

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

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

His Holiness Pope Francis
Casa Santa Marta

00120 Città del Vaticano, Rom
Italy

21.11.2022

open letter

Action for damages for breach of the Concordat Treaty under the New York Convention on the Recognition of Arbitral Awards or Chapter 12 of the Swiss Private International Law Act (IPRG) against the Holy See, represented by the Archdiocese of Bamberg, Mr. Vicar General Georg Kestel, Domplatz 2, D-96049 Bamberg, Germany
for information to the Bavarian State Ministry of Justice

Concordat Treaty
Agreement on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Judgments
Holy See 14 May 1975 B 12 August 1975

His Holiness Pope Francis

it is quite simple to stop the war and to mitigate the warming of the earth's climate.
It is very simple to respect the treaties that have been concluded. That is, in case of dispute, one must recognize international arbitration courts.

The Holy See concluded the Concordat Treaty with the German Reich in 1933 and also acceded to the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition of Arbitral Awards on Aug. 12, 1975.

I wonder for what purpose the Concordat Treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany was continued. I conclude that this treaty gives the Holy See the power to end war and minimize arms expenditures.

In the Charter of the United Nations, states have committed themselves by Article 33 to have any dispute resolved by arbitration.

Ukraine is suing the Russian Federation at the International Court of Justice in The Hague and filing criminal charges at the International Criminal Court in The Hague for a war of aggression. But at the International Court of Justice in The Hague Prof. Dr. Georg Nolte is a judge and at the International Criminal Court in The Hague Prof. Dr. Bertram Schmitt is a judge. Both identify themselves as nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany. In truth, they are nationals of the National Socialist German Reich, who reject the nationality of the FRG, the ordre public of the FRG and reject today's European borders. They declare with it to continue the World War. This

war is actively led. It is not necessary to conquer a country militarily. It is enough to bring the judiciary under one's control. As in the last century, starting from the German state of Bavaria, the independence of judges was completely eliminated and National Socialist arbitrary law was reintroduced. Due to the treaties of the EU, all European states must take over German arbitrary law unchecked and thus import this law.

How can it be that no one is reporting that Germany is once again a National Socialist dictatorship? 90% of the Germans do not agree with it.

All lawyers and also civil servants would have to complain about this.

This can only be due to the World Economic Forum (WEF). Numerous international companies belong to the WEF as strategic partners. They all have branches in Germany with legal departments. All these lawyers would have to complain that fair trials are not taking place in Germany and that every agreed law is thus being violated.

The former German Chancellor Dr. Angela Merkel said about the "bank bailout": "The markets would have demanded this." That was referring to the WEF. On the uncontrolled admission of 1,000,000 refugees, she said, "If we hadn't done this, there would have been worse consequences." Threatens came from the WEF. Former Bavarian Prime Minister Seehofer openly admits, "Those who are elected have nothing to say. Those who are not elected have the say." This refers to the WEF.

The WEF obviously dominates the entire "Western" press. The WEF is thus convicted as a foundation of liars and frauds. The WEF obviously fears the truth. Why?

I represent a helpless Dutch woman who has been severely damaged in her health by the Koninklijken (Royalen) DSM N.V.. International legal relations are involved. Therefore, I had arbitration proceedings conducted in accordance with the 12th Chapter of the Swiss Private International Law Act. The DSM Group filed a complaint against the Arbitral Award of Oct. 14, 2015, consisting of 77 pages with 226 marginal figures. Already for formal reasons, this appeal should not have been accepted. The 6 claims from the Arbitral Award are only casually addressed in a meaningless margin. The main subject of the complaint is my political persecution. I therefore bought the claims of the Dutch woman against the DSM Group. It turned out that the entire Swiss state apparatus dances to the tune of the DSM Group. To prevent me from enforcing the claims of the Arbitral Award, I was extradited to Germany. Everyone knew that this was a deprivation of liberty. A compulsory lawyer was forced on the Dutch woman, with the threat of incapacitating her if she refuses. A lawsuit is to be filed against the DSM Group. The Dutch woman is no longer a party. I am her representative. It is known that I was deprived of my freedom and that I should not be released. Only by lucky circumstances I got free with severe health damages. I found out that Koninklijke DSM N.V. is a strategic partner of the WEF. The CEO of the DSM Group, Mr. Feike Sijbesma is responsible for deprivation of liberty, grievous bodily harm, predatory extortion, forgery of documents, etc. Mr. Feike Siibesma is on the board of the WEF and at the World Bank. The WEF has a contract with the Swiss Confederation. Obviously, the WEF controls the Swiss state apparatus, just like the FRG and especially the judiciary.

