



Verwaltungsgemeinschaft  
Freie Stadt Danzig

**Senatspräsident  
Beowulf von Prince**  
Schweizer Str. 38  
AT-6830 Rankweil

Oct. 14, 2023

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

**To International Court of Justice**

Peace Palace  
Registrar Mr. Philippe Gautier  
Carnegieplein 2

2517 KJ The Hague  
The Netherlands

Declaration on the authorization of Mr. Beowulf (Adalbert) von Prince to act as responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig and until further notice also of Germany.

Mr. Beowulf (Adalbert) von Prince is not a politician. He is only carrying out the order given by the British, on behalf of the League of Nations, to his father, Mr. Tom (Adalbert) von Prince as a national of the Free City of Danzig in 1940. As an official of the Federal Republic of Germany, he is primarily responsible for ensuring that the international treaties of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany are observed. The most important treaty under international law of the Federal Republic of Germany is the Two-plus-Four Treaty on the Final Settlement for Germany as a Whole. The requirement under Article 1 of this treaty is to promulgate a constitution for Germany in accordance with Article 146 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

A constitution under Article 146 of the Basic Law must be approved by the nationals of the Free City of Danzig. As a national of the Free City of Danzig and an official of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Beowulf (Adalbert) von Prince is responsible for ensuring that a constitution of Germany is promulgated.

The function as representative of the Free City of Danzig was forced upon Mr. Beowulf (Adalbert) von Prince - see further remarks on the person, page 14.

Request to examine whether the enclosed Constitution of Germany upholds the Versailles Peace Treaty and sufficiently fulfills the requirements and conditions of the Two Plus Four Treaty on the Final Settlement for Germany as a Whole of 1990. The only exception is the confirmation of the border between Germany and Poland under international law. This condition is dependent on the payment of the reparation claims of the Free City of Danzig first.

If no objection to the Constitution of Germany is notified, then Germany will join the lawsuit of Ukraine against the Russian Federation and at the same time proclaim the dispute against Ukraine and against the states that joined the lawsuit of Ukraine against the Russian Federation.

Further, the dispute is declared against the Swiss Confederation, for violation of the Neutrality Treaty or the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, against the general rules of international law, and so on.

Further, the dispute is announced against the Kingdom of Belgium, for violation of the Versailles Peace Treaty, against the general rules of international law and against the EU Framework Decision on the EU Arrest Warrant.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. JURISDICTION OF THE COURT .....	3
A. Jurisdiction under Article 37 of the Statutes of this Court .....	3
B. Jurisdiction under Article 36 of the Statutes of this Court .....	4
a. Two-plus-Four Treaty .....	5
aa. London Dept Agreement of 1953 .....	7
bb. The Exchange of Notes of 27/28 September 1990 .....	7
cc. Transitional Treaty ( <u>Convention on the Settlement of Questions                 Arising out of the War and the Occupation</u> ) .....	8
C. Joining the Lawsuit .....	8
D. Preliminary Remarks on the Lawsuit in General .....	10
E. Preliminary Remark on the Allegation of the Russian Federation that it is Being Threatened by Nazis under the Protection of NATO .....	10
II. PARTIES .....	14
A. The Plaintiff Party - On the Legal Person of the Free City of Danzig .....	14
a. The Free City of Danzig .....	14
b. On the Person of the Plaintiff as the Responsible Representative of the Free City of Danzig .....	15
aa. The Nationality of the Plaintiff .....	16
The inherited Nationality of the Free City of Danzig of the Plaintiff .....	16
1. The Grandfather as a British/German Colonial Officer .....	16
2. The Father with British Ancestry, but a Member of the German German Nobility Became a Danzig National .....	16
3. The Father with Danzig Nationality as "German within the Meaning of Art. 116 (1) GG .....	17
bb. The Plaintiff as a Civil Servant of the Federal Republic of Germany with an Oath to the Basic Law .....	18
cc. The Plaintiff has Never Waived His Rights/Duties .....	18
dd. Confirmation of the Plaintiff as a Representative of the Free City of Danzig .....	18
B. On the Person of the Defendant .....	22
a. On the Russian Federation .....	22
b. On the Ukraine .....	22
c. On the Republic of Poland .....	23
d. On the Republic of France .....	24
e. On the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland .....	24
f. On the Kingdom of Belgium .....	24
g. On the Swiss Confederation .....	24
h. On the Persons of the other Defendant States .....	25
II. FACTS .....	25
A. Review/Facts up to the Year 2004 .....	25
a. Start of World War 2 .....	25
b. The German Empire .....	25
c. The League of Nations/UN .....	27
d. The Nuremberg War Crimes Trials .....	27
aa. Violations of the Briand-Kellogg Pact .....	27
bb. Violations of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare .....	27
cc. Crimes against humanity .....	28
e. Potsdam Agreement .....	28
f. The Federal Republic of Germany .....	29
g. The Two-plus-Four Treaty .....	32

B. Review/Subject Matter as of 2004 .....	34
a. Transformation of the BRD into a nationalist dictatorship .....	34
b. Examination of the Nationals of the German Reich .....	37
c. Enforcement of the Two-plus-Four Treaty .....	38
aa. Passport Laws .....	38
bb. In Force Certain Provisions of the Transition Agreement .....	39
C. Facts Concerning the Swiss Confederation .....	40
Conclusion on Switzerland .....	44
D. Facts Concerning the Kingdom of Belgium .....	44
E. Summary .....	48
F. Statement of Claims .....	50
IV. CLAIMS .....	51

## I. JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

### A. Jurisdiction under Article 37 of the Statutes of this Court

1 This Court has jurisdiction under Article 37 of the Statutes of this Court.

*Art. 37*

*Whenever a treaty or convention in force provides for reference of a matter to a tribunal to have been instituted by the League of Nations, or to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the matter shall, as between the parties to the present Statute, be referred to the International Court of Justice.*

The Versailles Peace Treaty concerning Article 100-108 Free City of Danzig still exists. If a new treaty under international law is to replace the old one, this must be evident. Only contracting parties can replace an old international treaty with a new one.

The Saarland had given itself its own constitution and nationality law, as did the German Democratic Republic. Nevertheless, they remained nationals of the German Reich, which was subject to reparation. The nationals of the German Reich cannot unilaterally determine peace treaty, occupation law and defense law regulations. If the nationals of the German Reich want a share in the state property and territory and thus the right to property, they must acquire it.

2 In 1990, the Soviet Union wanted a peace treaty, i.e. negotiations with all states that were at war with the German Reich. The government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic wanted the provision of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, which was already made in 1949, to be implemented. This is the provision that the Basic Law expires on the day when the nationals of Danzig proclaim a constitution. The nationals of the German Reich have no say in the matter. The Danzigers must ensure that a constitution for Germany adequately regulates the legal succession to the Versailles Peace Treaty.

**3 Motion:**

**The motion is made to examine whether the Constitution of Germany is compatible with the following articles of the Versailles Peace Treaty - see Exhibit 3 Constitution of Germany.**

*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.*

It is an expression of sovereignty to conclude treaties. No other state had more treaties than with all the states of the League of Nations. Thus, the Free City of Danzig was the most sovereign state.

**ARTICLE 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.*

A state that is under the protection of the most powerful states is the most powerful state.

4 In Danzig, too, the Nazis came to power through elections and wanted to transform the laws of the state under the rule of law, the German Reich, into arbitrary law. Citizens of Danzig complained against this, invoking Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty.

The Permanent International Court of Justice in The Hague has ruled that the Free City of Danzig is a state under the rule of law in which the rights of the individual outweigh the interests of a majority - see PCIJ Series A/B No. 65 judgment.

No individual can have more rights.

5 The provisions of the Versailles Peace Treaty concerning the Free City of Danzig are based on the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare of 1907 and apply mutatis mutandis to the separate peace treaty between the United States of America and the German Reich.

The Parliament of the United States of America refused to ratify the Versailles Peace Treaty and instead concluded a separate peace treaty with the German Reich within the borders of 1917.

For the United States of America, Danzig was a part of the German Empire, which was under the occupation of the League of Nations.

6 The Free City of Danzig as a sovereign state and Danzig under occupation differ in state assets and territory.

**B. Jurisdiction under Article 36 of the Statutes of this Court.**

7 This Court shall retain jurisdiction under Article 36 to interpret the Two Plus Four Treaty on the Final Settlement for Germany as a Whole.

**Article 36**

*1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.*

*2. The states parties to the present Statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:*

*a. the interpretation of a treaty;*

*b. any question of international law;*

*c. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;*

*d. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.*

*3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on*

*condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.*

*4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the Statute and to the Registrar of the Court.*

*5. Declarations made under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present Statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.*

*6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.*

8 The declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany on the jurisdiction of this Court shall also apply to the Free City of Danzig and Germany with the restriction that this Court shall not have jurisdiction for Article 36, paragraph 2, item d,.

The jurisdiction of this Court for this point was expressly excluded in the Exchange of Notes of 27/28 Sept. 1990 between the three Western Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany.

## **9 Motion:**

**The motion is hereby made to examine whether the enclosed Constitution of Germany complies with the requirements and conditions of the Two-Plus-Four Treaty.**

As stated, the provision of the Two-plus-Four Treaty is excluded:

*Article 1 (2) The united Germany and the Republic of Poland shall confirm the existing border between them in a treaty that is binding under international law.— see the following explanation.*

### **a. Two-plus-Four Treaty**

10 <https://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/2plusfour8994e.htm>

*The Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America,  
Have agreed as follows:*

#### **ARTICLE 1**

*(1) The united Germany shall comprise the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic and the whole of Berlin. Its external borders shall be the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and shall be definitive from the date on which the present Treaty comes into force. The confirmation of the definitive nature of the borders of the united Germany is an essential element of the peaceful order in Europe.*

*(2) The united Germany and the Republic of Poland shall confirm the existing border between them in a treaty that is binding under international law.*

*(3) The united Germany has no territorial claims whatsoever against other states and shall not assert any in the future.*

*(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.*

11 Article 146 means that all nationals of the Free City of Danzig recognized under international law must agree - see Declaration on the German Reich and the Federal Republic of Germany.

