly because of climate change, but receives little support. Tanzania is one of the most peaceful countries. Perhaps this comes as a legacy, from times as a German colony with an exemplary rule of law. In Uruguay, members of parliament have foregone half of their salaries because of the Corona measures. This is certainly a model for others.

Prof. Dr. Stückelberger is proposed as a further arbitrator.

Reason: Prof. Dr. Stückelberger is a professor in Geneva and has worked at the WHO.

Prof. Dr. Dr. Baudenbacher is proposed as a further arbitrator.

Justification: Prof. Dr. Dr. Baudenbacher was presiding judge of the EFTA Court in Luxembourg and is head of the Center for International Law in St. Gallen and is familiar with Swiss Private International Law.

The Plaintiff proposes Prof. Dr. Hans Herbert von Arnim as a further arbitrator.

Reason: As a constitutional law expert in the Federal Republic of Germany, he should be able to judge compliance with the Danzig/German ordre public.

As a further judge, the Plaintiff proposes the Spaniard Mr. Baltasar Garzón Real.

Justification:

The UN Human Rights Committee has confirmed that he judges impartially as an independent judge.

3.8 Suspension by Arbitration Proceedings

Thus, according to Art. 181 sIPRG, all Corona coercive measures are pending and out of execution.

Art. 181 IPRG

The arbitral proceedings shall be pending from the time when one of the parties seizes with a claim either the arbitrator or arbitrators designated in the arbitration agreement or, in the absence of such designation in the arbitration agreement, from the time when one of the parties initiates the procedure for the appointment of the arbitral tribunal.

Art. 186 IPRG

1 The arbitral tribunal shall itself decide on its jurisdiction. 1 It shall decide on its jurisdiction notwithstanding an action on the same matter between the same parties already pending before a state court or another arbitral tribunal, unless there are serious reasons to stay the proceedings.

2 A plea of lack of jurisdiction must be raised prior to any defence on the merits.

4. Concerning the Parties

4.1 The Free City of Danzig was created as an instrument for maintaining peace before the declarations of human rights existed.

With the Free City of Danzig, an area of law, freedom and security was created for the first time.

Human rights can always be violated only by states.

According to Article 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the citizens of Danzig were placed under the protection of the League of Nations.

Article 102

The Principal Allied and Associated Powers undertake to establish the town of Danzig, together with the rest of the territory described in Article 100, as a Free City. It will be placed under the protection of the League of Nations.

In return, no Danzig national may resort to military means for his defense; even the acceptance of medals is forbidden, Art. 73 of the Danzig Constitution.

"No national of Danzig may accept titles or decorations."

The Free City of Danzig can therefore never be a belligerent in the meaning of Section 1 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare. The ordre public must always be upheld, whether enemy or friend. No Danzig citizen may follow an instruction which violates his ordre public.

According to Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig shall be agreed upon with representatives of Danzig and the League of Nations.

Art. 103

A constitution for the Free City of Danzig shall be drawn up by the duly appointed representatives of the Free City in agreement with a High Commissioner to be appointed by the League of Nations. This constitution shall be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

Thus, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is a treaty of citizens with states.

This treaty cannot be terminated even by the overwhelming majority of the population of Danzig, Art. 49 of the Danzig Constitution.

"Amendments to the Constitution may enter into force only after they have been communicated to the League of Nations, which has declared that it has no objection to the amendments."

Danzig Constitution Article 71. *"Fundamental rights and duties shall be the guide and barrier of legislation, administration of justice and administration in the State."*

These are defined in Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution.

"All laws and ordinances in force in the territory of the Free City of Danzig at the time of the entry into force of this Constitution shall remain in force...."

According to Art. 76, the people of Danzig enjoy protection from foreign countries, both at home and abroad.

"With respect to foreign countries, all nationals within and outside the territory of the State shall be entitled to the protection of the State."

That is, even if the vast majority of the population is in favor of a law, it may not be applied if it does not comply with the Civil Code. Compliance with the Civil Code is superior international law under Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty. The League of Nations, with legal succession to the United Nations, is responsible for ensuring that these provisions are observed and is liable for violations.

The separation of powers is unsurpassed in the Free City of Danzig. The legislature (legislative branch) is internationally supervised by the supreme power of the state (executive branch) for compliance with the Constitution and acts only on the basis of an international court (judicial branch).

The precedent for this is present. The Nazis had provided the legislature and the government through elections in the last century. As a result, they began to introduce Nazi law. About this, Danzig citizens complained and the Permanent International Court of Justice in The Hague, in the opinion Series A/B No. 65, stated that the Free City of Danzig is a constitutional state and the laws enacted violate the Constitution. As a result, Great Britain announced that it would take over the executive power in the Free City of Danzig. As a result, the laws were cancelled again.

4.1.1 Danzig as an Area of Law, Freedom and Security

Anyone could enter the Free City of Danzig without a visa. Approximately 620,000 citizens of Jewish faith used Danzig to escape. It is said that without the Free City of Danzig there would be no state of Israel.

The French were silent when the German Reich took back the Saarland. The French were silent when the German Reich annexed Austria.

But with the invasion of Danzig, the battle cry of the French was, "For the freedom of Danzig." It became clear that the "Germans" were not concerned with revising the peace treaty, but with eliminating an area of law, freedom and security for all. Again, the battle cry of the French was not, "For France." or "For Poland," but "For the freedom of Danzig."

Mrs. Karin Leffer is working for peace and thus for the freedom of all people. She is therefore wanted on an arrest warrant. This arrest warrant is thus directed against anyone who wants justice, freedom and security.

The battle cry, not in the military meaning, but of civil society must therefore be: "For the freedom of Mrs. Leffer". Anyone who does not join in must be suspected of failing to provide assistance, as an enemy of civil society.

Again: with the attack on Danzig it became clear that terror against humanity and thus violence and mass murder was the intention.

That is why it was also stated in the Charter of the United Nations:

WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought

untold sorrow to mankind,.... to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained,...."
Article 33

1. *The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.*

4.2 The German Reich

The nationals of the German Reich violated the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare and lost all rights.

The German Reich waged a house-to-house combat for Berlin. Berlin was thus a fortress under international law. A fortress enjoys no protection in wartime. What applies to the capital applies to the whole country. It was no longer possible to form an independent government. The German Reich ceased to exist under international law. The nationals of the German Reich enjoy no protection from their government and are defined by international law as refugees and displaced persons. Article 116 GG: ".....Germans in the meaning of Article 116 GG are the refugees and displaced persons of German ethnicity who have found refuge in the territory of the German Reich within the borders of Dec. 31, 1937." Clearly: The FRG has nothing to do with the German Reich. Especially not in the borders of Dec. 31, 1937. The nationals of the German Reich, as it existed in the borders of 1937, are the refugees and displaced persons in the meaning of Art. 116 GG", to whom the ordre public of the German Reich at the time Jan. 1920 (Danzig Constitution Art. 116) was given back.

Basically, the German Reich in the meaning of international law had already been eliminated in 1933. The Nationality Act was: Reich and Nationality Act. The German Reich was an association of sovereign states that had their own Nationality Acts. Reich nationality referred to residents of the colonies who were granted German Reich nationality upon application.

In 1933, the nationality of the states of the German Reich was eliminated. There was only Reich nationality left, but no territory to it. The ordre public of the German Reich belonging to the Nationality Act was eliminated in favor of Nazi law. Thus, the German Reich as a subject of international law had basically already ceased to exist in 1933. The real power in the Reich was held by the SS, an international organization without a defined ordre public.

4.2.1 The SS (Schutzstaffel, Sturmsschutz, Satanic Sect)

National Socialism is not a political idea, but a pseudo-religion. If one assumes that the opposite of what is said is true, then one is usually correct. When the Nazi propaganda minister Goebels asked the Germans in 1943, "Do you want total war?" he already knew that the war was hopelessly lost. He therefore meant: "Do you want your total annihilation?". The Germans cheered: "Jaaa".

Does anyone seriously want to claim that the whole of Germany was not a madhouse?

Every thinking German had to be aware that the war was already lost. That is why the Scholl siblings founded the "White Rose" and pointed out on leaflets that the continuation of the war was nothing but senseless killing. The Scholl siblings were executed for this reason.

On the official website of the Bavarian Ministry of Justice it is reported about Mr. Attorney General Lückemann and Mr. Chief Public Prosecutor Lohneis that they were appointed as disciplinary superiors of the judges. Reference was made to the traveling exhibition on the "White Rose" and where it leads when the independence of judges is eliminated. To the murder

of critics by judges. There is no more cynical way to demonstrate that the Germans are once again not sane.

The SS was the so-called elite. They had their own rituals, which were held under the "Black Sun". The "Black Sun" is the symbol that always the opposite is true of what is claimed. Among other things, children were baptized with a silver dagger, and so on.

The SS already consisted of 30 different nationalities in the last century. It was the real ruler in the German Reich and also directed against the Germans. The Reichsführer of the SS Heinrich Himmler had even issued the order that SS members had to impregnate the wives of the German Wehrmacht members. Only because Hitler feared for the fighting morale of the German Wehrmacht, this order was withdrawn.

The German Wehrmacht was only the auxiliary force of the SS to establish its rule in Europe. The SS had its own army and was thus a belligerent in the meaning of Section One of the Hague Land Warfare Regulations. But the SS was also subordinate to the police, with the secret police, Interpol and the secret service. Crimes against humanity were committed by the SS. The concentration camps (KZ) were operated by the SS. The SS got paid by industry to run the concentration camps.

The SS printed £ notes. What SS assets were hidden by the SS after the war, and in what accounts, has never been uncovered.

The SS never surrendered.

After the war, SS members were again in important offices. 80% of the post-war judges were members of the NSDAP and the SS.

The daughter of Reichsführer Heinrich Himmler, an ardent supporter of the SS until her death was an employee of the German Federal Intelligence Service (secret service). The Federal Police was founded by a member of the SS. Schleyer, who later became the president of the Employers' Association, was an SS captain, etc....

The practice of not signing court verdicts, contrary to what was on paper even then, was introduced by the Nazis. The prosecutors of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials had problems proving individual guilt because nothing was signed.

Why sign anything when the highest legal order was the order?

4.2.2 Terms "German", Germany, German nationality

Ever since the Versailles Peace Treaty, the "Germans" have been playing a confusing game with the terms "German," Germany and German nationality.

Nationality defines the scope of the constitution, the *ordre public*, the applicable treaties under international law and the national assets.