So it's no wonder that they don't want ordinary citizens to make use of arbitration, is it? The lawyer of the DSM Group, Mr. Nordmann in his complaint against the Arbitral Award: "Just imagine, this makes school."

I was arrested so that an Arbitral Award would not be enforced.

Obviously, the WEF fears nothing more than tribunals of arbitration. Obviously, WEF fears nothing more than the truth.

But nothing is so finely spun, it does come to the light of day.

With the sober fact that German judges are not independent, all state courts, at least in Europe have declared themselves incompetent. If at all European courts judges sit, who identify themselves with a false identity and are thus liars and cheats, what can one expect from state judges? One can reject a judge because of bias. Then it will be decided in the next instance. If the highest courts are rejected because there is suspicion that they are liars and cheats or cooperate with liars and cheats, then the lowest judge is also rejected.

All kinds of oaths are taken there that are not kept. That's embarrassing, isn't it?

Surely it is enough for anyone who wants to be financed by taxes to declare in writing that they recognize the primacy of arbitration tribunals over state courts. This has always been the case and has been constantly confirmed in all kinds of treaties.

Why doesn't the Russian Federation speak clearly about the fact that at the International Tribunals there are judges with a false identity who declare to continue the war? Why does the Russian Federation nebulously speak about the fact that it is threatened by Nazis, by Satanists under the protection of the EU and NATO?

I suspect that then it would come up that it was not the German Reich that started World War I, but was branded as the sole culprit in the Versailles Peace Treaty.

World War I began when the Hungarian-Austrian hereditary prince was assassinated while on a state visit to Serbia. According to the general rules of international law, Hungary-Austria had to take over the prosecution. Serbia refused to do so. In order to preserve the general rules of international law, Hungary-Austria had to declare war on Serbia. Russia was the protecting power of the Serbs. Russia was allied with France and Great Britain. The German Emperor still wrote to his colleague, the Russian Tsar, saying that the Russian Tsar was the only one who could prevent the world war. In response, Russia attacked the German Empire. Russia lost the war and in the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk had to give up a wide corridor from the Black Sea to the Baltic Sea in order to create a buffer between Russia and the German Empire. The Versailles Peace Treaty abrogated the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty.

Is the war in Ukraine now really about the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty? I see it differently. The Soviet Union liberated Europe from the SS with 27,000,000 victims. The Russian Federation demands neutrality from Ukraine. The only thing that connects the Sevastopolians with the Lvivians is that they have always been at war with each other. The Russian Federation has supplied Germany with cheap gas and thus contributed significantly to the economic power of the Germans.

I don't see what is left to negotiate about.

With the 2 (Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and German Democratic Republic (GDR)) + 4 (Powers) Treaty of 1990 was supposed to end World War II.

But the 2 + 4 Treaty has not been realized.

Conditions according to Art. 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty is that a constitution according to Art. 146 of the Basic Law must be decided, in which the state borders are defined, as this was regulated in Art. 23 of the Basic Law. The Danzigers must agree to a constitution. Without the Danzigers, the territory of the Free City of Danzig cannot be decided and without the consent of the Danzigers, the European borders in Europe are not confirmed under international law.

One only has to read Art. 4 (2) and (6) of the Unification Treaty between the FRG and the GDR to realize that this treaty has not been realized.

Art. 4 (2) of the Unification Treaty: "Article 23 of the Basic Law is repealed."