*(5) The Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist*

*Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America take formal note of the corresponding commitments and declarations by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and declare that their implementation will confirm the definitive nature of the united Germany's borders.*

## **ARTICLE 2**

*The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic reaffirm their declarations that only peace will emanate from German soil.*

*According to the constitution of the united Germany, acts tending to and undertaken with the intent to disturb the peaceful relations between nations, especially to prepare for aggressive war, are unconstitutional and a punishable offence. The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic declare that the united Germany will never employ any of its weapons except in accordance with its constitution and the Charter of the United Nations.*

## **ARTICLE 5**

*(3) Following the completion of the withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces from the territory of the present German Democratic Republic and of Berlin, units of German armed forces assigned to military alliance structures in the same way as those in the rest of German territory may also be stationed in that part of Germany, but without nuclear weapon carriers. This does not apply to conventional weapon systems which may have other capabilities in addition to conventional ones but which in that part of Germany are equipped for a conventional role and designated only for such. Foreign armed forces and nuclear weapons or their carriers will not be stationed in that part of Germany or deployed there.*

## **ARTICLE 6**

*The right of the united Germany to belong to alliances, with all the rights and responsibilities arising therefrom, shall not be affected by the present Treaty.*

## **ARTICLE 7**

*(1) The French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America hereby terminate their rights and responsibilities relating to Berlin and to Germany as a whole. As a result, the corresponding, related quadripartite agreements, decisions and practices are terminated and all related Four Power institutions are dissolved.*

*(2) The United Germany shall have accordingly full sovereignty over its internal and external affairs.*

## **ARTICLE 8**

*(1) The present Treaty is subject to ratification or acceptance as soon as possible. On the German side it will be ratified by the united Germany. The Treaty will therefore apply to the united Germany.*

*(2) The instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Government of the united Germany. That Government shall inform the Governments of the other Contracting Parties of the deposit of each instrument of ratification or acceptance.*

## **ARTICLE 9**

*The present Treaty shall enter into force for the united Germany, the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great*

*Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America on the date of deposit of the last instrument of ratification or acceptance by these states.*

*Source: American Foreign Policy Current Documents 1990. Department of State, Washington, 1991*

12 The requirements must be met in the future. To comply with the requirements were reminded:

Justification of the open question of territorial borders.

The governments of the FRG and the GDR have agreed that the territory of the FRG and the GDR will become the territory of Germany.

However, neither the nationals of the German Reich nor the Republic of Poland can decide on the territory of the Free City of Danzig, or the part of the German Empire under occupation, without the consent of the Danzigers.

Therefore, according to Article 1 of the Two-plus-Four Treaty, the final borders must be expressly confirmed by a separate treaty under international law with Poland.

For this purpose, the subject of international law Germany must first be formed by a constitution of Germany. For this purpose, the nationals of the Free City of Danzig must have a right to veto international law treaties and laws as stipulated in the constitution, otherwise no border treaty under international law can be concluded.

In view of the war in Ukraine, the consequences of which also affect the nationals of the Free City of Danzig, the Free City of Danzig reserves the right to negotiate a territory independently.

13 The fact that a binding border treaty with Poland under international law can only be concluded once the Free City of Danzig has received all the reparations demanded is clear from the London Debt Agreement of 1953.

The correct legal basis is

#### **aa. the London Debt Agreement of 1953, Article 5.2**

##### ***Article 5 Claims excluded from the Agreement***

*(1) Consideration of governmental claims against Germany arising out of the first World War shall be deferred until a final general settlement of this matter.*

*(2) Consideration of claims arising out of the second World War by countries which were at war with or were occupied by Germany during that war, and by nationals of such countries, against the Reich and agencies of the Reich, including costs of German occupation, credits acquired during occupation on clearing accounts and claims against the Reichskreditkassen shall be deferred until the final settlement of the problem of reparation.*

Even after the conclusion of the Two-plus-Four Treaty, provisions of the Transitional Agreement continue to apply, as was expressly stated in the Exchange of Notes of Sept. 27-28, 1990.

The conditions are to be fulfilled in the future. To comply with the conditions, it was recalled:

#### **bb. The Exchange of Notes of 27/28 September 1990**

14 In the Exchange of Notes of Sept. 27/28, 1990, after the conclusion of the 2 (Federal Republic of Germany (FRG and German Democratic Republic (GDR) + 4 (Powers) Treaty of Sept. 12, 1990, it is expressly stated that the following provisions of the Transitional Treaty remain in force after 1990.

Federal Law Gazette:

[https://www.bgbl.de/xaver/bgbl/start.xav#\\_\\_bgbl\\_\\_%2F%2F%5B%40attr\\_id%3D%27bgbl290s1386.pdf%27%5D\\_\\_1695369148987](https://www.bgbl.de/xaver/bgbl/start.xav#__bgbl__%2F%2F%5B%40attr_id%3D%27bgbl290s1386.pdf%27%5D__1695369148987)

*Announcement of the Agreement of 27/28 September 1990 on the Treaty on Relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Three Powers (as*

*amended) and on the Convention on the Settlement of Questions Arising out of the War and the Occupation*

**cc. Transitional Treaty** (Convention on the Settlement of Questions Arising out of the War and the Occupation) of Oct. 23, 1954 of the Three Powers with representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany.

15 The following provisions of the Settlement Convention shall, however, remain in force: „- from the first part: Art. 1(1), first sentence...”

*Art. 1 (1) The Federal and Land authorities shall have the power, in accordance with their respective competences under the Basic Law of the Federal Republic to repeal or amend legislation ...*

as well as paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, Art. 2 par. 1, Art. 3 par. 2 and 3, Art. 5 par. 1 and 3, Art. 7 par. 1 and Art. 8, - from the third part: Art. 3 par. 5 letter a of the Annex, Art. 6 par. 3 of the Annex,

**- from the sixth part: Art. 3 par. 1 and 3,**

*Part Six REPARATIONS, Art. 3 (1 and 3)*

*(1)The Federal Republic shall in the future raise no objections against the measures which have been, or will be, carried out with regard to German external assets or other property, seized for the purpose of reparation or restitution, or as a result of the state of war, or on the basis of agreements concluded, or to be concluded, by the Three Powers with other Allied countries, neutral countries or former allies of Germany.*

*(2)No claim or action shall be admissible against persons who shall have acquired or transferred title to property on the basis of the measures referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article, or against international organisations, foreign governments or persons who have acted upon instructions of such organisations or governments.*

- from the seventh part: Art 1 and Art. 2,

- from the ninth part: Art. 1,

- from the tenth part: Art. 4."

### **C. Joinder to the Lawsuit**

16 The Free City of Danzig and Germany accedes to the lawsuit Ukraine against the Russian Federation and at the same time proclaims the dispute against Ukraine and against the states suing with Ukraine against the Russian Federation, as well as against the Swiss Confederation and against the Kingdom of Belgium

17 If the court finds that the Constitution of Germany violates the Versailles Peace Treaty and/or fails to meet the requirements of the Two-plus-Four Treaty, then the Constitution of Germany must first be rectified.

18 Plaintiffs: Free City of Danzig and Germany - see Exhibit 3 Constitution of Germany - represented by Mr. Beowulf (Adalbert) von Prince, Schweizer Strasse 38, AT- 6830 Rankweil

Defendants: The Russian Federation and Ukraine

as well as the states which joined the action of Ukraine against the Russian Federation



for compliance with the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, derived therefrom the Versailles Peace Treaty, Articles 100-108 derived therefrom, the Charter of the United Nations, Articles 33, 53 and 107, derived therefrom the London Debt Agreement of 1953, Article 5.2 summarized in the

2 (Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and German Democratic Republic (GDR))  
+ 4 (United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic and the Soviet Union (the legal successor of the Soviet Union is the Russian Federation)).  
1990 Treaty on Germany as a Whole.

19 To enforce the Two-plus-Four Treaty, the provisions of the Transitional Treaty (Convention on the Settlement of Questions Arising out of War and Occupation) continue to apply after its conclusion. The provisions thereof on reparations are not subject to judicial review.

**20 The motion continues to be made as to which subject of international law the Swiss Confederation still is. Whether the Swiss Confederation still complies with the essential treaties of the Swiss Confederation under international law.**

This is the Peace Treaty of Westphalia from 1648.

[https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Westf%C3%A4lischer\\_Friede#Bestimmungen\\_des\\_Westf%C3%A4lischen\\_Friedens](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Westf%C3%A4lischer_Friede#Bestimmungen_des_Westf%C3%A4lischen_Friedens)

The Confederation was recognized as independent from the Holy Roman Empire.

<http://www.pax-westphalica.de/ipmipo/index.html>

§ 61 Exemption of the City of Basel and the Swiss Confederation from the Imperial Courts.

And the Convention (V) respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land. The Hague, 18 October 1907.

Approved by the Federal Assembly on April 4, 1910; Swiss instrument of ratification deposited on May 12, 1910.

*Article 13*

*A neutral Power which receives escaped prisoners of war shall leave them at liberty. If it allows them to remain in its territory it may assign them a place of residence.*

*The same rule applies to prisoners of war brought by troops taking refuge in the territory of a neutral Power.*

Does the Swiss Confederation still adhere to these essential treaties or has it joined the now again nationalistic Federal Republic of Germany?

For more information, see Facts of the Swiss Confederation.

21 The responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig and Germany respectfully requests the Court to invite Judge Prof. Dr. Georg Nolte to make a statement regarding his nationality. Is Prof. Dr. Nolte a national of the German Reich, date of issue of the Nationality Act, 22.07.1913?