The US President Wilson did not want to negotiate a peace treaty with any emperor. Therefore, a revolution had to take place to abolish the monarchy. A counter-revolution followed. Civil war prevailed. At the same time, the British maintained a starvation blockade. About 750,000 Germans had already starved to death. Therefore, the Weimar Republic was created with the Weimar Constitution. But the Weimar Constitution had no scope. Nor was a new Nationality Act promulgated. Rather one held on to the Nationality Act, date of issue July 22, 1913, which is still valid today. This law was still enacted by the German Emperor and not only extended from today's French Alsace-Lorraine to the Russian border, but also included the German colonies.

The German Reich was a union of sovereign states, such as the Kingdom of Prussia, the Kingdom of Bavaria, etc., with their own nationalities. The emperor was its "sovereignty." In the meaning of international law, an independent subject of international law. In the democratic

meaning, a building block of the separation of powers. Those who lived in the colonies could not acquire nationality of one of the German states, but could apply for Reich nationality.

The Versailles Peace Treaty was signed by representatives of the Weimar Constitution, who were not responsible for any scope. Instead, the Nationality Act of 1913 was retained, with scope from Alsace-Lorraine to the Russian border. For the nationals of the German Reich, the Second World War was merely the continuation of the First. The Nuremberg War Crimes Trials were always only victors' justice for the "Germans". The Nationality Act of the German Reich, date of issue July 22, 1913 is valid for the nationals of the German Reich until today.

But what is always concealed, although it is known, just not aware:

In 1933, the national law, the *ordre public* of the German Reich was completely eliminated.

So now we have a Nationality Act that applies to the territory of the German Reich in the borders of 1913, including the German colonies.

But it is no longer the *ordre public* of 1913 that applies, but the *ordre public* from the year 1933.

Then we have the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 GG paragraph 1" whereby a distinction is made between the "holders of German nationality in the meaning of Article 116 paragraph 1 GG" and then still the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 paragraph 2 GG". Then there are those who have rejected the German nationality and the Austrians who have this nationality according to the Nationality Act of the German Reich.

The difference between all the above can be summarized simply:

The "holders of German nationality in the meaning of Art. 116 GG para. 1" are the Danzigers as holders of the right of the Free City of Danzig, defined in Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution: German law at the time of 1920 is guaranteed.

All other "Germans" are subject to the Nazi law of the German Reich, introduced in 1933.

Those who do not accept this law must explicitly reject the nationality according to the Nationality Act of the German Reich, date of issue July 22, 1913. One must insist on the right from 1920, otherwise tacit consent is interpreted as an expression of will to submit to Nazi law. After all, this is part of the nationality of the German Reich since 1933.

Nazi law means nothing else than the abrogation of all binding legal norms and international treaties. Only the "order" is valid.

According to Section 16 of the Nationality Act of the German Reich, one must solemnly declare one's allegiance to the GG, but this was eliminated in 1990.

The same game is played again. The scope of the GG was abolished, the Nationality Act from 1913 was kept. We are only in the 3rd phase of the First World War.

In addition one must note that certainly 95% of the inhabitants of the federal territory are convinced democrats and know nothing about the legal practices, particularly in Bavaria.

Probably 70-80% of the population assume that the 2 + 4 Treaty is fulfilled and that they are nationals of the FRG.

The foreign countries also assume this. The EU has communicated that as representatives of the FRG only nationals of the FRG are admitted to offices.

Even most members of the Bundestag do not know which subject of international law they govern. Doubts exist because the Basic Law still states: Art. 120: "*The Federation shall bear the costs of the consequences of war and the costs of occupation*" and Art. 133: "*The Federation shall enter into the rights and responsibilities of the United Economic Area*" and

furthermore there is also Art. 146: *"The GG shall expire on the day on which a constitution is promulgated to which all Germans have consented."*

Therefore the Scientific Service of the German Bundestag was commissioned in 2006 to prepare a scientific report on the sovereignty of the FRG or which international treaties continue to exist after the 2 + 4 Treaty. The Scientific Service comes to the conclusion that, among other things, the reparation obligations still exist. It escapes the Scientific Service that Art. 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty is not realized and the Versailles Peace Treaty or the Free City of Danzig is not mentioned.

Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany

(1) Unless otherwise provided by a law, a German within the meaning of this Basic Law is a person who possesses German citizenship or who has been admitted to the territory of the German Reich within the boundaries of 31 December 1937 as a refugee or expellee of German ethnic origin or as the spouse or descendant of such person.

Again, Art. 116 (1) GG refers to the Danzigers.

"In possession of German nationality in the meaning of Art. 116 GG para. 1 refers to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution and has nothing to do with the nationality of the German Reich.

Paragraph 2 refers to nationals of the German Reich:

(2) Former German citizens who between 30 January 1933 and 8 May 1945 were deprived of their citizenship on political, racial or religious grounds, and their descendants, shall on application have their citizenship restored. They shall be deemed never to have been deprived of their citizenship if they have established their domicile in Germany after 8 May 1945 and have not expressed a contrary intention.

Everyone thinks that this means the Jewish citizens. In fact, it means all nationals of the countries of the German Reich, who were deprived of their nationality in 1933 and subjected to the Nazi public order.

Insidious, isn't it? The Jewish citizens who had fled from the Nazis are now allowed to become Nazis and to participate in reparations.

Those who were in Germany after May 08, 1945 must express that they reject Nazi law.

An expression of will is made in writing, orally or by action.

In the meantime Nazi right is practiced again. That is simply recognizable for everyone. According to the ordre public of the FRG, the Free City of Danzig and the German Reich until 1933, official documents must bear the signature of the issuer. According to Section 839 of the Civil Code, the official is personally liable for the legality of his act. An administrative official, like a judge, must therefore sign so that his personal liability is expressed.

However, all legally relevant letters, such as an arrest warrant, are no longer signed. Who accepts this, rejects the ordre public of the FRG and with it to be "German in the meaning of Article 116 GG".

He thereby confesses to be a member of the SS and to follow every order and no longer the laws.

But who knows that?

About 80% of the inhabitants of the FRG believe that the 2 + 4 Treaty would be realized and they would be nationals of the sovereign, free democratic state under the rule of law FRG.

Thus also the Ambassador of the FRG in the USA assures in the preface to the bilateral contracts with the USA that the FRG is a free democratic constitutional state, which submits to EU right.

But what nationality do the ambassadors of the FRG have? Which Constitution, from when, with which scope, which Nationality Act from which date, with which territory and state law/ordre public, in force when, do they have?

With the overwriting of Section 15 of the Nationality Act, date of issue July 22, 1913, as of Aug. 21, 2021, it is made clear: The nationality of the German Reich means the arbitrary right of the Nazis. The denunciation of the treaties under international law, the refusal of a peace settlement, the continuation of the Second World War, which for the "Germans" is the continuation of the First and we are only in the third phase of the First.

Nationality Act (StAG)

Date of issue: July 22, 1913

Full Citation:

"Nationality Act in the adjusted version published in the Federal Law Gazette, Part III, Section No. 102-1, as last amended by Article 1 of the Act of August 12, 2021 (Federal Law Gazette I p. 3538)."

Section 15 Persons who, in connection with measures of persecution on the grounds listed in the first sentence of Article 116, paragraph 2, of the Basic Law, in the period from January 30, 1933, to May 8, 1945.

1. gave up or lost their German nationality before February 26, 1955, ...and their descendants shall be naturalized upon application..."

Attention: There are 3 periods.

1. Jan. 30, 1933 to May 8, 1945.
2. May 8, 1945 to Feb. 26, 1955 and
3. after Feb. 26, 1955.

First period: According to Art. 116 para. 2 becomes a national of the German Reich, unless he has expressed a contrary will. The ordre public of the German Reich from 1933 - 1945 is the Nazi law, which is practiced again. If he does not reject this right expressly, he is Nazi.

Second period from May 08, 1945 - Feb. 26, 1955: This concerns the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG" and the Austrians.

With the insertion of Section 40a in the Nationality Act, the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG" were eliminated in 1999. Those who applied for a "German" identity card applied for nationality of the German Reich.

The Austrians did become Austrians again by the Second Law for the Regulation of Questions of Nationality of 17 May 1956. But this law was repealed on Dec. 08, 2010. Thus the Austrians are again nationals of the German Reich according to this law.

Second Act on the Regulation of Nationality Issues (2nd StAngRegG n.a.Abk.)

*Act of May 17, 1956, Federal Law Gazette I p. 431; **repealed by Article 3 Act of December 8, 2010**, Federal Law Gazette I p. 1864. Valid from 01.01.1964; FNA: 102-6 Nationality*

Opening formula

It is hereby established that the Reich Law on the Reunification of Austria with the German Reich of March 13, 1938 (Reichsgesetzbl. I p. 237) has expired. The legal questions arising therefrom in the field of nationality shall be regulated as follows:

This law is repealed. The following apply
Nationality Act, date of issue, July 22, 1913.

Section 4 (1) By birth a child acquires German nationality if one parent has German nationality.
Thus, anyone whose ancestor was once a German is still a German unless he or she has expressly rejected German Reich nationality.

Third period Feb. 26, 1955 refers to the First Law on the Regulation of Nationality of Feb. 22, 1955, Rejection of German Reich Nationality. The Government of Lower Franconia confirms that someone who has rejected German Reich nationality is "German in the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law." This is the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff cannot become a national of the German Reich even upon application (identity card).

Although Section 40a was repealed after 22 years, this does not eliminate the old legal status; in this case, in particular, the Nazi law that was practiced again. It is true that the First Law on Rejecting German Reich Nationality was also repealed. This does not change the expression of will that the nationality of the German Reich is rejected. This is in contrast to the legal abrogation of Austrian nationality by law. The legal regulation is not an expression of will.

Further with Section 15 it is finally confirmed that those who have rejected the nationality of the German Reich retain their nationality and do not lose it even on application and are present and represented in the FRG, independently. The nationals of the German Reich are not responsible for the "other" nationals. Accordingly, Section 15 GVG: "Courts are state courts." has been repealed. Thus, since then, all "state" courts are in fact arbitration courts.

Again: Section 15 StAG confirms that in the FRG there are different nationalities with different Nationality Acts. One are the nationals of the Free City of Danzig with its Nationality Act, its constitution and its ordre public and the other are the nationals of the German Reich. Towards the nationals of Danzig, whether friend or enemy, the ordre public of the Free City of Danzig/occupation law must always be observed.

Again, even if 99.99% of the Danzigers had voluntarily accepted the nationality of the German Reich, the Free City of Danzig would not have ceased to exist because of Articles 102 and 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty.