So the opposite was agreed between the GDR and the FRG when the "Germans" committed themselves. Article 4 (6) states that a constitution has yet to be decided.

According to Art. 100-108, the Free City of Danzig was created together with the League of Nations and the Permanent International Court of Justice in The Hague as an instrument to secure peace. Under Art. 102, the Free City of Danzig is under the protection of the League of Nations. The Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is a treaty with the League of Nations. Therefore, for the first time in international law, it was established here that citizens could have any law reviewed before an international court of arbitration to determine whether that law was compatible with the Constitution. In the process, following Art. 43 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, the *ordre public* was established as an unchangeable element in the Danzig Constitution: Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution: "The Weimar Constitution is repealed. German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed." The precedent for this exists - see the decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague Series A/B No. 65. Such an Arbitral Award is enforced by an international force.

World War II began with the German Reich's invasion of the Free City of Danzig on Sept. 1, 1939 - see Annual Commemorations - Indictment No. 1 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

The "German Reich" had absolutely nothing in common with the original German Reich with the Constitution of 1871 and the associated laws. The *ordre public* no longer existed and thus the "German" state people in the meaning of international law. The "German" state people in the meaning of international law continued to exist through the Danzigers.

This was a thorn in Hitler's side. He had finally completely eliminated the *ordre public* in "Germany". As occupier, he should have guaranteed the Danzigers their *ordre public* and the right to have any occupation decision reviewed by a Danziger for conformity with *ordre public* before an international arbitration tribunal. Instead, he forced National Socialist German nationality on the Danzigers, thus depriving them of *ordre public* - Charge No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. Those who clung to their Danzig nationality were sent to the Stutthof concentration camp. There, only 35% of the inmates survived. Finally, Danzig was declared a fortress and thus ordered to be exterminated - Indictment No. 3 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

The GG has already been amended 60 times, but Art. 146 GG is still there. Likewise the regulations like, Art. 16, 25, 116, 120 and 133 still stand in it. This is due to Art. 79 (1) sentence two *mutatis mutandis*: The GG cannot be amended insofar as it concerns peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues. But the GG expires on the day on which a constitution is promulgated according to Art. 146 GG. Logically, the nationals of the German Reich cannot unilaterally decide on peace treaty regulations. For this the Danzigers must be heard, who are the only ones who have not yet received reparations.

So the Danzigers determine what the constitution of "Germany" must be and in what way the state structure will be regulated.

With the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations, all citizens should enjoy the rights of the Danzigers.

The FRG was conceived as the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig.

Following Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution, the "Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG" became the "people of the state" of the FRG.

The rule that every citizen can have every law checked to see if it complies with *ordre public* was prescribed in Art. 25 GG. **"The general rules of international law are part of federal law. They take precedence over all laws and directly generate rights and obligations for every inhabitant of the federal territory."**

The Vatican was recognized by the German Reich under international law with 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, loyalty to the German Reich (today: the Federal Republic of***

Germany) and to the Land N.N. (name of the federal state). I swear and promise to respect **the constitutionally formed government** and to have it respected by my clergy. In dutiful concern for the welfare and interest of **the German state, I shall, in the exercise of the ecclesiastical office entrusted to me, strive to prevent any harm that might threaten it'**. (Article 16).

The fact that the GG no longer has any scope is a formal defect. This does not yet cause any damage.

But the GG is only on paper. Essential parts of the state structure are no longer observed.

This already begins with the election of deputies. According to Article 38 of the Basic Law, deputies must be elected directly. But due to the election laws at least 50% of the delegates belong to parties. A deputy who does not belong to a parliamentary group does not have the same rights as a parliamentary group. Members of a parliamentary group are subject to factional coercion and do not make decisions according to their own knowledge and conscience. The government is not determined by directly elected deputies, but by the parties. The parties claim that they have been mandated by the voters to implement party programs. But no government formed by parties is elected by all. A government, however, must represent all citizens.