Is Prof. Dr. Georg Nolte "German within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law" and can he prove by facts that he has this status? Or is Prof. Dr. Georg Nolte "German in the meaning of Article 116 (2) Basic Law" and liable for reparations to the Free City of Danzig? See the comments on the true legal relationships in the Federal Republic of Germany, Marginal No. 137-167 and Exhibit 4 und 5.

#### **D. Preliminary Statement of Claim in General:**

22 The Second World War began with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig and will not end until the Free City of Danzig has received reparations. The confirmation of the borders in Europe according to international law also depends on this.

23 Until 1990, it was still clear to everyone involved that borders could be decided by payments of reparations. The Benelux countries had also annexed German territory. These territories were bought back in 1963.

The Soviet Union would also have renounced Northeast Prussia, which was under Soviet administration, by paying 80`000`000.-DM.

24 The Russian Federation and Ukraine are fighting a war for territory. The world war has not ended yet and the Eastern European borders have not been finally confirmed by international law.

Why doesn't Ukraine negotiate with the Russian Federation about what it will cost if Ukraine gives up Crimea?

And why are the bazionals of Danzig involved in the costs of the war in Ukraine, although they have not yet received any reparations and could and can acquire territory with reparation payments?

25 Due to the activities of the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig, Poland demands 1`300`000`000`000.-€ reparations. With the indication of the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig that also still about the today's west Polish border can be negotiated, the Russian Federation demands from Poland 750`000`000`000.-€ at too much ceded reparations.

Why shouldn't the Free City of Danzig or Germany acquire a corridor between Ukraine and the Russian Federation or lease it on a long-term basis?

Still after every war there was a peace treaty in which reparations and thus borders were negotiated.

Why not negotiate payments before both sides have destroyed hundreds of billions of € and human lives?

The Second World War ends only with the enforcement of the constitution of Germany. Until then, the conclusion of border treaties under international law is not even possible.

26 The Russian Federation is waging war with the claim that it is threatened by the Nazi-dominated EU and NATO. It is right in this - see evidence in the complaint.

The Constitution of Germany restores the rule of law. With it the argument of the Russian federation it would be threatened by Nazis is void.

27 With the approval and enforcement of the Constitution of Germany and thus reparation payments to the Free City of Danzig, border treaties under international law can be concluded. Only then will the borders in Europe be finalized. Ukraine and the Russian Federation must also participate in the enforcement of the Constitution of Germany.

#### **E. Preliminary remark on the claim of the Russian Federation that it is threatened by Nazis under the protection of NATO.**

28 The joint government of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) claims to its own people and to the rest of the world that the

conditions of the Two-plus-Four Treaty have been fulfilled. One only has to read Article 1 of the Two-plus-Four Treaty and Articles 4 (2) and 4 (6) of the Unification Treaty (state treaty) between the two partly sovereign states FRG and GDR to realize that only the conditions according to Article 1 of the Two-plus-Four Treaty are not fulfilled.

29 Externally, "German" politicians defend human rights and criticize, for example, Polish judicial reform. In the bilateral treaties between the USA and the FRG, the "German" ambassador assures that the FRG is a state under the rule of law, subject to EU law.

In truth, as in the last century with the German state of Bavaria, the Federal Republic of Germany is not only a de facto dictatorship, but a nationalist dictatorship. This, too, can be easily verified. The consequence of this is that towards the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig most serious crimes are committed beginning with the year 2004 until today. In sum, the war crime of attempted genocide is committed, under the protection of NATO - more on this under Federal Republic of Germany, Marginal No. 137-167 and Exhibit 4 and 5.

The fact that these easily verifiable facts are concealed proves that the EU and thus NATO is dominated by Nazis.

So that no misunderstanding arises from the outset:

The Hitler method or the Nazi principle

Easier than to defeat a country militarily is to subvert a state by propaganda. In terms of international law, Nazis are enemy agents working against the interests of the people.

A Nazi is not a nationalist, anti-Semite, racist and fascist. So were the Poles in the last century, but not Nazis. A Nazi twists the terms. As a rule, the opposite of what is claimed is true. He does not lie and cheat to enrich himself. He lies and cheats to destroy any binding law, the principle of good faith, to provoke mass murder.

As a sign of a satanic sect, the swastika, the sign of good, was turned upside down and used as a hooked cross. The so-called self-proclaimed elite of the Nazis, the SS, celebrated their ceremonies under the symbol of the Black Sun, as a sign of worship of Satan. In the end, the SS included thirty different nationalities.

30 That the two easily verifiable facts:

A) the Two-plus-Four Treaty has not been realized and

B) the FRG is again a nationalistic dictatorship

is concealed from all sides, both by politicians, the media and above all by lawyers can only be due to the influence of the World Economic Forum. Only the World Economic Forum has connections to politicians, dominates the media and through the strategic partners of the World Economic Forum with their legal departments the lawyers.

The World Economic Forum was founded and is headed by the German Klaus Schwab. Klaus Schwab's father worked for a Swiss company in the Hitler Empire. He was able to enter and leave Switzerland with his family. If he had not been a reliable Nazi, this would certainly not have been allowed. In a book about secret societies, the author conducts an interview with a leader of a secret society. The leader reports frankly that it is intended to reduce mankind by 90%. He justifies this with the fact that the raw materials are limited and also coming generations are dependent on it. So in order to secure the prosperity of the coming generations, the population must be reduced evenly now. Of course, this cannot be left to the stupid citizens. That's why once a year the extraterrestrials meet over the mountains of Geneva to discuss it. By the extraterrestrials, of course, we mean the heads of the strategic partners of the World Economic Forum (WEF), and they do not meet over the mountains of Geneva, but in Davos. The publication of this book has been banned.

31 That the WEF is behind this, that the easily verifiable facts are concealed, is not only a plausible explanation. There are concrete indications.

One of the WEF's strategic partners is Koninklijke DSM. N.V. CEO of Koninklijke DSM N.V.

was Mr. Feike Sijbesma. He created a code of conduct for Koninklijke DSM N.V., the Business Code of Conduct. This code ensures compliance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. No form of corruption is tolerated. If this code cannot be complied with in a country, the DSM Group will look for solutions itself. Every six months, all employees must sign a binding declaration that they will report any violations of the Code of Business Conduct, also in the future. This makes them liable. The sober facts are that the Code of Business Conduct is being violated to the greatest possible extent. Any employee who reports a violation will be immediately dismissed and, if further efforts are made to report the violation in a binding manner and to cure it, will be economically destroyed.

32 The responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig has the evidence that the DSM Group under the CEO, Mr. Feike Sijbesma is responsible for the most serious crimes, such as bodily injury resulting in disability and deprivation of liberty. The representative of the DSM Group Mr. Nordmann, Attorney at Law, boasts that he is acting on behalf of Mr. Feike Sijbesma and that the whole of Switzerland is dancing to his tune - see more under Swiss Confederation.

Mr. Feike Sijbesma sits on the Supervisory Board of the WEF, the Dutch Central Bank and the World Bank. Mr. Feike Sijbesma was Corona Commissioner for the Netherlands and responsible that the sale of Ivermectin was banned under penalty. As Carbon Commissioner at the World Bank, he is responsible for Dutch farmers having to declare bankruptcy.

There sits Mr. Feike Sijbesma in highest positions, is responsible for the fact that most serious crimes are committed and stands obviously above the right. No law enforcement agency can be found to investigate Mr. Feike Sijbesma and his helpers.

33 Should the countries of the African Union, for example, be surprised if the Ukraine is supported by the international organizations of the UN to finance death and destruction, while Madagascar, for example, would need only negligible financial support in proportion, so that Madagascar would become a green island again, hunger would be eliminated and the world climate would be cooled?

But even through Mr. Feike Sijbesma, the Carbon Officer of the World Bank, Madagascar receives no aid for irrigation.

With the money that Ukraine receives to finance the war and its consequences, world hunger could be eliminated.

34 The Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Guterres, takes the arrest of 25 so-called "Reich Germans" under Prince Reuss as an opportunity to warn the world against the "Reich Germans". "Reich Germans" is probably to be interpreted as Nazi. There is war in the Ukraine, starve millions of people and it crises everywhere in the world, but Mr. Guterres warns against 25 "Reich Germans". If one looks in the Internet under "Reich Germans" one reads: "Reich Germans reject the Federal Republic of Germany." What did Prince Reuss and, among others, high-ranking officers and a female judge want? They want a peace treaty. Why do they want a peace treaty? So that the rule of the Nazis can be ended.

So Mr. Guterres warns that with a peace treaty the world war will end and the state under the rule of law in Germany will be restored. One can probably compare the action of Mr. Prince Reuss with the assassination of Hitler by Count Stauffenberg.

35 In fact, the WEF is obviously panicking since the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig successfully conducted arbitration proceedings against Koninklijke DSM N.V.. This demonstrated how Nazi justice can be elegantly and easily undermined.

36 Even in the last century, the Nazis knew the war was lost as early as 1943, when the propaganda minister Goebbels asked the Germans, "Do you want total war?" "Yes!" was cheered. The Germans still believed in the final victory when the Soviets knocked on the

Berlin front door with the tank barrel.

It is something like that again.

The Nazis know that they have lost and want to provoke the greatest possible mass murder as quickly as possible.

But thereby more and more critical states and people notice that something is not right.

There still everything is done fast, fast, in order to plunge as many people as possible into the ruin.

The outbreak of the coronavirus was planned only for the year 2023 with a more dangerous variant. But after the lies could no longer be concealed, the coronavirus has just been released earlier. The American David Martin registered the patents for viruses. He found out that, for example, the American health consultant Fauci has acquired patents, but also Google. He found that 2/3 of those responsible for the Corona measures belong to the WEF board.

Mr. Elon Musk finds out by buying Twitter that Twitter was censoring at the behest of Mr. Fauci and the FBI regarding Corona. Mr. Fauci could not recall anything at a hearing in the U.S. Congress.