The fact that the Plaintiff was deprived of his liberty because of his Danzig nationality and that the arrest warrant, Indictment, Ref.: 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11, Allegation: "Mrs. Karin Leffer is the representative of the Free City of Danzig." exists, does not limit Danzig law to the territory of the FRG. In case of doubt, international arbitration courts are competent to interpret Danzig law. Just as a personal statute exists for employees of the UN, it exists for Danzig nationals and those who wish to be.

4.3 The Legal Succession of the Free City of Danzig by the Federal Republic of Germany

The Versailles Peace Treaty is a fundamental treaty of international law. If it were to be amended, all parties to the treaty would have to agree, including the Free City of Danzig.

The Federal Republic of Germany was conceived as the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig by the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany. This legal succession will only be confirmed under international law if the people of Danzig agree to a constitution in accordance with Article 146 of the Basic Law.

The nationals of the German Reich are obligated to fulfill their obligations to the nationals of Danzig: Art. 133 GG: *"The Federation shall enter into the rights and responsibilities of the administration of the United Economic Territory."*

According to the second sentence of Art. 79 (1), the GG cannot be amended insofar as it concerns peace treaty, occupation law (Danzig law) and defense law issues. According to Article 116 GG, the Danzigers are "in possession of German nationality in the meaning of Article 116 GG." Art. 116 GG refers to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution: "German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed." But the GG can be changed by a constitution according to Art. 146 GG. A constitution under Art. 146 GG must be agreed to by the people of Danzig.

The requirement according to Art. 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty is to adopt a constitution according to Art. 146 GG, in which the state borders are defined, as it was regulated in Art. 23 Scope GG. That means, a constitution must be decided, in which the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig is regulated.

Only the nationals of the German Reich did not want a legal succession of the Free City of Danzig by the FRG. That is why they committed themselves to pay reparations in the London Debt Agreement of 1953. Only the Free City of Danzig has not yet received reparations. In 1989 there was supposed to be a peace treaty with payment of reparations. But then the State Treaty of Austria was followed and the 2 + 4 Treaty was concluded and thus finally the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig by the FRG was agreed to.

If treaties under international law are replaced by others, then this must be described in concrete terms. For example, in the Versailles Peace Treaty:

SECTION II.

LUXEMBURG

ARTICLE 40

With regard to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, Germany renounces the benefit of all the provisions inserted in her favour in the Treaties of February 8, 1842, April 2, 1847, October 20-25, 1865, August 18, 1866, February 21 and May 11, 1867, May 10, 1871, June 11, 1872, and November 11, 1902, and in all Conventions consequent upon such Treaties. Germany recognises that the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg ceased to form part of the German Zollverein as from January 1, 1919, renounces all rights to the exploitation of the railways, adheres to the termination of the regime of neutrality of the Grand Duchy, and accepts in advance all international arrangements which may be concluded by the Allied and Associated Powers relating to the Grand Duchy.

SECTION XI.

FREE CITY OF DANZIG

ARTICLE 100

*Germany renounces in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all rights and title over the territory comprised within the following limits:
from the Baltic Sea southwards to the point where the principal channels of navigation of the Nogat and the Vistula (Weichsel) meet:
the boundary of East Prussia as described in Article 28 of Part II (Boundaries of Germany) of the present Treaty;*

A constitution of the FRG must therefore regulate the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig with regard to Art. 100 - Territory of the Free City of Danzig and Art. 102 Protection and Art. 103 Guaranteed Right.

In addition again Art. 79 para. 1 sentence 2: The GG cannot be changed, as far as it concerns

- peace treaty issues, i.e. reparations or territorial provisions of the Versailles Peace Treaty - here Art. 100 of the Versailles Peace Treaty - Territory;
- occupation law issues - here Art. 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty - guaranteed rights; and
- questions of defense law; here Art. 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty - protection of the Danzigers.

But the GG can be amended in connection with Art. 116 and Art. 146 GG, if the Danzigers agree.

A First Constitution of the FRG describing the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig has been presented in the meantime. The nationals of the German Reich can accede to it by signing it. With the signature the nationality of the German Reich is rejected. This extinguishes reparation claims and the enemy state clauses of the United Nations Charter, Articles 53 and 107.

Nevertheless, the ruling nationals of the German Reich refuse to confirm the final peace order in Europe.

With the overwriting of Section 15 of the Nationality Act on Aug. 21, 2021 of the German Reich, the FRG has ceased to exist for these nationals.

There are for the nationals of the German Reich, even after the repeal of Section 40a of the Nationality Act no longer "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG".

On the basis of Art. 116 GG alone, an identity card of the FRG could not be proof of a nationality. This is confirmed by the Munich Residents' Registration Office, among others.

At the latest with the law for the regulation of the nationality of Feb. 22, 1955 this was clearly regulated.

With the introduction of Section 40a in the Nationality Act (contrary to international law) in 1999, an identity card of the FRG is the confirmation of the nationality of the German Reich. Thus, since 1999, deception in international legal relations, deception about a false identity is practiced.

There are again only the nationals of the Free City of Danzig and the nationals of the German Reich.

The nationalities of the German Reich and the Free City of Danzig apply again.

Therefore, among other things, the Danzig Gulden is again valid as currency and the country code DA for passenger cars.

4.4 Concerning Austria

In order not to change the Versailles Peace Treaty, Austria was reconfirmed as a subject of international law by the State Treaty of 1955. Austria had been integrated into the German Reich without resistance in 1938 and had participated in all acts of war. With the State Treaty of Austria of 1955, the Austrians undertook that human rights would not only be written on paper, but would also be respected and that Austria would not enter into any connection with Germany.

Austria should thus also be an area of law, freedom and security. In this meaning also legal successor of the Free City of Danzig.

But the State Treaty was concluded with representatives of the United Nations. The decisions of the United Nations are not binding on the people of Danzig.

Only when the 2 + 4 Treaty is realized, the State Treaty of Austria is also finalized.

Austria is also obliged, because of its accession to the EU, to observe closely whether the fundamental rights of the EU are observed in the FRG.

Austria should have taken a closer look at the German legal relations at the latest due to the ECJ ruling of May 27, 2019. 5,000 arrest warrants had to be reissued. How many of them would Austria have executed? Austria must have been informed about the preliminary inquiry (complaint) of a Thuringian judge to the ECJ. The Plaintiff is, after all, aware of this. Austria would have to have ensured long ago that clarity is created here or would have to leave the EU.

Bavarian Prime Minister Söder had already called for mandatory vaccination in January 2021. The Ethics Council has determined that this is ethically unacceptable. Now Austria has decided on mandatory vaccination.

Is the Austrian government collaborating with the Bavarian dictatorship?

The sober fact is that Austria is violating the State Treaty of 1955. Thus, under international law, Austria is once again part of the German Reich, and Austrians are once again Germans under the German Nationality Act.

The State Treaty of Austria could only be concluded in 1955 after the "Germans" had committed themselves to paying reparations in the London Debt Agreement. Reparations are due in case of a reunification of Germany, Art. 25 of the London Debt Agreement. Everybody understands the reunification between the FRG and the GDR. But that's not what Art. 25 says. It says: Reunification of Germany. Under international law, Austria was still part of the German Reich in 1953.

So, by reunification of Germany, did the Germans mean reunification with Austria? Is that why the Second Nationality Act was repealed?

Are the Austrians being deliberately incited here to violate the State Treaty so that the Germans would not have to pay the reparations alone? See also overwriting of Section 15 of the Nationality Act of the German Reich of Aug. 21, 2021.

4.5 Concerning the Swiss Confederation

The Swiss Confederation has committed itself to neutrality and is obliged to protect its sovereignty in the event of war.

The sovereignty of Switzerland was violated by the extradition proceedings, Case No. of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice: B 224`63/TMA. By decision of Aug. 20, 2012, the extradition of the Plaintiff was approved only for presentation for trial. This was fully violated. Unauthorized law enforcement actions were carried out. This is a violation of Article 14 of the European Convention on Extradition, Principle of Speciality. That is, it is extradited only for the specifically authorized case. Violation of the Principle of Speciality violates sovereign rights and means a violation of sovereignty. According to the German legal commentary, the criminal offense of deprivation of liberty has been committed and would have to be prosecuted accordingly by Switzerland. According to Swiss legal commentary, Switzerland would have to file a lawsuit in The Hague for violation of sovereignty.

In violation of the requirements and conditions of the extradition decision of Aug. 20, 2012, Ref.: B 224`163/TMA, criminal prosecutions were carried out in the matter of Danzig. In hastily conducted mass trials, everyone who possessed a Danzig identity card was convicted of forgery. This resulted in the Indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11. Charge: "Mr. von Prince and Mrs. Karin Leffer are the representatives of the Free City of Danzig." This corresponds to Indictment No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

This is another reason why Switzerland is obliged to heal this violation.

But this has not been done to date.

Although the Swiss Federal Office of Justice subsequently, by decision of March 10, 2014, rejected the entire extradition on the grounds that extradition of criminal acts was not requested, but for political reasons, a cure has not been made to date.

Instead, on April 15, 2016, the Aargau/Switzerland Cantonal Police broke down the Plaintiff's front door and extradited the Plaintiff to Germany. In doing so, all parties were fully aware that the Plaintiff was not allowed to be extradited and was being held in captivity because of his nationality.

This is active participation in the Second World War. It is active partisanship in favor of the National Socialist German Reich. It is, in case of doubt, active partisanship for the benefit of reparation claimants.

The DSM Group boasts that it is responsible for this.

The DSM concern is a typical example of how the SS controls states.

A typical example of how the SS principle has been adopted by corporations is the DSM corporation.

For every employee and every business partner, the Code of Business Conduct is contractual law. It guarantees compliance with the highest ethical values, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Any form of corruption is rejected.

In fact, the DSM Group relies on the fact that these binding contractual elements cannot be sued because all state courts are not independent.

This means that Switzerland is also one of the enemy states.

But one must take into account that a People' Initiative for judicial reform has been formed in Switzerland. More than 130,000 Swiss confirm with their signatures that the entire state apparatus has been appropriated by the "political class" at the expense of the citizen, that judgeships have been bought, which would already be punishable today. All of these, without being aware of it, have rejected the jurisdiction of state courts and instead agreed to arbitration. The same is true of the "Friends of the Constitution." This association was formed because of the Corona measures and they invoke that these measures are incompatible with the Swiss Constitution. They also declare their will to be nationals of Switzerland. Even if they are not aware of it, the Friends of the Constitution call the politicians and authorities non-Swiss. In principle, these also reject the state courts.

Thus, there is de facto a personal sovereignty, a personal statute.

Whoever wants Corona measures must personally bear the costs.