The constitutional structure of the state also includes provisions on jurisdiction.

As in the last century, with the German state of Bavaria leading the way, all provisions on jurisdiction in the GG have been eliminated. The 2005 Judges and Prosecutors Act eliminated the independence of judges. The 1st Act to Adjust the Federal Law of April 19, 2006, eliminated the entry into force of essential laws. Incoming cases are no longer assigned according to the provisions of Art. 101 of the Basic Law.

Court records are not kept verbatim or are even falsified. The legal hearing, Art. 103 GG is denied. The entry into force of the Federal Constitutional Court Act has ceased, etc. A judge from the German state therefore submitted a preliminary request to the ECJ as to whether he may issue an arrest warrant under EU law. His reasoning is that the powers of the state are not separate, but intertwined. The ECJ does not answer this question. The judge himself has already decided that he is not allowed to issue arrest warrants under EU law and that the FRG should not be part of the EU.

The Archbishop of Bamberg should have noticed that the General Prosecutor of the Higher Regional Court of Bamberg Mr. Lückemann was appointed disciplinary superior of the judges of the Higher Regional Court, thus violating Article 97 of the Basic Law Independence of Judges.

The Archbishop cannot plead that other officials are responsible for reclaiming this. The oath of the officials is to uphold the Basic Law. The scope of the GG has been abrogated. Any civil servant can claim that he or she is therefore no longer bound by the GG.

In contrast, the bishops' oath is to the German state.

Only because the independence of the judges straight at the Coburg Regional Court and at the Bamberg Higher Regional Court (as in the last century first) was eliminated, the arrest warrant, Case No.: 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 against Mrs. Karin Leffer could come about. Furthermore, this arrest warrant could only come about in violation of the requirements and conditions of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice of Aug. 20, 2012, Case No.: B 224'163/TMA. I was arrested on Dec. 21, 2012 and extradited to Germany against my will. The extradition was authorized only for presentation for trial so that an international arrest warrant against me would be revoked. But I was held in detention and placed under a mail and visitation ban so that in hastily conducted mass trials, without my advice, anyone could be convicted as an instigator and accomplice in a forgery of documents who possessed a Danzig identity card. My bail offer of €1'344'000,- was deemed too low by the Coburg Regional Court to release me from prison even one day early. Needless to

say, I went on hunger strike and have already sued for damages from prison. An unauthorized prosecution is a violation of the general rules of international law. The Swiss Federal Office of Justice, which is responsible for the proceedings 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11, condemns these proceedings as political persecution. There are approximately 20 known acquittals in the case.

The background for Danzig identity cards.

After the insertion of Section 40a into the Nationality Act, date of issue July 22, 1913, "Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG" were declared to be nationals of the German Reich. However, only "Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG" are allowed to hold a German passport according to the Passport Act. For example, the Double Taxation Treaty with the USA applies only to "Germans within the meaning of Art. 116 (1)

GG." Therefore, since 1999, a German passport is an identity document forgery in the meaning of the Criminal Code, used for deception in legal relations. In contrast, a Danzig identity card is proof of being "German in the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law", confirmed by the Government of Lower Franconia. A Danziger Ausweis is the proof that one is subject only to the German *ordre public* at the time of Jan. 1920. The accusation of the arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court, Case No. 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 reads: "Mr. von Prince and Mrs. Karin Leffer are the representatives of the Free City of Danzig. They spread the idea of the Free City of Danzig on the Internet. German law they recognize only in parts."

The World War has not ended as long as the Free City of Danzig has not received reparations. There must be representatives of the Free City of Danzig to end the World War. Is it punishable to end the World War? The idea of the Free City of Danzig is that the right of the individual takes precedence over the right of the majority and can be reviewed by an international court. Is it punishable? A Danzig national is not allowed to defend himself militarily. Is that punishable? Of course, we recognize only German law recognized under international law and not National Socialist law. Is that punishable?