Vaccination is propagated as the only protection against corona disease. The Austrian chancellor at the time, Mr. Kurz, ordered 40 million doses for 8 million Austrians. Obviously it is known that vaccination does not help. The Bavarian de facto dictator Söder wants the compulsory vaccination. Thereby it is written on every package insert that there is no approved vaccine and the late effects are unknown.

37 The head of the WHO, the Ethiopian Tedros is suspected of being jointly responsible for mass murder in Ethiopia. Mr. Tedros advised against the use of Ivermectin. Therefore, the virus spread in India, where previously a pack of Ivermectin could be bought at any kiosk for 2,60 €. After Ivermectin was used in Mexico, hospital occupancy decreased by 85% due to Corona patients. In Guatemala, a packet of Ivermectin with vitamins was given out to anyone who wanted it. There was effectively no covid disease in Guatemala.

38 Against the nationals of the Free City of Danzig, the Corona measures were a violation of Article 43 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

Again:

The Permanent Court of Justice in The Hague has established that the Free City of Danzig is a state governed by the rule of law, in which the rights of the individual take precedence over the interests of a majority - see Decision A/B No. 65. According to this, everyone can protect himself as he wants, but no one can demand that a Danziger must protect himself. If a Danzig man wants to fall ill or die of covid, no one can forbid him to do so, taking into account Article 43 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

39 In Montreal, it was decided that agricultural production should be reduced by 30% in order to save mankind from greenhouse gases. Yet plant production is the simplest way to sequester CO<sub>2</sub>. For the past 50 years, growers have been injecting CO<sub>2</sub> into greenhouses to increase production. Now CO<sub>2</sub> is to be sucked out of the air and pumped into the earth. But already 10 years ago, scientists have grown algae in salt water that produce 40 times the biomass of a cornfield, provided there is enough CO<sub>2</sub>. So if you're already taking CO<sub>2</sub> out of the air, you could use it to create biomass in saltwater without end. Fifteen years ago, Shell bought a patent that could produce sulfur-free diesel fuel from biomass for 0.30 cents/liter. Why don't they do this? Don't the so-called CO<sub>2</sub> experts know anything about it?

40 Blood has already been spilled in Ukraine since 2014.

Instead of using the Minsk Agreement to eliminate corruption in Ukraine and thus convince eastern Ukrainians that western Ukraine is the better state, the focus is on escalation. Linguistic minorities, not only Russian, are discriminated against.

Where is the Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg? What about the International Covenant on Civil Rights? Where is the UN human rights commissioner?

The United Nations Organization with its sub-organizations is suspected of being infiltrated

by Nazis. Of course, not all states of the United Nations. After the United States of America, the Federal Republic is the largest financier of the United Nations Organization. To this end, the United Nations Organization has signed contracts with the World Economic Forum, and the WHO, for example, is also financed by strategic partners of the World Economic Forum. The successor as CEO at Koninklijken DSM N.V. is Ms. Matchett. She is attending a meeting with Mr. Guterres.

Could this be the reason why confidence in the United Nations Organization is waning?

41 Joining the lawsuit of Ukraine against the Russian Federation, and at the same time joining the lawsuit against Ukraine and the states that joined the lawsuit of Ukraine against the Russian Federation, is supposed to end the World War, and with it the war in Ukraine.

42 In 1990, the then Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the United Nations that there would no longer be a representation of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, but that Germany would take their place.

In 1990, it was not yet possible to adopt a constitution for Germany.

The Federal Republic of Germany was continued only as a makeshift within the framework of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

To this end, it was stipulated that the Federal Republic of Germany would not raise any objections to expropriations without compensation against German property.

With the Constitution of Germany, the stopgap "Federal Republic of Germany" has expired.

The nationality of Germany will not be granted to persons who have proven themselves to be stubborn Nazis.

This disempowers the Nazis, provided the Defendants enforce the Constitution of Germany.

That is why lawsuits are filed against the states that are suing. After all, these states claim to want to end the war in Ukraine by peaceful means.

A decision that denies the right to be heard is always void.

The Germans were not allowed to participate in the negotiations for the Versailles Peace Treaty. This helped Hitler in his seizure of power. For the German Wehrmacht, the Second World War was only the continuation of the First. The German Wehrmacht always behaved correctly. The crimes were committed by the SS, which in the end included 30 different nationalities.

By the fact that now the EU allows itself to be dominated by Nazis, the guilt of the Germans is relativized.

## II. PARTIES

### **A. The Plaintiff Party - On the Legal Person of the Free City of Danzig**

#### **a. The Free City of Danzig**

43 The Free City of Danzig was created under Articles 100-108 of the Versailles Peace Treaty and is a contracting party to these provisions and a contracting party with respect to Articles 1-26 League of Nations and Articles 387-427 International Labor Organization of the Versailles Peace Treaty. Under Article 102, the Free City of Danzig is under the protection of the League of Nations. Thus, the supreme executive is an international force.

44 Under Article 103 of the Peace Treaty, the Constitution is a treaty with the League of

Nations. The legislative branch under the Constitution is the Danzig people. Supreme judicial power is an international arbitration court.

45 The Danzigers are entitled to protection from foreign countries, both foreign and domestic.

*Article 76 of the Danzig Constitution: Every national, whether within or outside the territory of the State, shall have the right to claim the protection of the State in his relations with foreign countries.*

This means that Danzig decisions are to be enforced by all states. Appeals against them can only be made to an international arbitration court, arguing that the decision violates the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig, or Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution.

*Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution: The Constitution of the German Empire of August 11th, 1919, is hereby revoked. All laws and decrees which are valid in the territory of the Free City of Danzig at the time of the coming into operation of this Constitution shall remain in force in so far as they are not suspended by this Constitution or by legislation. The Popular Assembly shall be bound, as soon as it meets, immediately to appoint a Committee to examine all decrees which have been issued since January 10th, 1920.*

46 Via Danzig, 620'000 citizens of Jewish faith fled. It is said that without the Free City of Danzig there would be no state of Israel.

With Danzig, the Nazi war of extermination would have come to nothing.

That is why the Second World War began with the invasion of Danzig.

To resist the Nazis, the United Nations was created. The rights of the Danzig people should be given to everyone. For this purpose, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was created.

47 The Federal Republic of Germany was conceived as the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig. But this legal succession is not confirmed under international law until the Danzigers agree to a constitution under Article 146 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

For the United States of America, the Free City of Danzig is part of the German Imperial Empire under occupation of the League of Nations, entitled to claims wrongfully made under the Versailles Peace Treaty.

48 Both as a Free City of Danzig and as a component of the German Imperial Empire, Danzig sided with the Allies against the Nazis. For the United States of America, the representative of the Free City of Danzig is the representative of the German Imperial Empire. The grandfather was killed as a representative of the German Imperial Empire in the Battle of Tanga in 1914 and the Plaintiff's father was never a member of the Weimar Republic.

for more see Marginal Nos 51-57, Exhibits 1, 2, 3 Constitution of Germany

Proof: Versailles Peace Treaty

Proof: Constitution of the Free City of Danzig

Proof: Decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague  
Series A/B No. 65

<https://archives.ungeneva.org/constitution-of-the-free-city-of-danzig-league-of-nations-secretariat-special-supplement-no-7-of-the-league-of-nations-official-journal-containing-the-german-text-of-the-constitution-with-translations-in-english-and-french/download>

## **b. On the person of the Plaintiff as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig**

49 Beowulf von Prince (full name: Beowulf Adalbert von Prince), residence Schweizer

Str. 38, AT- 6830 Rankweil, Austria.

The Plaintiff is the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig and at the same time the representative of Germany until the formation of a government by nationals of Germany:

Remark: The government of the Federal Republic of Germany is formed by nationals of the nationalist German Reich. According to the civil service laws of the Federal Republic of Germany, they cannot be civil servants of the Federal Republic of Germany. The government officials are instigators and accomplices in an identity card forgery for the purpose of deception in legal transactions. In contrast, the Plaintiff is a national of the Federal Republic of Germany and a civil servant of the Federal Republic of Germany - see more under Federal Republic of Germany and Exhibit 4.

#### **aa. The Plaintiff's Nationality**

50 According to the United Nations, the Plaintiff is a national of the Free City of Danzig - see Exhibit 2

Comment on this:

Although the United States of America was a major party to the provisions of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Parliament of the United States of America did not ratify that treaty and instead entered into a separate peace treaty with the German Empire within the borders of 1917. For the United States of America, Danzig is part of the German Imperial Empire, which was under the occupation of the League of Nations and on the side of the Allies against the Nazis. For the United States of America, the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig is the responsible representative of the German Imperial Empire.

#### **The Inherited Nationality of the Free City of Danzig of the Plaintiff**

##### **The parentage of the Plaintiff**

##### **1. The Grandfather as a British/German Colonial Officer**

51 The Plaintiff's great-grandfather was a British police chief in Mauritius. Plaintiff's grandfather was born there and was British but became a German colonial officer and founded the present state of Tanzania.

Proof: book of the grandfather: "Against Arabs and Wahehe".

He could not acquire nationality of one of the German states, but at best colonial nationality, which is imperial nationality according to the Reichsstaatsangehörigkeitgesetz des Deutschen Reiches of July 22, 1913. The grandfather was elevated to hereditary nobility and is representative of the German monarchy.

Proof: "Genealogical Handbook of the Nobility".

##### **The grandfather was killed in action in 1914.**

Proof: Monument in Tanga in Tanganyika/today Tanzania

He died as representative of the German Emperor. For the United States of America, the Plaintiff is the Deputy of the German Emperor.