4.6 Concerning the Representative of the Free City of Danzig

The Plaintiff's Inheritance or Representative of the Free City of Danzig

The Plaintiff's father was sent in the German Reich in 1940 from the League of Nations Mandate Territory Tanganyika, as a Danzig national, and thus as a contracting party of the League of Nations against the German Reich. In 1955, the Plaintiff's father expressly made use of the Law on the Regulation of Nationality of 22 Feb. 1955 (Rejection of Reich Nationality). The government of Lower Franconia/Bavaria/Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) confirms that he is a national of Danzig and, after rejecting Reich nationality, is a "German in the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law (GG)" for the FRG. In 1956, the Plaintiff's father filed claims for damages with the United Nations in New York. The United Nations confirmed the

nationality of Danzig. The Plaintiff's father received only 3% of his claims. The rest is due under the London Debt Agreement of 1953.

No other state has suffered greater losses in % than the Free City of Danzig and is the only state not to have received reparations.

The East Germans were partially murdered, beaten to death and raped en masse with impunity. Finally, they were expropriated and expelled without compensation. The Sudeten Germans suffered the same fate. Austria had joined the German Reich in 1938 without resistance and was also subject to reparations. The Saarland was de facto incorporated into France. Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands annexed territories. The rest of Germany was divided into zones of occupation by the 4 powers for the extraction of reparations.

And what about the Free City of Danzig?

Danzigers are not only "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG" but "in possession of German nationality in the meaning of Art. 116 para.1 GG" because "in the meaning of Art. 116" refers to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution: "German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed." Thus, Art. 116 defines the law of the state, the *ordre public*, and thus nationality.

How can someone pay reparations if he gets reparations?

The explanation why the Plaintiff's father, or the Free City of Danzig did not receive reparations is that the FRG was conceived as the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig by the GG. Under international law, however, the FRG only becomes the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig when a constitution under Article 146 GG is adopted. A constitution according to Art. 146 GG must be agreed to by all Danzig nationals. Thus their nationality expires and the Second World War is over. Art. 146 was already included with the promulgation of the GG in 1949. Thus, a final peace settlement could have been reached as early as 1949. But the nationals of the German Reich have always held on to their nationality and therefore committed themselves to paying reparations in the London Debt Agreement of 1953. Therefore, to clarify that no nationals of Danzig would be involved, the Nationality Settlement Act of Feb. 22, 1955, was created.

If State A wages a war of extermination against State B and one survives from State A and 100 from State B, what does the one owe the 100? Probably everything. If 100 women survive from state A and only one from state B, what do the 100 women owe to the one? But probably also everything.

All the assets of the nationals of the German Reich and the companies in the FRG are based on owed reparations.

In 1990 the Plaintiff sued for damages at the German Federal Constitutional Court because of the German-Polish Border Treaty. The lawsuit was left there until the Federal Constitutional Court Act was changed, according to which lawsuits do not have to be accepted. Berlin was still occupied. The German-Polish Border Treaty is thus not a binding treaty under international law, but only the confirmation of administrative borders.

This treaty becomes binding under international law only when the conditions on the final peace settlement according to Art. 1 of the 2 (Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR)) + 4 (Powers) Treaty are realized. Condition of the Art. 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty is that a constitution must be decided according to Art. 146 GG, in which the borders are defined, as this was regulated in Art. 23 Scope of the GG.

But the FRG and GDR first concluded a Unification Treaty. First the GDR joins the GG. But two sentences further both withdraw together from the GG, in which they explain that the Scope of the GG, Article 23 is cancelled.

Thus the GG is formally extinguished.

What remains is the "state people" of the GG, the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 (1) GG".

This was eliminated in 1999 by inserting Section 40a into the Nationality Act of the German Reich. After the Plaintiff pointed out that this change in the law was null and void without his consent, this Section 40a was repealed without a sound after 22 years.

If the Plaintiff wants to take up his inheritance, then he must see to it that the World War is ended.

4.6.1 The Plaintiff as a "German"

The Plaintiff is a civil servant of the FRG out of office, but a civil servant for life. The Plaintiff has taken an oath to uphold the GG (ordre public under international law) and thus, of course, the international treaties of the FRG.

As a national of Danzig, the Plaintiff is in any case obligated under its Constitution to protect the Constitution against unlawful, i.e. unconstitutional, attacks. There is therefore no conflict of interest with his oath.

One can also regard Danzig as the only remaining part of the German Reich. Since 1933, the German state people, through the elimination of German law, has ceased to exist, except in Danzig. There the ordre public of the original German Reich still applies. Thus, Danzig, as a part of the original German Reich, was an enemy of war, strictly speaking against the SS, the true rulers of the rest of the German Reich, which had basically been extinct since 1933 under international law.

According to Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution, the Weimar Constitution was abrogated. But that did not extend to Danzig anyway. So it can even be interpreted as if Danzig was the only remaining part of the German Reich.

So, for those who do not recognize the FRG, the Plaintiff is a Danzig national.

For those who do not recognize the nationality of Danzig, the Plaintiff must be the representative of the German Emperorship.

The Plaintiff is completely unemotional towards the respective classification by others.

No matter from which side the Plaintiff is considered, it is always the German law, ordre public at the time of Jan. 1920, which is nothing else than the law of 1913.

Who does not recognize the nationality of the Free City of Danzig, does not recognize the Versailles Peace Treaty. Then the Versailles Peace Treaty must be negotiated once again.

4.6.2 The Plaintiff as an Enemy of the Nazis

The Plaintiff was deprived of all means of livelihood, expropriated without compensation, deprived of his freedom, and in the process severely harmed in his health, expressly because of his nationality - see Exhibit 3. Allegation in the Indictment, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 of the Bavarian Public Prosecutor's Office: "Mr. von Prince and Mrs. Karin Leffer are the representatives of the Free City of Danzig. They recognize German law only in part." Clearly, we only recognize German law at the time of Jan. 1920, the Public Prosecutor's Office recognizes German law from 1933 - 1945.

The background to this. Mrs. Karin Leffer and the Plaintiff, together with others, founded the Association for Law in 2006 to demand German law. In order to make it clear which German law is meant, the Free City of Danzig was politically reorganized in 2008 and all relevant authorities were informed. Anyone who wished to join as a national of the German Reich was required to sign a peace agreement with it and send it to the United Nations. Thus, in effect, the requirement under Article 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty was fulfilled.

The Indictment, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 could only come about by violating the requirements and conditions of the extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice, Case No.: B 224'163/TMA. In hastily conducted mass trials, everyone was convicted as an instigator and accomplice in a forgery of documents. The insane (in the medical meaning) accusation was that a Danzig identity card was a forgery of a Federal German identity card. If this accusation were true, then the offense of identity card forgery would be correct and not

document forgery. The penalty for a forgery of an identity document is only half that for a forgery of a document.

In doing so, the Principle of Speciality, Art. 14 European Convention on Extradition was violated. This is a violation of the general rules of international law. According to the German legal commentary, the criminal offense of deprivation of liberty has been committed. According to the Swiss Law Commentary, Switzerland would have to file a lawsuit in The Hague. Even against a bail offer of 1'344'000,-€/day the Plaintiff was not released from prison, decision of the Coburg Regional Court/Bavaria/FRG, Case No.: 2 Ns 118 Js 181/08 of Sept. 18, 2013. Without his legal knowledge and hunger strikes, the Plaintiff would possibly still be in prison or in a psychiatric institution today.

It is true that the Swiss Federal Office of Justice, in its decision of March 10, 2014, subsequently rejected the entire extradition on the grounds that extradition was not requested for criminal acts, but for political reasons. Nevertheless, the proceedings 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 are not discontinued and continue to violate the sovereignty of Switzerland.

Thus, the Plaintiff was there at the instigation of Switzerland and had a de facto status similar to that of a diplomat.

On April 15, 2016, the Aargau/Switzerland Cantonal Police broke down the Plaintiff's front door and extradited him to Germany in handcuffs. But the extradition was expressly forbidden. Moreover, the extradition was also illegal because of the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons, including the visa-free regime between Switzerland and Danzig.

The background is that the Plaintiff purchased receivables from the DSM Group. The DSM Group is the most important employer in the Canton of Aargau. The Plaintiff should be prevented from enforcing his claims against the DSM Group.

The Freiburg/FRG Criminal Enforcement Chamber wrote in Sept. 2016: "Mr. von Prince remains in custody. He is convinced to be a national of the Free City of Danzig and considers their identity cards legitimate."

Why isn't the British Prime Minister in jail, or the Secretary General of the UN?
Or the legislator who amended the Federal Constitutional Court Act in 1990?

The Plaintiff survived this imprisonment from April 15, 2016 to April 13, 2017 only by fortunate circumstances, but suffered most severe health damages.

Since the proceedings in Bavaria have not been discontinued, the Plaintiff had to go back to Switzerland. There he is being prosecuted for alleged illegal residence. The representative of the DSM Group, Mr. Nordmann, a lawyer, boasts that this is happening at his instigation. Of course, the Plaintiff filed bias motions. Nevertheless, the prosecution continues. The Plaintiff filed a complaint at the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg for violation of Art. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 with 168 pages of official documents. There, the complaint was shredded with the claim that the legal process had not been exhausted. Meanwhile, one overrode the bias motions and thus *lis pendens* on lower instance.

On May 27, 2019, the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg ruled, in response to a preliminary inquiry by two alleged Romanian bank robbers about Irish courts, that German prosecutors are not judicial authorities in the meaning of EU law. They lack independence. This is also true for Bavarian judges. Therefore, the Plaintiff traveled to Belgium in order to be able to exhaust legal recourse to the EU Court of Justice from there. But there the Plaintiff was immediately arrested and extradited to Germany. With the judgment of Oct. 01, 2019, the Plaintiff was confirmed as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig.

Mrs. Karin Leffer and the Plaintiff filed suit in Washington D.C., Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN against the FRG, Switzerland, the Kingdom of Belgium, and the EU. Initially, on the grounds that the plaintiffs cannot bring an action throughout Europe in which procedural due process rights are respected. The defendants disputed jurisdiction. Therefore, a supplementary

complaint was subsequently filed. In it it was proved that the 2 + 4 Treaty of 1990 has not been realized and could not be realized without political organization of the Free City of Danzig. The FRG was requested to finally fulfill the 2 + 4 Treaty or that alternatively a peace treaty be concluded. Mr. Justice Nichols ruled that there would be no renegotiation of the 2 + 4 Treaty and that the Enemy States Clauses of the United Nations Charter, Articles 53 and 107 would be available for enforcement.