Mrs. Karin Leffer has not taken an oath and is not financed by taxes. She only follows Art. 25 GG: "The general rules of international law are part of federal law. They take precedence over all laws and directly generate rights and obligations for every inhabitant of the federal territory." According to the general rules of international law, no other state may deprive another national of his national law/*ordre public*. Art. 16 GG: No German may be deprived of his nationality, that is, of his national law. This means that no "German in the meaning of Art. 116 GG" may be deprived of the German *ordre public* as defined in Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution.

With the First Act on the Regulation of Nationality of Feb. 22, 1955, Section 15 of the Courts Constitution Act: "Courts are state courts." was abolished.

Contract autonomy/freedom of contract includes the choice of judge in case of dispute. The difference between a state court and an arbitral tribunal is that in arbitration the parties are directly involved in the appointment of the judge.

The 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition of Arbitral Awards does not distinguish between domestic and international legal relationships. Therefore, for laymen the term arbitration agreement is misleading.

Every legal relationship is based on an agreement. International treaties/agreements take precedence over national laws. Laws are therefore also agreements.

Laws are in fact general business provisions. If it is a question of property law, the dispute can be decided by arbitration (the contract divorced by payment).

In the case of national legal relationships, each party has a share in the legal provisions in the appointment of the state judge. If one wishes to deviate from this, then this must be expressly agreed.

In international legal relations, the case is exactly reversed. A party has no share in the legal provisions on the appointment of the state judge. There is a fundamental suspicion of bias that the state judge will rule in favor of the party's own national.

Arbitration proceedings are therefore mandatory. If arbitration is to take place before a state court, this must be expressly agreed.

This has always been the case. In the Charter of the United Nations, Art. 33, the states undertake to conduct arbitration proceedings in case of doubt.

In the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition of Arbitral Awards, this was recognized by 168 states, including the Holy See. If one adheres to this, then there should be no wars. One could use the whole armament expenditures of meanwhile more than 2'000'000'000'000,-€/year for reforestation measures, irrigation, the education of the poorest of the poorest etc..

Agenda 21 was adopted in 1992. On more than 300 pages, measures are recommended, but not a word about armament expenditures. Now there are debates about the world climate and one wants to allocate 100'000'000'000,-€ for it. But the completely counterproductive Corona measures alone have swallowed up 1'000'000'000'000,-€ in Germany. Meanwhile, the war in Ukraine is said to have already cost about 300'000'000'000,-€, while millions of people are starving.

Through the embassies I have written to Mr. President of Ukraine Selenskyj and asked what right he grants me and that he should first come to an agreement with Mr. Putin about the territory of the Free City of Danzig, before arguing about borders, which can not be recognized conclusively under international law, before the question of the territory of the Free City of Danzig is not clarified.

So let's end the war.

I don't mean the war in Ukraine, but the World War.

This can be done very simply.

The Catholic bishops must keep their oath.

Art. 25 GG follows Art. 43 ordre public of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare. According to this, also the occupier has to keep the ordre public. This corresponds to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution. According to this, the individual citizen stands above parliament and the government in the event that laws or their repeal violate ordre public. This is decided by an international arbitration court.

The arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court proves that Ms. Karin Leffer is merely following Article 25 of the Basic Law, fulfilling her civic duties and claiming the rights thereof.

She stands thereby over the legislator and is thereby the highest representative also of the Bavarians.

Wouldn't the oath of the Bavarian bishops then have to be taken vis-à-vis Mrs. Karin Leffer?

Or do the Bavarian bishops in truth follow the WEF?

The elimination of the independence of judges has caused and continues to cause damage to Ms. Karin Leffer, among others. Ms. Karin Leffer is still wanted on a warrant for her arrest for fulfilling her civic duties under Article 25 of the Basic Law.

The Concordat Treaty has thus been violated. When a state treaty is violated, joint and several liability arises.

Mrs. Karin Leffer had to go into exile in order not to sit innocently in prison. But it is not just exile.

Mrs. Karin Leffer must constantly expect to be extradited and therefore lives in hiding. Again: Mrs.