##### **2. The Father of British Descent, but a Member of the German Nobility became a Danzig National.**

52 Plaintiff's father was born in East Africa and was in Danzig for education in 1919. In 1924, he returned to his homeland, the League of Nations Mandate of Tanganyika, with a Danzig identity card. Then World War II broke out with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig. The British sent the father to the war zone of the German Reich in 1940. Not to be drafted into the Wehrmacht, of course, to shoot as many British as possible, but as a Danziger. A Danziger may not even accept a medal. He had to resist civilly. That's what he did. He evaded the call-up to the Wehrmacht, carried out undermining of the armed forces at the risk of his life, was tortured and survived only with severe health damage.

Proof: documents of the UN: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1656856?ln=en>

**The Plaintiff thus belongs to the victorious powers.**



### 3. The Father with the Nationality of Danzig as "German in the meaning of Art. 116 (1) GG

53 The Plaintiff's father has availed himself of the First Nationality Act of Feb. 22, 1955 (renunciation of the nationality of the German Reich). The Government of Lower Franconia confirms that he is a national of Danzig and "German within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law" - see Exhibit 1. Thus he was officially registered as a Danzig national.

"German within the meaning of Art. 116 GG" refers to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution: "The Weimar Constitution is repealed. German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed."

Whoever does not recognize the Free City of Danzig does not recognize its constitution. Then he does not recognize the Weimar Constitution either. Then he must recognize the Constitution of the German Imperial Empire. Whoever does not recognize the Free City of Danzig, for him the Danzigers are part of the German Imperial Empire on the side of the Allies against the nationals of the National Socialist German Reich or the SS. For those who do not recognize the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Plaintiff is a representative of the German Empire.

54 In 1956, the father submitted his claims for damages to the United Nations. The UN confirmed that he is a Danzig national. The claims are on hold pending the conclusion of a peace treaty.

Proof: official documents of the United Nations and official documents of the Government of Lower Franconia - see Exhibits 1 and 2

Proof: London Debt Agreement of 1953 Art. 5.2, Marg.No. 13

Thus he was officially registered as a Danzig national.

55 According to Section 1 of the Nationality Act of the Free City of Danzig, this nationality passes to the legitimate children.

Proof: Nationality Act of the Free City of Danzig.

The Plaintiff, Mr. Beowulf von Prince, full name, Beowulf Adalbert von Prince is legitimate son of Tom Adalbert von Prince.

Proof: for example, genealogical handbook of nobility

56 The provision "in possession of German nationality within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law" confirmed the Free City of Danzig as part of the Allies. The people of Danzig decide on a constitution:

Proof: the Basic Law has already been amended 60 times. But, for example, still exists Art. 120 GG:

*"(1) The Federation shall bear the expenses for occupation costs and the other internal and external consequential war burdens as further determined by federal laws."*

and Art. 133 GG:

*"The Federation shall enter into the rights responsibilities of the unified economic territory."*

This is due to Art. 79 (1) sentence two GG mutatis mutandis:

*The GG cannot be amended insofar as it relates to peace treaties, occupation law and defense law issues.*

Proof: But the GG expires on the day on which a constitution according to Art. 146 GG is decided. The deputies of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) can therefore not determine about peace treaty, occupation-legal and defense law issues. This is simply logical. The nationals of the German Reich cannot unilaterally decide on a peace settlement.

57 On the basis of the Election Laws, no one who had renounced the nationality of the German Reich could become a member of parliament.

Proof: Election laws

**bb. The Plaintiff as an Official of the Federal Republic of Germany with an Oath to the GG**

58 The Plaintiff has become a forestry officer.

Proof: among other things, probationary period assessment.

He could not become a member of parliament.

Proof: Election laws - Anyone who has renounced the nationality of the German Reich and is "German within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law" cannot become a member of parliament.

But a civil servant can only be one who is "German within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law." As a Danzig national, the Plaintiff is in any case obliged to protect the ordre public. That can be done best as a civil servant.

Proof: Civil Servant Laws

**cc. The Plaintiff has never waived his rights/obligations**

59 In 1990, the Plaintiff filed a lawsuit for damages because of the German-Polish Border Treaty. The lawsuit remained pending until the Federal Constitutional Court Act was changed, according to which lawsuits no longer had to be accepted. The Plaintiff did not have to pursue the lawsuit. Berlin was still occupied. The German-Polish Border Treaty was therefore only a confirmation of the administrative borders.

A border treaty under international law recognizing today's European borders can only take place with the consent of the people of Danzig. The nationals of the German Reich allowed themselves to be deprived of their defined territory by Hitler.

Proof: Documents of the Federal Constitutional Court

Proof: Amendment of the Federal Constitutional Court Act

Proof: Neither the 4 Powers nor Poland nor the nationals of the German Reich can determine about the territory of the Free City of Danzig.

But this registers the Plaintiff as a Danzig national, who has yet to be compensated.

**dd. Confirmation of the Plaintiff as Representative of the Free City of Danzig**

60 In 2006, the Plaintiff, together with Mrs. Karin Leffer, founded the Bund für das Recht (Association for the Law) in order to demand German law.

Proof: Book "Do Your Duty - Save Your Existence"

61 The 1st Act to Adjust the Federal Law of April 19, 2006, abolished the entry into force of essential laws. In the 2nd Act to Adjust the Federal Law of Nov. 27, 2007, in Art. 4 Adjusted Occupation Law, Section 3 The rights and duties of the occupying powers are preserved, it was confirmed that the 2 (Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and German Democratic Republic (GDR)) + 4 Powers Treaty of 1990 has not yet been realized. In order to clarify which German law is required, and that for the realization of the Two-plus-Four Treaty the political organization of the Free City of Danzig must exist, the Plaintiff with Mrs. Karin Leffer and Mr. Manfred Heinemann, reorganized the Free City of Danzig politically and communicated this on May 23, 2008 to all relevant authorities.

Proof: numerous registered letters with advice of receipt

Proof: documents of the United Nations

Proof: documents of the Federal Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, etc.

62 In violation of the principle of speciality in extradition proceedings against the Swiss Confederation, the Plaintiff was held in detention from Dec. 21, 2012 to Oct. 18, 2013. The

arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court on Sept. 19, 2013, reads: *"Mr. von Prince and Ms. Karin Leffer are the representatives of the Free City of Danzig. They recognize German law only in parts."* Of course, the Plaintiff recognizes only German/Danzig law and not nationalistic "German" law.

A violation of the principle of speciality is a violation of the general rules of international law, a legal ground for war.

63 The Plaintiff has offered 1'344'000,-€ bail. By decision of Sept.18,2013, Mr. Judge Dr. Koch rejected this offer as too low to release the Plaintiff from detention even one day earlier. With this decision, Judge Dr. Koch violates the requirements and conditions of the extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice.

Proof: Extradition decision Case No. B 224`163/TMA

Proof: Decision of Coburg Regional Court of Sept. 18, 2013, Case No. 2 Ns 118 Js. 181/08

Proof: Arrest warrant of the Regional Court Coburg of Sept. 19, 2013, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11

64 The Plaintiff was arrested again on April 15, 2016. In Sept. 2016, the Freiburg Execution Chamber ruled: "Mr. von Prince remains in custody. He is convinced to be a national of the Free City of Danzig and considers its identity documents legitimate."

Proof: Freiburg Prison Enforcement Chamber Case No. 12 StVK 381/16

Proof: Lörrach Prison

65 In 2017, the Plaintiff wrote to the International Court of Justice in The Hague with the letterhead and stamp of the Free City of Danzig, among other things to recall that the statutes for the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials were created because of the invasion of the Free City of Danzig. As a result, the International Court of Justice in The Hague changed its website and the United Nations published documents of the Plaintiff's father.

Proof: change of the website of the International Court of Justice in The Hague

Proof: publication of documents of the Plaintiff's father regarding his claims for damages

66 On Oct 01, 2019, the Plaintiff was convicted by the Coburg Regional Court for Danzig ID cards, confirming him as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig.

Proof: Judgment of Oct. 01, 2019, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11

67 In Nov. 2019, the Plaintiff with Ms. Karin Leffer filed suit in Washington DC against the Federal Republic of Germany, the Kingdom of Belgium, the entire EU and the Swiss Confederation. Initially, on the grounds that no judicial proceedings can be conducted throughout Europe in which the procedural guarantees of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights are respected. The Defendants disputed the jurisdiction of the Court. Therefore, a supplementary complaint was filed, proving that the Two-plus-Four Treaty is not realized and cannot be realized without the political organization of the Free City of Danzig.

The Court in Washington decided that it does not have jurisdiction.

The reasons are:

According to Article 1 of the Two-plus-Four Treaty, a constitution must be promulgated in accordance with Article 146 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, in which the state borders are defined, as was regulated in Article 23 Scope of the Basic Law. Already in the preliminary negotiations for the Two-plus-Four Treaty, the Secretary of State of the USA, James Baker, omitted Article 23 GG and thus withdrew the power of representation from the nationals of the German Reich.

Except for the Danzigers, no one can dispose of the territory of the Free City of Danzig.

Even the Danzigers cannot unilaterally change the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig.

The consent to change the Danzig Constitution was given by the 4 powers as representatives of the United Nations with Article 146 of the Basic Law.

The nationals of the German Reich lost all rights. The Saarland had its own constitution and nationality law, as did the German Democratic Republic. Nevertheless, they remained nationals of the nationalist German Reich under international law. The nationals of the nationalist German Reich can only rid themselves of the legacy of the nationalist German Reich by taking on the nationality of another state and thus acquiring its rights.

A constitution that does not regulate the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig would mean that the Versailles Peace Treaty is terminated and then this treaty must be renegotiated. This is not in the interest of the Europeans and the then Soviet Union.

How the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig is regulated can only be decided by the nationals of the Free City of Danzig recognized under international law.

Article 116(1): *"Possessor of German nationality within the meaning of Article 116(1) is ..."* refers to Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution: *"German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed."* The Danzigers recognized under international law are thus the ones who can decide on a constitution according to Article 146 GG.