The Plaintiff has jurisdiction.

What else should Mr. Nichols decide?

The Plaintiff did not appoint himself to represent them.

Mandate and power of attorney for representation were already given by the British in 1940 to the Plaintiffs' father - see official United Nations records

<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1656856?ln=en>

This commission could have been terminated as early as 1955. With the Law on the Regulation of Nationality of 22 Feb. 1955, a separation was made under international law between those liable for reparations and those entitled to reparations. This separation was made because of the London Debt Agreement. Even if, according to this agreement, reparations were to be paid only after a reunification of "Germany", reparations could already have been paid to the Danzigers.

The Plaintiff's mandate to find a final peace settlement for the Free City of Danzig could have been completed by the United Nations as early as 1957, or by the Federal Constitutional Court in 1990.

Whom should Mr. Justice Nichols designate as the competent authority, except the Plaintiff?

The 2 + 4 Treaty is to be fulfilled and the conditions are set by the representative of the Free City of Danzig.

By the criminal prosecutions, expressly because of the nationality of the Free City of Danzig, the Plaintiff is confirmed representative of the Free City of Danzig.

In addition the Plaintiff is an official of the FRG and thus obligated that the ordre public, both of the FRG as well as of the Free City of Danzig is maintained and entitled in a constitution for the FRG to establish the ordre public.

The 4 powers are the representatives of the United Nations. These can decide in management without order in the meaning for the Free City of Danzig, but the final agreement must come from the Free City of Danzig.

Confirmation that the plaintiff's father was sent to the German Reich by the British in 1940 as a citizen of Danzig and thus a party to the League of Nations:

<https://digitallibrary.un.org/?ln=en>

Tom Adalbert of Prince

link <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1656856?ln=en>

<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1656856?ln=en>

https://digitallibrary.un.org/nanna/record-thumb/big_218828_0.png

file:///C:/Users/princ/AppData/Local/Temp/T_RES_1717(XX)-EN.pdf

file:///C:/Users/princ/AppData/Local/Temp/T_RES_1717(XX)-EN-1.pdf

file:///C:/Users/princ/AppData/Local/Temp/T_PET-2_200-EN.pdf

file:///C:/Users/princ/AppData/Local/Temp/T_PET-2_200_Add-3-EN.pdf

see Exhibit No. 2. In Exhibit 1, the Government of Lower Franconia/Bavaria/ FRG confirms the rejection of German Reich nationality and confirms being "German in the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law" as a national of Danzig.

The application of the Enemy State Clauses of the Charter of the United Nations, Art. 53 and 107 means the expropriation of German property without compensation. The German property is based anyway only on owed reparations. The Free City of Danzig had the greatest losses

in % and has not yet received reparations. It is clear that the FRG belongs to the nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to the nationals of the German Reich. With the overwriting of Section 15 of the Nationality Act of Aug. 21, 2021, it is confirmed that the Danzig nationals are the owners of the FRG.

The Plaintiff was thus given the power of attorney and the mandate in the last instance by Mr. Judge Nichols that the 2 + 4 Treaty be realized.

The representative of the Plaintiffs has taken his oath on the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany and is therefore obliged to ensure that the 2 + 4 Treaty is observed and cannot evade this mandate.

The Plaintiff has therefore begun to make use of the Enemy State Clauses of the Charter of the United Nations and has drafted a Constitution which complies with the requirements of Article 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty and has signed it - see Annex 4.

Nevertheless, the rulers of the nationals of the German Reich refuse to sign this Constitution. Thereby the nationals of the German Reich can of course make suggestions for improvement. So there is no rational reason not to sign this Constitution. The rulers of the nationals of the German Reich obviously already see themselves as the victors of the First and Second World Wars.

But indestructibly the Free City of Danzig exists. Finally, the representative has also personally inherited extensive claims for damages/reparations. If the representative of the Free City of Danzig wants to claim these, then he must also see to the end of the war.

Who else?

Who else is responsible for ensuring that the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig is recognized under international law in a constitution pursuant to Article 146 of the Basic Law?

4.6.3 The Plaintiff, in Management without Order for Everyone Deceived

Mr. Beowulf von Prince is obligated, in management without a mandate, to act on behalf of everyone who does not want a Nazi victory.

Section 677 of the German Civil Code (BGB):

„A person who conducts a transaction for another person without being instructed by him or otherwise entitled towards him must conduct the business in such a way as the interests of the principal require in view of the real or presumed will of the principal.“

Every right also generates duties. A person who neglects his duties cannot invoke his rights. Section 677 must always be applied when the situation requires it.

This is the case here.

The Plaintiff, as a managing director without a mandate according to Section 677 of the German Civil Code, is acting on behalf of all those who want to end the world war. This means, precisely because of global warming, to speak also for those who are affected by it. The Free City of Danzig was created to secure peace, to reduce armament spending. The armament expenditures rise and amount to world-wide approx. 1'500'000'000'000,-€. But because of climate protection only 100'000'000'000,-€ should be provided. This is disproportionate. But the world war still exists. It is time to end this and to use the military expenditures more meaningfully.

The Plaintiff represents all those who want the rule of law, who want a Europe of law, freedom and security, and those who think that alternatives to Corona measures are more effective and cheaper to eliminate Corona diseases.

With regard to the Corona measures, it is evident that a large number of "Germans" do not agree with them, as do many citizens in Europe.

Even if a very large majority of the population were in agreement, there is no justification under Danzig/German law/Constitution of the Free City of Danzig to override these guaranteed rights for individuals, here on the grounds of preventing Corona infection.

4.7 Concerning the Defendant United Nations

The United Nations is the legal successor to the League of Nations - see Article 37 of the Statutes of the International Court of Justice at The Hague, assumption of the properties of the League of Nations and the League of Nations Mandated Territories.

The United Nations is the war alliance against the German Reich. The 4 powers were (or are ?) the representatives of the United Nations against the German Reich for the fulfillment of Art. 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty.

It can be seen that the Allies conducted the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials as proxies of the Free City of Danzig.

The FRG was to be the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig. This legal succession becomes binding under international law only when the people of Danzig agree to a constitution for the FRG. With this, the nationality of the Free City of Danzig expires. Thus the Second World War is ended.

This is also why it was made a condition of the complete sovereignty of the FRG in Article 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty that sovereignty becomes effective only with the realization of the conditions of the 2 + 4 Treaty.

But the "nationals of the German Reich" - the government of the FRG and GDR agree on a Unification Treaty. According to Art. 3, the GDR first accedes to the GG, two sentences later the FRG and GDR withdraw from the GG, in which they declare that the scope of the GG is abolished. Thus the GG is formally extinguished.

What remains is the people of the FRG, the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG". Instead of declaring the "nationals of the German Reich" to be "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 GG", the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 GG" are declared to be "nationals of the German Reich".

All post-war regulations were supposed to secure to everyone the rule of law guarantees of the Free City of Danzig, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil Rights, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

But what do we have now?

As a result of the insertion of Section 40a into the Nationality Act of the German Reich, the *ordre public* of the FRG/Free City of Danzig is being replaced step by step by the *ordre public* of the "German Reich". The international treaties of the FRG are *de facto* cancelled.

This destroys the entire international legal structure.

Above all, the EU states and even the USA must execute Bavarian arrest warrants unchecked. In doing so, the common right to conduct fair trials is violated. The judges especially of the EU and also of Switzerland and even of the USA would have to go on strike as long as Bavaria does not adhere to the agreed law.

How will a judge from Switzerland, Austria, etc., claim to be independent and impartial when he executes German court rulings and arrest warrants?

He also represents the German judges in the execution. He is acting on their behalf.

He cannot claim that he himself applies the provisions for a fair trial if his colleague does not comply with them. The legal principle of equal law for all no longer applies. A judge who does

not ensure that equal law is applied equally simply cannot claim that he is acting lawfully. He must first clarify what the common law is.

The UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva also rejects a complaint on the grounds that the legal process has not been exhausted. As already mentioned, the exhaustion of legal recourse is not possible, because the handing over of a judgment in the legal meaning is already lacking, lawyers are compelled to be present, and the admission of lawyers is withdrawn if they want to exhaust legal recourse.

The letter from the UN Human Rights Commission also bears no signature or other name or names an employee. Here, too, anonymous persons are acting who can be held responsible for absolutely nothing, although they are responsible if war crimes take place under their noses again.

The Plaintiff presents the "Germans" with a Constitution that complies with the requirements of the 2 + 4 Treaty. But the "nationals do not countersign.

The Plaintiff points out that the insertion of Section 40a of the Nationality Act of the German Reich is null and void because he did not give his consent.

Now Section 40a has been repealed again and Section 15 has been overwritten.

Section 15 now clearly separates.

The Plaintiff is not a national of the German Reich and cannot become one even upon application. The Plaintiff's father has rejected this nationality. According to Section 1 of the Nationality Act of the Free City of Danzig, this nationality passes from the father to the child.

The Deputy Plaintiff, together with Mrs. Leffer and others, already pointed out to the United Nations in 2008 that the Free City of Danzig had organized itself politically. Danzig identity cards were issued for this purpose. Whoever wanted to have one as a national of the German Reich, an express Peace Treaty was concluded with them and sent to the United Nations. This made it clear that these persons did not fall under the Enemy State Clauses of the United Nations Charter, Articles 53 and 107, and fulfilled Article 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty.

The Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations states that the Charter of the United Nations was adopted with the intention that all treaties under international law be observed. Among the binding treaty elements of the United Nations Charter are the principle of good faith, Art. 2, to resolve disputes through arbitration, Art. 33, and the Enemy State Clauses, Arts. 53 and 107.

Who now represents the FRG at the United Nations?

These are not "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG Para. 1", but impostors, fraudsters, in truth not even nationals of the German Reich, but correctly, members of the SS.

4.8 Concerning the Defendant WHO

The WHO, too, must uphold their *ordre public vis-à-vis* the Danzigers and must work to ensure that this is upheld in its recommendations.

The Plaintiff hears very little about the WHO's activities with respect to corona influenza. The WHO should have long since been able to draw a comparison of the very different measures and then make recommendations.

In the German-speaking media the success of vaccinations is reported. The success is justified with the fact that of the inoculated less badly ill and faster from the hospital are discharged. But what about those who recover? Do convalescents end up in the hospital? Apparently none. This confirms the long-known knowledge that surviving an infection leads to immunity, which also ensured that Spanish, Bird and Swine flu simply disappeared. The WHO apparently recommends mandatory masking, which will not protect anyone in the long run from getting infected sooner or later. WHO apparently recommends testing that is as useful as a hole in the head. WHO apparently recommends vaccinations that are now admittedly proving to be quite useless and are suspected of prolonging rather than shortening corona flu.