Karin Leffer is not simply threatened with deportation, but with innocent imprisonment. She cannot register, exercise a profession, drive a motor vehicle, etc. She had to give up her family with her house and profession. This for meanwhile 8.5 years. Everything that Mrs. Karin Leffer has built up

in decades is gone. Who loses everything by a natural disaster, one feels sorry for and one receives support. But Mrs. Karin Leffer is persecuted by the whole German and towards the Germans obligated foreign state power. The Catholic Church in Germany is also financed by taxes. The archbishop of Bamberg also belongs to the state power.

Mrs. Karin Leffer is not wanted by arrest warrant, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11, because she committed an act for her own benefit, but in order to protect every inhabitant of the FRG from joint and several liability because of the violation of the general rules of international law. This Bavarian proceeding Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/1 violates 18 international conventions and treaties, as Ms. Karin Leffer and I have pointed out in our lawsuit in the District Court in Washington DC, Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN. Courts in the U.S. post all incoming correspondence, for anyone worldwide to see, on the Internet. Our lawsuit is also easily readable on our website www.verfassung.info.

What is Ms. Karin Leffer entitled to in terms of property losses and damages for pain and suffering? Debtors are in joint and several liability all inhabitants of the federal territory. So also the Catholic Church. How large is the share of the Archdiocese of Bamberg in this?

Shouldn't the Archdiocese of Bamberg set a good example and concede to Mrs. Karin Leffer that she is also owed a part of the damages and compensation for pain and suffering by the Archdiocese of Bamberg?

Mrs. Karin Leffer and I have already noticed in 2006 that German law is no longer respected and have founded the Association for the Right.

At the latest with the appointment of the Attorney General Lückemann of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court as disciplinary superior of the judges of the Higher Regional Court in 2013, the Archbishop of Bamberg should have complained that this is not compatible with his oath.

How many taxes has the Archbishopric of Bamberg received since then?

<https://www.domradio.de/artikel/mehr-als-700-millionen-vermoegen-erzbistum-bamberg-mit-erster-bilanz>

The assets of the Archdiocese of Bamberg amount to 744'000'000,-€. The tax revenues in 2018 amount to 183'000'000,-€. Of this amount, 1'800 employees are paid.

3'000'000,-€ were obtained in surpluses, which were put at the disposal of Caritas.

144'000'000,-€ are available for the care of retired priests.

After all, Mrs. Karin Leffer does not act for purely idealistic, formal reasons.

The observance of fair legal procedures is the prerequisite for a lean, cost-effective administration. Unnecessary court proceedings burden the administration and cost citizens unnecessary time and money. The best state investment is in sufficient judges. It is cheaper for the state if 50% of the judges twiddle their thumbs than if court proceedings take years and "short" trials lead to unfair verdicts and thus to perpetual litigation. Ultimately, unfair trials lead to a loss of trust in the state, at best to internal resignation from the state, and at worst to mass murder.

At the moment, the federal states are negotiating with the federal minister of justice about higher expenditures for the judiciary.

In the process, the provisions of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG) would first have to be complied with.

For example Section 21 GVG

"Eligible for election are judges for life and temporary judges who have been assigned a judicial office at the court."

The President of the Bamberg Regional Court is Mrs. Ursula Haderlein.

But Mrs. Ursula Haderlein was not a judge at the Bamberg Regional Court. She was previously President of the Coburg Regional Court. There, too, she was not previously a judge at the Coburg Regional Court. Mrs. Ursula Haderlein was previously a prosecutor at the Coburg Regional Court. As a prosecutor at the Coburg Regional Court, she was responsible for the Indictment 1 KLs 123

Js 3979/11, allegation: "Mrs. Karin Leffer and Mr. von Prince are the representatives of the Free City of Danzig."

If I want a retrial, it ends up at the Bamberg Regional Court, where the person responsible for the proceedings 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 is the disciplinary superior of these judges.

Because of these legal relationships, I have in fact been doing nothing but complaining full-time since 2006. And not only in Germany, but also in Switzerland. I have also been to the Supreme Court in Belgium, I am known at the courts in The Hague and in the USA also at the court in Washington DC.