The 4 powers have given their consent to this and this consent cannot be terminated unilaterally.

Therefore, the Danzigers, who are recognized under international law, are solely responsible for restoring the rule of law and confirming the borders in Europe.

Plaintiff has submitted to the Washington DC court the confirmation of Danzig nationality by the Government of Lower Franconia and the United Nations. Thus, the U.S. does not have jurisdiction to establish the rule of law and implement the Two-plus-Four Treaty.

Proof: Two-plus-Four Treaty

Proof: omission of Article 23 Basic Law

Proof: any amendment to an international treaty, especially if it moves a boundary, must explicitly mention the previous treaty, otherwise the old treaty is considered terminated. A unilateral termination means no recognition of the old as well as the new borders.

Proof: Article 79, paragraph 1, sentence 2, Basic Law, *mutatis mutandis*: The Basic Law cannot be amended insofar as it concerns peace treaties, occupation law and defense law.

Proof: Article 116 (1) Basic Law

Proof: Article 146 Basic Law

68 Through the lawsuit in Washington DC, the Plaintiff looked at the Nationality Act of the German Reich for the first time. After all, it could not concern him. He found the 1999 insertion of Section 40a, which declares "Germans within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law" to be nationals of the German Reich. The Plaintiff informed the German Federal Government in Oct. 2020 that without his express consent this Section is null and void and demands €160'000'000'000,- in damages for the Free State of Danzig and the power to dispose of Germany's foreign trade surpluses. The Plaintiff has the say with regard to peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues.

On 12 Aug. 2021 Section 40 a fell away without a sound. Instead, Section 15 of the Nationality Act of the German Reich was overwritten. According to this, the nationals of the German Reich are not "Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law", but according to Article 116 (2) and thus nationals of the nationalist German Reich, unless they express a different will.

It is confirmed to the Plaintiff that he cannot become a national of the German Reich even upon application.

69 The Unification Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic was amended in July 2021, confirming that these two partly sovereign states still exist and that the Two-plus-Four Treaty has not yet been realized.

This confirms that the Plaintiff is competent.

The then Minister of Finance, Mr. Olaf Scholz, made an election promise to increase the minimum wages by 20% immediately, instead of only 2% as before, in order to reduce the

foreign trade surpluses so that the Plaintiff would receive less.

70 In April 2017, the Plaintiff was officially negotiated for the first time as a representative of the Free City of Danzig. The press reported about it. As a result, Poland prepared an expert opinion on the justification of reparations. In 2018, Poland put the claims at €690'000'000'000,-. Thereupon, the Plaintiff inquired whether this included the Free City of Danzig. Poland therefore increased its claims to 850'000'000'000,-€. The Plaintiff awards Poland 690'000'000'000,-€ and claims the territory of Danzig. As a result, Poland moved the commemoration of the beginning of World War II to Poland after 79 years. The Plaintiff inquired whether Poland represents Danzig in terms of foreign policy and whether Polish officials are withdrawn from Danzig and Poland receives, for example, the German State of Brandenburg as compensation. As a result, Poland moved the celebrations back to Danzig and is now demanding €1,300,000,000'000,-.

71 In February 2023, the Plaintiff, as the responsible representative, initiated arbitration proceedings against the United Nations, World Economic Forum, etc. The complaint comprises 202 pages with attachments and was sent to a total of over 50 addresses. Of these, to over 40 embassies. The main issue is whether there is anyone who does not recognize the Free City of Danzig. To this end, the Plaintiff announces that it will issue Danzig identity cards and put into circulation Danzig Gulden backed by the gold of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In doing so, the Plaintiff points out that the war in Ukraine is completely unnecessary as long as the territorial issue of the Free City of Danzig has not been settled, and thus the borders in Europe have not been conclusively settled. By 1990, it was clear to every Pole that the East German territories could be bought back, just as the territories annexed by the Benelux countries were in 1963.

The Danzigers have a pre-emptive right to purchase East German territories, such as East Prussia. This has not changed until today.

The Russian Federation demands therefore from Poland 750'000'000'000,-€ because of too much ceded reparations.

Now Poland is vigorously arming itself.

There is no objection to the issue of Danzig identity cards and Danzig Gulden.

Thus the Plaintiff is recognized as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig and responsible for a Constitution of Germany and the realization of the Two-plus-Four Treaty.

72 The Constitution of Germany has now been drawn up and regulates the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig. Whoever wants to receive the nationality of Germany as a national of the German Reich and thus receives all rights, must apply for the nationality of Germany and receive it from the Danzigers recognized under international law, represented by the Plaintiff.

With the coming into force of the Constitution of Germany, the Plaintiff is at the same time the representative of the Free City of Danzig and of Germany until a government is formed from nationals of Germany.

Proof: The Constitution of Germany regulates the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig and the naturalization of the nationals of the nationalist German Reich into Germany.

73 The naturalization to Germany can be done only by the nationals of the Free City of Danzig.

Proof: Only by becoming a national of another state can one lose one's old nationality.

Proof: A debtor does not lose his debts by taking another name. He loses his debt only if his debt is cancelled by the creditor.

74 The Constitution of Germany first creates the prerequisite for ending the World War. The World War is only ended when the Danzigers have received reparations. Only then can

a border treaty under international law be concluded with the Republic of Poland.

## **B. On the Person of the Defendants**

Concerning the Defendants in the Proceedings Ukraine vs. the Russian Federation

### **a. On the Russian Federation**

75 The Russian Federation is the legal successor of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union was the legal successor of the Russian Tsarist Empire. The Russian Tsar had claimed to be the protector of Slavic-speaking Europeans, such as the Serbs.

World War I began with the assassination of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne during a state visit to Serbia. According to the general rules of international law, Austria-Hungary claimed prosecution. Serbia refused. As a result, Austria-Hungary had to declare war on Serbia. Russia was allied with France and Great Britain.

Therefore, the German Emperor wrote to 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.

76 In the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty of 1918, the now formed Soviet Union renounced a strip from the Black Sea to the Baltic Sea. The people living there were to create their own states as they saw fit.

The Versailles Peace Treaty abrogated the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and confirmed the Russian borders of 1913.

77 But then Poland attacked the Soviet Union and, under the 1922 Riga Peace Treaty, annexed what is now western Ukraine. The Poles harassed the Ukrainian and Russian speaking and Jewish populations.

In the Hitler-Stalin Pact it was agreed that the Soviet Union would regain the territories ceded in the Riga Peace Treaty.

The Western Ukrainians joined the Germans and committed pogroms against the Polish-speaking and Jewish population.

In order to end these discords, Stalin decided to resettle the Polish-speaking population from what is now western Ukraine to eastern Germany. Therefore, the East Germans were expelled.

78 As the legal successor of the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation is a party to the Two-plus-Four Treaty and has the right to object to the Constitution of Germany, except for the question of the German-Polish border treaty. The question of whether Article 5 (foreign armed forces may not be stationed in the territory of the GDR) of the Two-plus-Four Treaty is still in force does not arise, because under the Constitution of Germany, an International Protective Force is in fact the supreme executive of Germany.

79 Until the conclusion of a German-Polish border treaty, the Soviet Union is also particularly responsible for the protection of the Danzigers and that the Danzigers receive reparations.

### **b. On the Ukraine**

80 Ukraine effectively received Western Ukraine through the Two-plus-Four Treaty.

Until 1990, all parties were aware that East Germans expelled from East Germany (East Prussians, Silesians, and Pomeranians) still had property claims to their real estate. Until 1990, a map of Germany in the 1937 borders hung in every German classroom. The East Germans had received compensation for burdens, but the law explicitly stated that this compensation for burdens did not constitute compensation for damages. Then further compensation payments were made to the East Germans, but again no full compensation was made.

And what about the Danzigers? The "Germans" cannot decide on the claims of the

Danzigers. Therefore, the Danzigers have not received any compensation until today.

Most of today's western Poles were resettled in 1945 from what is now western Ukraine to eastern Germany and in effect received eastern Germany as compensation for the loss of their homeland. But the area was only under Polish administration and de facto state property. Private acquisition of real estate was excluded until 1990.

Theoretically, today's western Poles could and can regain their real estate in what is now western Ukraine through payments from the Germans.

Because the World War de jure did not end, this possibility theoretically continues to this day.

This concerns especially the territory of Danzig. As said, the question of the territory of the Free City of Danzig has not been solved.

The Germans were not consulted in the expulsion and expropriation without compensation of the East Germans. France had effectively annexed the Saarland and the Benelux countries annexed territories without the Germans having a say.

And Danzig?

Danzig, under the protection of the League of Nations, suffered the greatest losses in %. A de facto war of extermination was waged against the Danzigers.

The FRG was de facto conceived as the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig, with the Danzigers as the state people of the FRG. So the FRG and the territory of the FRG belong to the Danzigers. This is how the conditions of the Two-plus-Four Treaty are to be understood.

But the Danzigers must agree to it. The Danzigers could and may well assert a right of first refusal to East German territory. That is a question of price.

Borders in Europe are still a question of price.

That is why Poland demands reparations of 1'300'000'000,-€ and the Russian Federation 750'000'000,-€ from Poland.

Thus, the question of Ukrainian borders can be finally settled only when the territorial question of the Free City of Danzig or the German Reich is mutually agreed between Poland and Germany in a treaty binding under international law.

### **c. On the Republic of Poland**

81 Poland was divided between Prussia, Russia and Austria in the 18th century.

To resist Russia, the German Empire and Austria-Hungary re-established Poland as a sovereign state.

82 In the Versailles Peace Treaty, Poland was granted West Prussia and parts of Silesia. As said, Poland then attacked the Soviet Union and annexed parts of the Western Soviet Union. Then Poland violated the Minority Protection Treaty, the small Versailles Peace Treaty, and harassed the minorities. About 80,000 ethnic Germans were forced to emigrate. Most of the 620,000 citizens of Jewish faith who used Danzig to escape were Polish citizens.