Plaintiff fails to see that WHO is fulfilling its constitutional mandate.

According to Wikipedia, WHO is significantly funded by Bill and Belinda Gates and their Gavi Foundation, who in turn have stakes in pharmaceutical companies like Pfizer that profit from vaccination. The Rockefeller Foundation also funds the WHO. Allegedly, the Rockefeller Foundation holds patents on testing.

The suspicion arises that the WHO is not fulfilling its mandate because it is not acting in the interest of health but in the interest of its sponsors.

4.9 Concerning Interpol

Interpol is headed by a former German police officer. He, too, must know that the ECJ has found that German prosecutors are not judicial authorities in the meaning of EU law. 5,000 arrest warrants had to be reissued. How many of these would Interpol have issued for wanted persons? Interpol is still issuing arrest warrants for wanted persons, which may not be issued for wanted persons due to Art. 6 ECHR, Art. 14 International Covenant on Civil Rights and Art. 47 GC.

4.10 Concerning NATO

NATO is primarily an alliance of values and is indirectly intended to provide military protection for those in Danzig.

In fact, NATO defends those who prosecute, expropriate without compensation, and deprive of freedom Danzig nationals only because of their nationality. In fact, NATO serves the nationals of the German Reich, precisely the SS, who clearly declare to continue the Second World War.

NATO is at the moment the auxiliary force of the SS.

The 2 + 4 Treaty states that no foreign troops, including NATO nationals, may be stationed on the territory of the GDR. There should be no expansion of NATO to Eastern European countries.

If the Plaintiff were Ukrainian, he would oppose Ukraine's admission to the EU and NATO. Russia has its own problems. But is far from Bavarian conditions. With Bavaria in the EU and NATO might as well admit China.

This would also be a solution to reduce military expenditures and instead water semi-deserts, for example.

4.11 Concerning the Defendant EU Commission and the EU Parliamentarians of the EU Parliament

The nationals of the German Reich, like Mrs. Ursula von der Leyen, President of the EU Commission, refuse to implement the requirements of Article 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty.

They reject thereby the obligatory peace regulation. They declare with it the world war to continue. They reject the nationality of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). They reject the international law contracts of the FRG and they reject the EU as area of the right, freedom and security. The State of Bavaria is again a de facto dictatorship.

One must admit that it is funny when the president of the EU Commission is a woman who has obtained her position by deceiving herself in legal relations. She pretends to be a national of the FRG, but actually insists on her nationality of the National Socialist German Reich.

What is the difference between the nationality of the German Reich and the "Germans in the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law"? The difference is that for the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG" the German law applies according to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution: "German law at the time Jan. 1920". For the nationals of the German Reich the Nazi arbitrary law applies. For the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG" the present borders of Europe apply. For the Nazis the borders of 1913. According to this, all Poles, Austrians, parts of the French, Belgian and Danish population are nationals of the German Reich, for whom the Nazi law is valid.

The process is as follows: The Nazis overrun Europe and are the rulers. Then the Allies advance and are the rulers. The Nazis launch a counteroffensive, retake the Ardennes, and are again in power. Then they retreat and the Allies are again the rulers. The 4 powers trust the "Germans" to keep the 2 + 4 Treaty and leave. But the Nazis do not honor this treaty and take over Europe again. This time not militarily, but by infiltration, as they did in the 30s of the last century in Austria and Danzig.

EU Commission President should be a member of the Bavarian CSU, Mr. Weber. Mr. Weber criticizes Hungary and demands that the Hungarian Fidesz Party be excluded from the conservative center of the EU Parliament, because of the authoritarian leadership style. At the same time, Bavaria is a de facto dictatorship. The CSU member and the EU Delegate Mrs. Monika Hohlmeier defends then that the Fidesz Party was not excluded nevertheless, with the fact that one did not want to divide the conservative center in the EU Parliament. Mrs. Hohlmeier is the daughter of the former Bavarian Prime Minister Franz-Josef Strauss. In 1973, he had filed a complaint with the Federal Constitutional Court to establish that the citizens of the GDR were still nationals of the German Reich. Mrs. Hohlmeier is therefore well aware that the 2 + 4 Treaty is not fulfilled and is informed about the Bavarian legal practice.

Instead of Mr. Weber, Mrs. Ursula von der Leyen became EU Commission President. Mrs. Ursula von der Leyen is the daughter of the former Prime Minister of Lower Saxony, Mr. Albrecht. She too surely knows that the 2 + 4 Treaty has not been fulfilled and that she is no longer a "German in the meaning of Art. 116 GG".

Mrs. Ursula von der Leyen, as well as Mrs. Hohlmeier and others deliberately pretend a false nationality.

How can it be that the EU is led by nationals who are not nationals of a member state of the EU?

How can it be that the EU is led by nationals who do not recognize today's European borders and stick to the borders at the time of 1913?

It cannot be that the EU is led by people who clearly declare to continue the First and Second World Wars against the rest of Europe.

The EU parliamentarians must ask themselves whether they represent the people of Europe, 95% of whom certainly want a Europe of law, freedom and security.

In addition one must already note: All European states have ratified the European Convention on Human Rights. According to Art. 6, everyone can represent himself or be represented by a person of his choice. But if you want to have the European Court of First Instance (EuG) examine whether EU law is being observed, you need a lawyer.

How does that fit together?

Also the MEPs are responsible that no corona coercion measures are ordered as long as the nationals of the German Reich clearly declare to continue the World War and go into liability.

4.12 Concerning the Vatican

The Vatican was recognized by the German Reich under international law by the 1933 Concordat Treaty. This treaty was continued by the Federal Republic of Germany.

The oath of the Catholic bishops reads: 'Before God and on the holy Gospels I swear and promise, as befits a bishop, to the German Reich (today: the Federal Republic of Germany) and to the Land N.N. (name of the federal state) loyalty. I swear and promise to respect the constitutionally formed government and to have it respected by my clergy. In my dutiful concern for the welfare and interest of the German state system, I will, in the exercise of the clerical office entrusted to me, strive to prevent any harm that might threaten it.' (Article 16)

There appears again the confusion of terms with: 'Federal Republic of Germany' 'constitutionally formed government' and 'German state system'.

All this does not fit together. The state of the FRG is defined in the GG.

The scope of the Basic Law Art. 23 of the "Constitution", the Basic Law has already ceased to exist on July 17, 1990. This was confirmed in Art. 4 (2) of the Unification Treaty between the FRG and the GDR. Since then, the governments of the FRG have de facto continued to administer the United Economic Territory, Art. 133 GG in management without mandate.

According to Art. 38 GG, members of parliament are elected directly. But according to the election laws, 50% of the deputies are appointed by the parties. Thus the parliaments are already unconstitutionally occupied. The judges of the "Constitutional Court" are appointed unconstitutionally. Art. 97 Independence of judges no longer exists in practice. Art. 101 Legal Judges GG is no longer observed. As a result of the fact that no verbatim records are kept in court, Art. 103 Right to be Heard is also no longer respected.

The concordat was continued by the "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG para. 1". The "Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG para. 1" were declared to be nationals of the National Socialist German Reich by the insertion of Section 40a and treated accordingly.

But the oath of the bishops can only serve a government.

The government of the Federal Republic of Germany can only be formed by nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany, elected by the nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Vatican or the Catholic bishops must now decide to whom their oath belongs. To the nationals of the German Reich, such as the Bavarian Prime Minister Söder, or to the legal successor of the FRG or German Reich. This is the Free City of Danzig.

The deputy Plaintiff therefore expects a clear statement from the Vatican or the bishops.

4.13 Concerning the other Defendants, the political parties of the governments and the "state organs" of the FRG, Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Belgium, France and Italy, etc.... in relation to the Corona measures

These are especially obliged to respect the ordre public of the Danzigers as long as no peace treaty has been concluded.

4.13.1 Facts about the Corona measures

The corona virus reached Italy. Death rates of up to 10% were reported. It is already clear that sooner or later everyone will suffer from Corona. The Plaintiff immediately bought 20kg of vitamin C. The first lockdown was correctly ordered on the grounds that it was necessary to slow (not prevent) the spread so as not to overburden the health care system. Emergency pay for nurses should have been paid immediately, and emergency personnel should have been recruited and emergency clinics should have been built. But then it very quickly became apparent that the vast majority did not even realize they were infected. No danger allowances were paid. So there is no danger. No emergency clinics were set up. Thus, there is no emergency. Corona measures are simply illegal.

If there were 30,000 intensive care beds in Germany at the beginning of 2020, there were only 20,000 at the end of 2020. In Austria, the medical profession had demanded an increase in the budget of €1,000,000,000,- in 2019. None of this has been paid to date.

A comparison of the occupancy of the intensive care beds of the Helios clinics in Germany and hospitals in Switzerland show that always about 30-20% of the intensive care beds were not occupied. Also the accountings of the health insurance companies do not say something else. Also the private health insurance of the Plaintiff sees no reason to increase the rates.

But for the lockdowns in Germany 400'000'000'000,-€ were spent, in Austria 40'000'000'000,-€. That makes per capita about 4'000 - 5'000,-€.

The German Chancellor Merkel justified the lockdown in March 2021 with literally: "dramatic death figures". According to the Federal Statistical Office, 11,000 fewer people died in March 2021 than in previous years. Public news channels claim that 70'000 people died of Corona in Germany. However, the official statistics show only 40,000. There is no excess mortality. How so? A comparison of the different causes of death shows that other causes of death have decreased. In total, also 40'000. This leads to the conclusion that nobody died from the corona virus, but only in connection with the corona virus,

Mrs. Merkel proposes corona measures starting at an incidence of 35 and a lockdown at an incidence of 100, while incidences of 700 were detected right at the time of the coronavirus outbreak, without overloading the health care system.

Meanwhile, Austrian nurses are protesting over inadequate pay, which has already been criticized in 2019.

In Germany, 5,000 nurses have resigned.

Meanwhile, incidences of 2,000 are noted and at the same time clinics are complaining that bankruptcy is imminent.

Instead, compulsory vaccinations are being introduced. The Bavarian de facto dictator Söder wants compulsory vaccination right away. The Ethics Council rejects it.

The Austrian ex-Chancellor Kurz (ex- because it came out that he financed falsified survey results and the publication with tax money), announces in January 2021 that he has ordered equal 40'000'000 vaccination doses for 8 million Austrians. So equal to 5 vaccine doses per person. Then he obviously knew that vaccination is pointless. That's why he also said in May 2021 that the corona crisis will continue for another three years. This raises the question of

whether the Austrian government was formed legitimately at all. After all, falsified poll results were published so that Mr. Kurz would become chancellor. Without the falsified poll results, the Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ), which vehemently opposes Corona measures, would possibly be represented in the government.