Mrs. Leffer advocates without personal gain, financial benefits for all.

The Holy See appoints and deposes bishops. The bishops are bound by the directives of the Holy See. In the civil law sense, the dioceses thus represent dependent daughters of the Holy See. The charitable donations could be greater if a functioning judiciary existed.

I would be terribly happy to leave it up to the Archdiocese of Bamberg to decide what share the Archdiocese is willing to pay in damages and compensation for pain and suffering to Mrs. Karin Leffer.

But I have already written several times to the Catholic Church, including the Archbishop of Bamberg, and have received no reply.

I see myself therefore compelled in management without order after Section 677 of the Civil Code to demand damages and compensation for pain and suffering for Mrs. Karin Leffer in the amount of 30'000'000,-€ and that the Archbishop of Bamberg demands from the Bavarian Prime Minister that he confirms in writing that he recognizes the precedence of arbitration awards over state courts. He has to do that anyway.

The Concordat Treaty is violated to the detriment of Mrs. Karin Leffer. The contracting party is the Holy See. So I sue the Holy See, represented by the Archdiocese of Bamberg according to the 12th Chapter of the Swiss International Private Law Act or according to the New York Convention on the Recognition of Arbitral Awards of 1958. Again: The New York Convention does not distinguish between national and international law. Therefore, the term "arbitration agreement" is misleading.

Swiss legislation already distinguishes between national and international legal relationships. According to Art. 2 sZPO, this may not be applied in international legal relationships, but the sIPRG.

As arbitrator I propose the Swiss Mr. Uwe Schulze. He organizes arbitration proceedings in market circle disputes. Alternatively or additionally I propose the Dutchman Mr. Gerard Nederpel. Mr. Gerard Nederpel has already been arbitrator in international maritime disputes. The Holy See, represented by the Archdiocese of Bamberg may reject these arbitrators on the grounds of bias and propose other arbitrators.

According to Art. 177 IPRG, no state can avoid arbitration. According to Art. 181, arbitration proceedings are initiated as soon as notice is given that arbitration proceedings will be held. Thus, a *lis pendens* is initiated.

Under Art. 186, the arbitrator alone decides on his or her jurisdiction.

Let us show the world how disputes can be resolved peacefully.

As a national of the Free City of Danzig, I am "in possession of German nationality within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law". I can only agree to a constitution for the FRG which includes the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig. This includes an international police organization and an international armed force that enforces international arbitral awards.

Or else the world community must recognize a peace treaty between the nationals of the German Reich and the Free City of Danzig, in which an international police organization with an international armed force is also agreed upon.

Whoever does not recognize the Free City of Danzig does not recognize the Peace Treaty of Versailles. For him I am then a national of the German colonies, specifically of German East Africa. Thus I am the representative of the German Emperor, who elevated my grandfather to hereditary nobility. This means that I am the head of an international armed force and can only deploy it on the basis of an international arbitration ruling.

Who can object to this and by what right?

I can think of nothing in this regard.

So it is quite easy to stop the war and invest vast sums of unnecessary armament expenditures in favor of meaningful projects, even if they do not yield any short-term profit.

With the communication of this letter, the arrest warrant against Mrs. Karin Leffer must be cancelled until it is decided whether Mrs. Karin Leffer is entitled to damages. Finally, the claims are getting bigger with each passing day. If Bavarian authorities do not revoke the arrest warrant, then the Bavarian bishops must publicly announce that they no longer recognize the Bavarian state government as a constitutional government that serves the German state system. Bavarian officials may then only be funded by taxes if each one confirms in writing that he or she recognizes the primacy of arbitral awards over state courts.

If the bishops do not comply, then the church has no right to be financed by taxes either.

A peace treaty is coming anyway. But without the help of the Holy See, it will take a little longer. Then even more people will die completely senselessly. The true evil is indifference.

It is up to the Holy See to set a clear sign for all.

With the utmost respect