83 Poland claimed Berlin was a Polish city and wanted to wage a two-front war with France against the German Reich. Finally, on Aug. 31, 1939, the German consul in Krakow was assassinated and Polish newspapers reported the victorious march on Berlin. Thus, one cannot speak of sole guilt for the war against Poland.

84 The crimes committed against the Polish population were not committed by the German Wehrmacht, but by the SS, a satanic sect, which in the end included more than 30 different nationalities. Right at the beginning of the invasion of Poland by the German Wehrmacht and the SS, an SS officer assaulted civilians. The German Wehrmacht arrested the SS officer in order to court-martial him. Only after Hitler's intervention was the SS officer released from captivity. The SS was gradually given actual power in the German Reich. The SS was subordinate to the police.

At the end of the war, the German Wehrmacht liberated special prisoners of the SS. The German Wehrmacht opposed the SS with rifles at the ready.

85 Because of ethnic tensions between Ukrainians and the Polish-speaking population in what is now western Ukraine, the East Germans were expelled and the Polish-speaking population of what is now western Ukraine was settled there. Until 1990, this arrangement was subject to a peace treaty.

According to Article 1 of the Two-plus-Four Treaty, therefore, a border treaty recognized under international law must still be expressly concluded. A binding border treaty under international law must include the legal succession of the old border treaty. A mere confirmation of the administrative borders established by the occupying powers is not a border treaty under international law.

#### **d. On the Republic of France**

86 France provided assistance to Russia in World War I and incurred enormous debts. In the Versailles Peace Treaty, France was awarded Alsace-Lorraine and substantial reparation claims, and the German Empire also had to relinquish Danzig in favor of France—see Article 100 of the Versailles Peace Treaty—and was thus effectively an occupying power vis-à-vis the Danzigers.

Therefore, in order to preserve the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, the Free City of Danzig has been placed under the protection of the League of Nations and the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is a treaty to preserve Article 43 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

#### **e. On the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.**

87 Great Britain also fulfilled its obligation of alliance to Russia and joined in the war against the German Empire.

In the Versailles Peace Treaty, the German Empire was obliged to pay the costs of the war to Great Britain.

And the German Empire also renounced the territory of Danzig in favor of Great Britain.

#### **f. On the Kingdom of Belgium**

88 Belgium received a small German-speaking territory as reparations. The German Reich could have bought back this territory. But due to the high reparation demands it was economically not in a position to do so.

#### **g. On the Swiss Confederation**

89 The Swiss Confederation has been a sovereign state since the Peace Treaty of Westphalia in 1648.

<http://www.pax-westphalica.de/ipmipo/index.html>

§ 61 Exemption of the City of Basel and the Swiss Confederation from the Imperial Courts.

90 But the Swiss Confederation does not follow its own law and its own judges, but in the concrete case Bavarian judges and National Socialist law.

91 The Swiss Confederation has committed itself to the defense of its neutrality in the Neutrality Treaty.

Convention V. respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land. The Hague, 18 October 1907,

Approved by the Federal Assembly on April 4, 1910, Swiss instrument of ratification deposited on May 12, 1910.

Entered into force for Switzerland on July 11, 1910.

*Art. 13. A neutral Power which receives escaped prisoners of war shall leave them at liberty. If it allows them to remain in its territory it may assign them a place of residence.*

*The same rule applies to prisoners of war brought by troops taking refuge in the territory of a neutral Power.*



But Switzerland violates the general rules of international law in favor of the German Reich's obligated persons for reparations, to the detriment of the Danzigers entitled to reparations - see facts.

**h. On the persons of the other defendant States.**

92 There is nothing further to add concerning the persons of the other defendant States.

III. FACTS

**A. Review/ Facts up to the year 2004**

93 The beginning of the First World War and its consequences have already been reported under Russian Federation, Ukraine, Poland, France and Great Britain.

**a. Beginning of the 2nd World War**

94 World War II began with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig by the German Reich on Sept. 01, 1939 at 4:45 a.m. The Free City of Danzig is under the protection of the League of Nations (the legal successor to the League of Nations is the United Nations) under Article 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty. Danzig nationals are forbidden to accept medals. According to Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig shall be agreed upon between representatives of the League of Nations and the Danzigers and shall be guaranteed by the League of Nations. The Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is thus a treaty under international law. In Art. 116 the national law/ordre public is guaranteed: Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution: *"The Weimar Constitution shall be repealed. German law at the time of Jan. 1920 shall be guaranteed."*

95 The Nazis were more afraid of nothing than of the Free City of Danzig: the state which successfully resisted the introduction of arbitrary law. The state in which the right of the individual prevails over the interests of even a large majority - see the decision of the Permanent International Court of Justice in The Hague Series A/B No. 65, see Marg. No. 100. Danzig should be erased from the memory of mankind. The Danzigers were the only bulwark against the Nazis. About 620'000 citizens of Jewish faith were able to escape through Danzig. It is said that without the Free City of Danzig there would be no State of Israel.

**b. The German Reich**

96 The "Germans", as a sign of rejection of the Versailles Peace Treaty, held on to their Reich and State Nationality Act, date of issue July 22, 1913.

Proof: Up to this day the date of execution of the Nationality Act of the German Reich is: date of issue July 22, 1913

But this law was passed by the German Emperor.

Proof: Signed by the German emperor

With the Weimar Republic, the monarchy was abolished.

Proof: There was no longer a German emperor

97 In 1933, the Nazis eliminated the nationalities of the German states, such as Bavaria, Prussia, and so on. There was no Bavaria or Prussia, which complained against it on international level.

Proof: Equalization Act of the German Reich

There was only the Reich state nationality. The Reich state nationality was the nationality of the German colonies. But the Weimar Republic had no colonies. Thus, the German Reich had no defined territory.

Proof: as before

98 Then the Nazis replaced the "German" law, the German *ordre public* by arbitrary law. A nation is defined by its *ordre public*. Factually, with the introduction of the Nazi law, the German state people was eliminated in the sense of international law.

Proof: For example change of Section 2 of the Criminal Code, see Recital No. 100

At the time of Dec. 31, 1937, the "German" state people in the sense of international law existed only through the Danzigers. There was no inhabitant of the German Reich who filed a complaint against this on the international level.

The "Germans" in the territory of the German Reich at the time Dec. 31, 1937 were no longer Germans in the sense of international law, but Nazis.

Proof: as before

99 Finally, the Nazis violated the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare and lost all rights.

Proof: see Charge No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, Marg. No. 106

Then there was also a house to house combat for Berlin and thus Berlin was declared a fortress. A fortress enjoys no protection. What applies to the capital applies to the whole country. The Nazis cannot form an independent government and have no representation vis-à-vis foreign countries.

Proof: Article 25 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare

The nationality of the German Reich is no longer a nationality in the meaning of international law. The nationals of the German Reich can no longer establish their own state authority in the meaning of international law. They are only members of a multinational satanic sect. They have no claim to property, no share in a state property and territory and no state power.

Proof: as before

100 Comment: In Danzig, too, the Nazis had come to power through elections and replaced Section 2 of the Criminal Code: *"If an act is not punishable according to the provisions of the Criminal Code, but is punishable according to popular feeling, then that act shall be punished in the manner that comes closest to the provisions of the Criminal Code."*

Against this, the Danzigers have complained at the international level. The Permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague has stated, *"The Free City of Danzig is a state under the rule of law in which the rights of the individual take precedence over the interests of the majority."* - see Series A/B No. 65.

Once again, it can not be repeated often enough

The Hitler Method or the Nazi Principle

Easier than to defeat a country militarily is to subvert a state by propaganda. In terms of international law, Nazis are enemy agents working against the interests of the people.

Let there be no misunderstanding:

A Nazi is not a nationalist, anti-Semite, racist and fascist. So were the Poles in the last century, but not Nazis. A Nazi twists the terms. As a rule, the opposite of what is claimed is true. He does not lie and cheat to enrich himself. He lies and cheats to destroy any binding law, the principle of good faith, to provoke mass murder.

As a sign of a satanic sect, the swastika, the sign of good, was turned upside down and used as a hooked cross. The so-called self-proclaimed elite of the Nazis, the SS, celebrated their ceremonies under the symbol of the Black Sun, as a sign of worship of Satan. In the end, the SS included thirty different nationalities.

101 The SS never surrendered. The Federal Intelligence Service favored SS members for

recruitment. The daughter of the Reichsführer of the SS, Heinrich Himmler, an ardent supporter of the SS to her death, was an employee of the Federal Intelligence Service BND. Mr. Walther Rauff worked as an agent for the BND from 1958 to 1963. The former SS-Standartenführer was one of the main persons responsible for the implementation of the extermination order against the European Jews. During the military dictatorship in Chile, he was instrumental in the persecution and murder of opposition members.

An SS officer was head of the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution. The Federal Criminal Police Office was founded by an SS officer. Employer President Schleyer was an SS Captain. The SS was paid by industry to run the concentration camps. An industry manager convicted of involvement in human experimentation was later awarded the Federal Cross of Merit. SS men served as military advisors in Argentina and Egypt. There, the concept of small, independent terror units was conveyed. In the Spanish dictatorship, they found a home and continued to cultivate ties with industry. In the judiciary of the FRG, 80% were party members of the NSDAP or SS members.

### **c. The League of Nations/the UN**

#### **The League of Nations**

102 The League of Nations was founded according to Art. 1 - 26 of the Versailles Peace Treaty.

According to Art. 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty - Protection of the Danzigers - the League of Nations is a war alliance for the protection of the Danzigers.

Proof: Articles 1-26 and Article 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty

#### **The United Nations**

103 The legal successor of the League of Nations is the United Nations as a war alliance for the protection of the Danzigers.

Proof: Takeover of the real estate of the League of Nations and the League of Nations mandated territories.