German Health Minister Lauterbach even concludes that it will take 4 years for corona disease to disappear.

The German World Medical Association President Montgomery: *"Vaccination must be given an expiry date" If a vaccination against the corona virus is given longer ago, one becomes an unvaccinated person again, says Frank Ulrich Montgomery. The way out is to get boosted. The President of the **World Medical Association**, Frank Ulrich Montgomery, calls for a time limit on vaccination status. Message from 28.11.2021.*

There is the alpha variant. How bad. Then comes the South African variant, much worse. Flights are canceled. Tourism suffers. Then comes the Indian variant. Terribly bad. Then comes the Brazilian version. The end of mankind threatens. Then comes another Indian variant (or was it a British one again?). The end of mankind is sealed. Now Omikron (or how is it spelled?) comes from South Africa again. But most of the people in the slums in South Africa should have died already, right?

And what about Madagascar? There the people suffer from hunger. For how many people is there one doctor, one hospital bed and one intensive care bed? People are not dying of Corona, but of hunger. Tanzania also does not notice anything about a pandemic. Just as little as in the slums of Nairobi, in the war zone of Ethiopia or in Sweden.

All of these countries stand out because they have implemented little or no Corona measures. The direct comparison can be made between Israel and Gaza. Israel has excellent health care and a high standard of living. There is nothing lacking. Gaza, one of the most densely populated areas on earth, lacks everything, especially good health care. Israel is the world champion in vaccination and is now being overrun by Omikron in a 5th wave after the third vaccination and is carrying out the 4th vaccination.

In Gaza, you don't notice any of this. No one wears masks as they do not in Sweden.

There are hardly any Corona patients. Not even the hospital staff wears any protection against infection, no masks at all.

It just shows what has always been confirmed: Every flu disappears all by itself. Certainly, more people die with flu. Certainly, the corona flu is worse than a normal flu. But one must see this in the relationship. In Germany, about 300,000 people get sepsis/blood poisoning every year. About 100,000 people die of sepsis, and some of those who survive suffer permanent damage to their health, including amputations. If doctors were better trained, about 15,000 lives could be saved and tens of thousands of people could be spared serious damage to their health. But the German Health Minister has no interest in this. He is also a shareholder in a lobbying firm for pharmaceutical companies.

Again: The country comparison clearly proves that the countries that have taken Corona measures the least or very late have fewer Corona patients than the countries that have taken Corona measures the fastest.

It has been clearly proven that all Corona measures are completely counterproductive. Everything that strengthens the immune system, which is the only thing that protects against serious illness, is banned.

Even the German RKI chief Wieler had to admit that. He has now advised normal flu vaccination because the immune system is not trained/weakened by the Corona measures - masks, testing with quarantine and exit restrictions.

Masks may help the Corona virus spread more slowly, but will not prevent everyone from getting infected sooner or later.

If testing should make sense, then only if the number of those who have already recovered is determined. But what is the point of determining how many have already recovered and are therefore immune?

Austrian television shows impressive statistics that prove that vaccinated people fall ill less severely than unvaccinated people.

And what about the comparison with convalescents? Obviously, there is no comparison, because recovered people do not get sick anymore.

According to tests, 10-15% of Austrians have already been infected and recovered in 2020. 65% are vaccinated. In Sept. 2021, incidences of 2,000 were measured. Within a few weeks, 20% had recovered. Thus, all Austrians should already be immune, if the data is correct. But still, mandatory vaccination is being introduced in Austria.

Again. Shortly after the outbreak of Corona infections, it became apparent that only a few people became seriously ill. In the spring of 2020, the diseases declined. One should not have suppressed the infection, but should have specifically promoted it. To do this, one should have paid decent wages to the nursing staff so that an increased workload would be absorbed by more staff. Pills containing Coronavirus should have been offered to anyone who wanted it, so that everyone could get past their infection on schedule. There would have been no need for another lockdown. Corona would already be history, just like Spanish, Bird and Swine flu.

It is unmistakable that the vaccine doses that have been ordered need to be used up. It is unmistakable that it is not about health. One might suspect it is about business if Austrian judges were not also enforcing Bavarian rulings.

The Plaintiff is not an opponent of vaccination. The Plaintiff used to have himself and his children vaccinated.

But with the announcement of the Bavarian Prime Minister Söder to carry out mandatory vaccinations, the Plaintiff has to refuse vaccination on moral grounds.

After it became known that Ivermectin is suitable for the treatment of Corona, the Plaintiff immediately had a prescription issued. However, his Austrian pharmacy said that the Chamber prohibited its sale. In Germany, the Plaintiff received Ivermectin, and the package cost €120. Before it was known that Ivermectin helps, a pack of Ivermectin in India is said to have cost 2, 60 €.

The Plaintiff has tried everything to become infected. The sooner the better. Finally an acquaintance fell ill. Maybe the Plaintiff is lucky and the infected person is sick with Corona. The Plaintiff mass fever under the tongue and to check whether the clinical thermometer read correctly, the Plaintiff also put the clinical thermometer under the tongue, etc.. The Plaintiff did not fall ill. After a week of fever, the Plaintiff took his patient to his primary care physician, who diagnosed Corona disease via a laboratory test. (That is the only purpose of testing that makes sense: diagnosis.) The Plaintiff administered Ivermectin to "his" patient. Immediately, the fever went down. Now the Plaintiff wanted to know. He had a PCR test done. Cost 117,-CHF. The test was negative. How could this be? He had another PCR test done and a blood sample taken to determine antibodies. Neither an infection nor antibodies could be detected.

But despite negative tests, the Plaintiff is denied access to the MediaMarkt, for example, as well as a visit to the spa.

There is definitely already a vaccination requirement for the immune. But vaccinations are not only useless, they pose an incalculable risk. That is written on every package insert.

What is going on in the head of the Bavarian dictator Söder at the thought of mandatory vaccination? Is he a pervert?

If the Plaintiff agrees to forced vaccination, then he might as well apply to be a concentration camp guard, right?

The concentration camps (KZs) of the SS were also legal, legitimate and appropriate under the circumstances. Thousands of healthy men died there every day. Women and children

perished in the hail of bombs. There was a lack of everything, including food. And then the internal enemies of the SS are supposed to be better off? Are the concentration camps supposed to be rest homes for conscientious objectors like those in Danzig? Then the concentration camps would be overcrowded. In the end they were overcrowded anyway, which is why the useless were sent straight to the gas chambers. Food had to be rationed for those who could still perform as much work as possible. After all, the work performance was rewarded with food. Those who could not perform, starved to death. So it was only humane to send the unfit for work straight to the gas chamber, or does a Corona advocate want to deny that?

The unvaccinated are now treated worse at their own expense, like criminals who are supposed to be integrated into social life and are given free time to do so.

Although there should be no more illnesses according to the Corona rules, the Plaintiff, as a confirmed Corona exempt, may not even have the rights that the Plaintiff had a year ago. This Austrian government, like the Bavarian one, is simply the successor organization of the SS.

Anyone who does not obey senseless orders is now already treated like a criminal, with the difference that he has to pay his own living expenses.

What if the unvaccinated person can no longer pay for his living and the social security funds no longer pay benefits? We already have this situation in Austria. Those who are unemployed, even if there is no prospect of work, must still submit to Corona measures in order to receive unemployment benefits. Who refuses nevertheless, must probably go sooner or later voluntarily into the prison, so that he does not starve. If only some of them do that, we will need concentration camps again. Then it is again only a small step up to the gas chamber, or?

Who advocates concentration camps in the last consequence, advocates gas chambers in the last consequence. He speaks his own judgment.

But there is still the Free City of Danzig.

In whole Europe Danzig/German right is valid: § 226 BGB chicanery prohibition.

Section 226 Civil Code (BGB) Prohibition of Chicanery

„The exercise of a right is not permitted if its only possible purpose consists in causing damage to another.“

Section 113 Criminal Code (StGB) Resistance to Officials

(3) The offence is not punishable under this provision if the official act is not lawful. This also applies if the offender mistakenly assumes that the official act is lawful.

Anyone who violates this is in violation of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare and does not enjoy immunity.

Anyone can protect themselves from Corona as they wish. But only at their own expense and not at the expense of the taxpayer. Anyone who wants someone else to participate in Corona measures must pay for it. But not the taxpayer. Only those who cannot afford to pay others to participate in corona measures can apply for government assistance.

5. Claims

Treaties must be honored or be properly terminated. Entering into treaties is an expression of sovereignty. The Free City of Danzig has treaties with all states of the United Nations. No other state can have more sovereignty. If a contracting party breaks a treaty, the treaty legally ceases to exist as soon as the damages from the breach are paid.

Therefore, the Plaintiff, as the representative of the Free City of Danzig, issues an order to end the World War.

But, of course, government orders in the Free City of Danzig are nothing but demands. Not only can any individual, but even the individual must raise an objection if he sees his rights violated. In a democracy, even the most powerful person stands only at eye level with another. Even if the power of the most powerful is based on an overwhelming majority of the population. For the rest, Section 677, Management without a mandate, applies anyway. That is, anyone can act on behalf of the Plaintiff.

Figuratively speaking, a house must be built in which everyone has room and which, if possible, pleases everyone. Figuratively speaking, the Plaintiff submits a draft. Basically, with this lawsuit, a tender for the draft of a house takes place, figuratively speaking. Anyone can submit a counter-draft. In the event of a dispute over the better draft, a court of arbitration decides.

In the rule of law, no order may be obeyed until the appeal has been decided. Anyone who disregards the pendency of a complaint is simply a fascist, a potential mass murderer who declares that he is best hanged from the nearest tree.

Of course, in the case of an emergency or danger, no court proceedings can be waited for - danger in delay. But who sees a danger situation, must assign a judge on the fastest way to confirm the emergency situation.

The Plaintiff is entitled to end the Second World War simply out of personal interest - in this case inherited compensation or reparations. As a judicially confirmed representative, the Plaintiff is also obligated to end the Second World War. The "Germans" were asked several times over the years to fulfill their obligation under the 2 + 4 Treaty. The proposals were rejected. No counter-proposals were made.

Therefore, it is ordered/proposed that:

Claim No. 1:

Art. 100 of the Versailles Peace Treaty is amended. The territory of the Free City of Danzig is extended to the territory of the FRG and GDR. The confusion with the term "Germany" has led to the Second World War and will therefore be finally eliminated.

The real estate of the Federation, the Länder and the municipalities of the FRG and GDR the participations, enterprises of the Federation and the Länder become state property of the Free City of Danzig. The currency of the Free City of Danzig, the Gulden, is reissued. It is covered, by the gold stocks of the FRG stored abroad.

Claim No. 2:

Article 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty shall be amended to provide for the protection of the people of Danzig by an international armed force. This armed force is an independent subject of international law with its own assets that the "Germans" pay for. This is not a problem. In 2019 alone, the FRG has achieved trade surpluses worth € 250'000'000'000,-. In the past 65 years worth about 6'000'000'000'000,-€. Ideally, this force is formed by equal shares of all states. This force will be active only on the basis of an international arbitration decision. This

force can also be deployed abroad by other states on the basis of an international arbitration ruling.

The state structure is based on the model of the United States of America. Municipalities, the states and the federal government levy their own taxes.

Until the protection of the nationals of Danzig is assured by an international force, the personal sovereignty applies to all Europeans and Swiss who invoke the ordre public of the Free City of Danzig. There must be no disadvantage.

All states of the EU and also Switzerland are obliged to grant the Danzig nationals their right in their territories. This must be granted anyway by the ECHR, the International Covenant on Civil Rights and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU and On the Mutual Recognition of Court Judgments, or Public Deeds.

It is primarily up to the states of the EU to end this personnel sovereignty by providing contingents for an international force.

Claim No. 3

First and foremost, the United Nations with its subsidiary organizations should require the "Germans" accredited and employed there to prove their nationality. For this purpose, these "Germans" should prove which constitution, from which year, with which scope, the corresponding Nationality Act, from which year, with which scope, which ordre public, defined in which laws, from which year they are subject to.

Nationals of the German Reich must be denied access to the United Nations. Anything else means capitulation to the German Reich.

The same applies to employees of Interpol, the World Medical Association and, of course, the EU.

According to the communication of the EU, only nationals of the FRG can work in the EU anyway, of course.

All nationals of the German Reich are to be excluded from the Parliament, the Council of the EU, the EU Commission and the employees from the EU. "German" judges are not preliminary instances of the ECJ.

All of these are to be replaced by nationals of the Free City of Danzig.

Only Danzig identity card holders may benefit from the double taxation agreements.

If this is refused, then it becomes obvious that the state institutions have capitulated to the Nazis.

Of course, no nationals of the German Reich who reject a peace settlement and the community of values of NATO can be part of NATO. All members of the German armed forces must be excluded from NATO. Unless they keep their oath to the ordre public of the FRG or Free City of Danzig and request a Danzig identity card as proof.

Austria must negotiate a peace treaty with the Free City of Danzig or is simply an enemy state and will not be heard. No true Austrian agrees with the latter.

Switzerland must establish its sovereignty and neutrality and expropriate German property without compensation until the Plaintiff is compensated.

Claim No. 4 because of the Corona measures:

Everyone in favor of Corona measures pays for those measures, but not through taxes - violation of Article 48 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

In turn, everyone who is against pays for adequate medical care through substantial wage increases for caregivers.

As evidence, the Plaintiff cites the Austrian Prof. Dr. Haditsch, or his evidence.

As further evidence the Plaintiff cites the Dutchman, Mr. Adamah. The proves that for example with the German "news" magazine "Spiegel" Bill Gates bought himself with 2'000'000,-€ to recommend vaccinations. Such a thing leads to the fact that for example the Russian federation forbids foreign financing of organizations. This is a restriction of the freedom of the press and opinion. But it is due to the fact that opinion is manipulated. An independent judiciary can help against this. But which politician wants an independent judiciary?

The Plaintiff certainly represents at least 10% of the population in management. On average, the Corona measures have certainly cost 4'000 - 5'000,-€/person.

In contrast, a maximum of 1'000,-€/person would have been sufficient, so that the health care system is not overloaded and infected, which no one disputes, everyone will anyway.

Thus the Plaintiff demands for example for the FRG with approx. 80'000'000 inhabitants for at least 10% of the population, that is 8'000'000,- x 3'000,-€ = 24'000'000'000,-€. Exact figures will follow. Concrete claimants are, for example, the doctors who have spoken out against vaccinations, organizations against Corona measures, probably anyone who has received a fine for violating Corona measures, for resisting state power, etc..

To be paid by all who order and enforce Corona measures. This starts with the WHO and ends with the store clerk.

Date

Signature

- Exhibits - 1 Rejection of the German Reich Nationality - Danziger
- 2 official documents of the United Nations - Danziger, with excerpt of the claim
- 3 Claim for damages dated Oct. 03, 2020
- 4 First Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany
- 5 Demand for personal assumption of liability

Appendix List of preliminary Defendants

Headquarters of the United Nations

760 United Nations Plaza,
Manhattan, New York City, (10017-6818)
United States

WHO Headquarters in Geneva

Avenue Appia 20
CH-1211 Geneva
Switzerland

WMA The World Medical Association

13, ch. du Levant
CIB – Bâtiment A
01210 Ferney-Voltaire
France
Phone: +33 4 50 40 75 75
e-mail: wma@wma.net

INTERPOL General Secretariat

200, quai Charles de Gaulle
69006 Lyon
France
Fax: +33 4 72 44 71 63

NATO Joint Warfare Centre

PO Box 8080, Eikesetveien
4068 Stavanger
Norway

For Media-related queries please click here

Chief Public Affairs Officer: Lieutenant Colonel Stefan Kuehling (German Army)

Mobile: + (47) 90 13 70 77

For further information about the Joint Warfare Centre, please Contact PAO

Phone: + (47) 52 87 9130 / 9131 / 9132

e-mail: pao@jwc.nato.int

EU-Kommission

Commission européenne
1049 Bruxelles
BELGIQUE/BELGIË.
Tel.: +32 229-91111
just-citizenship@ec.europa.eu

Europarat

Avenue de l'Europe
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex,
France
Tel. +33 (0)3 88 41 20 00

Federal Chancellery

Mr. Bundeskanzler Scholz
Willy-Brandt-Straße 1
D-10557 Berlin
Germany

Federal Chancellery Austria

Mr.
Bundeskanzler Karl Nehammer
Ballhausplatz 2
AT-1010 Wien
Österreich

Swiss Federal Council

Bundeshaus
CH- 3003 Bern
Schweiz

Ministerie van Algemene Zaken

Binnenhof 19
2513 AA Den Haag
Telefoonnummer 070 356 41 00
Postadres

Ministerie van Algemene Zaken

Postbus 20001

2500 EA Den Haag

<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ministerie-van-algemene-zaken/contact>

Belgian Federal Government
Premierminister Alexander De Croo
Rue de la Loi 16
1000 Brüssel
Belgien
contact@premier.be

President Emmanuel Macron
Palais de l'Élysée
55 rue du Faubourg-Saint-Honoré
75008 Paris, France

Presidente Sergio Mattarella
Palazzo del Quirinale
Piazza del Quirinale
00187 Roma
Tel. 06.46991; Fax 06.46993125

Vatikan
Seine Heiligkeit Papst Franziskus
Palazzo Apostolico
00120 Città del Vaticano, Rom
Italien

International Court of Justice
Registrar Mr. Philippe Gautier
Peace Palace
Carnegieplain 2
2517 KJ The Hague
The Netherlands

Our Case No.: 149506 of 9.Jan. 2018

International Criminal Supreme Court
Post Office Box 19519
2500 CM The Hague, The Netherlands

Our Case No.: OTP-CR-309/08

District Court of Columbia
333 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
United States of America

Our Case No.: 1:19-cv-03529-CJN

Palais de la Cour de Justice

Boulevard Konrad Adenauer
Kirchberg
L-2925 Luxembourg
Luxembourg

Preliminary question of the Thuringia judge on independence:
ECJ case number C-276/20 - 1

Europ. Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte

All. des Droits de l'Homme,
67000 Strasbourg, Frankreich

regarding the previously filed complaint

Case No. Karin Leffer: ECHR-Ager6 CMW/elf Subject No. 24493/18 dated 8/6/2018.

Administrative Court Berlin

Kirchstraße 7
D-10557 Berlin
Deutschland
Telefon: (030) 9014-0
Fax: (030) 9014-8790

Aktenzeichen: VG 6 L 95/21 und VG 6 K 94/21

Federal Administrative Court

PF 100854
D-04008 Leipzig
Germany
Tel. +49 (0) 341 2007 0
post@bverwg.bund.de

Federal Administrative Court

Erdbergstraße 192 - 196
AT-1030 Wien
Austria
Telefon: 01/60 149-0
eFax: +43 1 711 23-889 15 41
E-Mail: einlaufstelle@bvwg.gv.at

To

Federal Administrative Court

Postfach
CH-9023 St. Gallen
Switzerland

To
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
Botschaft des Königreichs der Niederlande
Klosterstraße 50
D-10179 Berlin
Germany
bln@minbuza.nl

To
Belgian Embassy
Jägerstrasse 52-53
D-10117 Berlin
Germany
Berlin@diplobel.fed.be

To
French Embassy
Pariser Platz 5
D-10117 Berlin
Germany

To
Italian Embassy
Hiroshimastr. 1
D-10785 Berlin
Germany
segreteria.berlino@esteri.it

To
Polish Embassy
Lassenstr. 19-21
D-14193 Berlin-Grunewald
Germany
berlin.amb.sekretariat@msz.gov

To
Embassy of the Russian Federation
Unter den Linden 63-65
D-10117 Berlin
Germany
info@russische-botschaft.de

To Bar Councils:

Bar Council of India
21, Rouse Avenue Institutional Area,
Near Bal Bhawan, New Delhi – 110 002
Telephone Nos.:011-49225000
Telefax No.:011-49225011 Website: www.barcouncilofindia.org
bciinfo21@gmail.com

Tanganyika law society Wakili House

Plot 391, Regent Estate, Chato Street
P.O. Box 2148, Dar es Salaam
+255 222 775 313
<https://tls.or.tz/category/tls-news/>
info@tls.or.tz

Ordre des Avocats du Barreau de Madagascar

Palais de Justice
3 Rue Jules Ranaivo
Antananarivo
Madagascar
Téléphone/Fax : +261 20 22 350 71
<http://www.barreau-de-madagascar.org/>

Colegio de Abogados de Uruguay

Av. 18 de Julio 1006, Piso 4to, Apto 401
Montevideo
Uruguay
Postal code 11100
Telephone +598 2 900 2065
Fax +598 2 902 3778
Email colabog@adinet.com.uy