Proof: Articles 53 and 107 of the Charter of the United Nation

Proof: Art. 37 of the Statutes of the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

104 The Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations in this form with the 5 veto powers shall apply until a peace treaty is concluded.

Proof: Art. 53 and 107 of the Charter of the United Nations

### **d. The Nuremberg War Crimes Trials**

#### **aa. Violation of the Briand-Kellogg Pact**

105 The invasion of the Free City of Danzig provoked the World War. The statutes for the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials were created in London in 1944 to provide criminal atonement for the invasion of the Free City of Danzig.

Charge No.1 - Violation of the Briand-Kellogg Pact. Towards no other state could the Briand-Kellogg Pact (non-aggression pact) be violated more clearly.

Remark on this: German history books say that the Second World War would have begun with the invasion of Poland. Danzig is not mentioned.

As already described under Poland, it is debatable whether the invasion of the German Wehrmacht violated the Briand-Kellogg Pact.

#### **bb. Violations of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare**

106 The nationality of the German Reich was forcibly imposed on the nationals of Danzig. Thus, the Danzigers were deprived of their national law and it was replaced by National Socialist law. The male population was forced into military service against their own protecting powers and enslaved. The Germans appropriated the state property and levied taxes to finance the war. Against no other state could there be a clearer violation of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare (HLWC) - Charge No. 2 of the Nuremberg War

Crimes Trials.

### **cc. Crimes against humanity**

107 Those who held on to their Danzig nationality were sent to the first concentration camp of World War II, Stutthof. There, only 35% of the inmates survived. Finally, Danzig was declared a fortress and thus total extermination was ordered. The Danzigers were to serve as a living shield against the Soviets. The already initiated genocide/genocide was to be carried out completely - towards the Danzigers the first genocide was started - Charge No. 3 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

*[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stutthof\\_concentration\\_camp](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stutthof_concentration_camp)*

*Stutthof was a Nazi concentration camp 34 km (21 mi) east of the city of Danzig (Gdańsk) in the territory of the German-annexed Free City of Danzig.*

*Stutthof was the first German concentration camp set up outside German borders in World War II, in operation from 2 September 1939.*

*Originally, Stutthof was a civilian internment camp under the Danzig police chief, before its subsequent massive expansion. In November 1941, it became a "labor education" camp (like Dachau), administered by the German Security Police. Finally, in January 1942, Stutthof became a regular concentration camp.*

Trials are now taking place against employees of the Stutthof concentration camp for involvement in mass murder.

108 The prosecutors of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials acted in effect as the executive of the Free City of Danzig and the judges as an international criminal court.

Proof: Article 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty

109 Civil punishment is a matter for the Danzigers and has yet to be settled.

Proof: Article 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty

### **e. The Potsdam Agreement**

110 The Potsdam Agreement is not a treaty under international law, but is what the military commanders-in-chief agreed upon, in effect a military order that applies until a peace treaty is concluded.

Proof: the Potsdam Agreement was not communicated to any parliament for a vote.

111 It is true that only the three powers negotiated at Potsdam, but nevertheless China is also part of it and France has been added.

The Potsdam Agreement states:

*<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1945Berlinv02/d1384>*

*Truman Papers No. 1384 Communiqué<sup>1</sup> Babelsberg, August 2, 1945*

*Report on the Tripartite Conference of Berlin – III Germany*

*The Allied armies are in occupation of the whole of Germany and the German people have begun to atone for the terrible crimes committed under the leadership of those whom, in the hour of their success, they openly approved and blindly obeyed.*

112 The "Germans" have not yet atoned for their terrible crimes.

The food rationing in 1945

The "Germans" had used up all energy reserves for the production of weapons and ammunition instead of artificial fertilizer. The famine was foreseeable. The forced laborers held by the SS received sufficient food for 3 forced laborers only for 2. Performance was paid for with food. Those who performed less got less to eat and died of hunger and weakness. The Holocaust began only when the famine became apparent. Those who were not able to perform in the first place, such as women and children, were gassed shortly and painlessly. The Allies had problems in 1945 to ensure the feeding of the "Germans". The Netherlands wanted to annex large areas and expel the "German" population from them. Only because

the 4 powers were overstrained anyway, the Netherlands had to be satisfied with a small area. Without the 4 powers, millions of Germans would have starved. After 1945, the

"Germans" were given economic aid, but only so that reparations could be paid later.

<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1945Berlinv02/d1384>

Report on the Tripartite Conference of Berlin – III Germany

*It is not the intention of the Allies to destroy or enslave the German people. It is the intention of the Allies that the German people be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis. If their own efforts are steadily directed to this end, it will be possible for them in due course to take their place among the free and peaceful peoples of the world.*

113 „It is not the intention to destroy or enslave the German people.” (as the nationals of the German Reich (the "Germans") did with the Danzigers).

Nicely expressed. If it were not an intention to annihilate or enslave the "Germans," then there would be no need to say that. So it is the intention to annihilate and enslave.

The Potsdam Agreement makes the limitation on that:

*"Unless the "Germans" preserve a free democratic state under the rule of law through steadily directed efforts of their own."*

114 The Potsdam Agreement remains in force until the implementation of the Two + Four Treaty or until the conclusion of a peace treaty.

During his state visit in 2013, the Chinese head of state first went to Potsdam, contrary to protocol and to the horror of the German government, to remind everyone that this agreement is still in force and that China is also a party to it.

**The violations against the Free State of Danzig have not yet been cured.**

#### **f. Federal Republic of Germany**

115 The "Germans" were not heard when reparations were first taken.

The East Germans were allowed to be murdered, beaten to death and raped en masse with impunity. Finally, they were expropriated and expelled without compensation. France de facto annexed the Saarland. The Benelux countries annexed German territory. The Germans were never asked. They lost all rights.

Danzig suffered the greatest losses in %, but was the only state yet to receive reparations.

If state A leads 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? Probably everything, right?

116 The Federal Republic of Germany was conceived as the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig.

In 1949, with the promulgation of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, the old ordre public of the German Imperial Empire was reintroduced as occupation law, which exists under international law through Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution.

In the meaning of international law, the Danzigers are the only German state people, defined by the German/Danzig ordre public in Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution. *"German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed."*

Therefore, the definition of German nationality in Article 116 of the Basic Law is: *"In the meaning of Article 116 Basic Law is..."*

Article 116 (1) *„German within the meaning of this Basic Law is a person who possesses German citizenship."*

The nationals of the German Reich were generously granted the status of Danzigers as refugees and displaced persons of German nationality within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law.

Proof: Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution

Proof: Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law

117 **This corresponds to the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement.** The "Germans shall again adopt German/Danzig law and establish a free democratic constitutional state. But then they must maintain this state under the rule of law out of their own unremitting efforts.

118 The Basic Law was indeed proclaimed by the "Germans". But before that, the Allies had demanded amendments 33 times before the tacit authorization was given to act on behalf of the Allies within the framework of the Basic Law.

Proof: The Basic Law is not a constitution: Proof: Article 146 Basic Law

Proof: The Basic Law is not an international treaty: Proof: no signatures of the Allies

119 For example, until April 19, 2006, the effective date in the Courts Constitution Act as of 1913 was still in it. This entry into force was repealed in 2006 - see Exhibit 4, Repealed Laws.

120 The territories annexed by the Benelux countries were bought in 1963 by the Federal Republic of Germany, the Danzigers, not by the nationals of the German Reich. The nationals of the German Reich have benefited from this until now.

121 The main provisions of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany are:

*Art. 16 (1) No German may be deprived of his citizenship.*

This means that a German may not be deprived of his share in international treaties, his *ordre public*, share in state assets and territory.

The nationals of the German Reich must be aware that they have let themselves be deprived of German law, that they have violated all international treaties and that they have lost any claim to property.

They must be aware of who still possessed "German" nationality, German law in 1937 and where the Second World War began.

*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.*

122 In 1949, the general rules of international law naturally meant first and foremost the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare. According to Article 43, the occupier must uphold the *ordre public*.

In international legal relations, Danzig law/*ordre public* is German law, which is defined in Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution. Laws that do not comply with it are null and void.

Art. 116: "*German within the meaning of Art. 116 (1) GG is...*" - who is subject to Danzig law.

The "Germans" have to think about what "German in the meaning of Article 116" means.

They must be clear about who they actually are and what they want to be.

*Art. 79 (1) sentence two mutatis mutandis: The GG cannot be amended insofar as it concerns peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues.*

Of course, the nationals of the German Reich cannot simply decide unilaterally on peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues.

But the Basic Law expires on the day on which all Germans proclaim a constitution.

**Art. 146 This Basic Law shall cease to apply on the day on which a constitution freely adopted by the German people takes effect.**

Every national of the German Reich must be aware that there must be "Germans" who can proclaim a constitution for Germany. They must ask themselves nevertheless who these "Germans" are.

"Germans" in the meaning of the GG are the proprietors of the German/Danzig law. The Germans can prove only after the withdrawal of the military part of the Free City of Danzig that they preserve the free democratic state under the rule of law from their own unremitting efforts.

The verification of compliance with the conditions of the Potsdam Agreement falls to the legislature of the Free City of Danzig, the Danzigers.

123 **In the London Debt Agreement of 1953**, the Germans undertook to pay reparations. In order for them to be responsible for their own economic success, they were granted partial sovereignty under the Basic Law.

### **The Transitional Treaty**

124 To this purpose, the Transitional Treaty (the Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising out of War and Occupation) of October 23, 1954, was concluded, in which, among other things, it was expressly stated:

*PART SIX REPARATIONS: Article 3*

*1. The Federal Republic shall in the future raise no objections against the measures which have been, or will be, carried out with regard to German external assets or other property, seized for the purpose of reparation or restitution, or as a result of the state of war, or on the basis of agreements concluded, or to be concluded, by the Three Powers with other Allied countries, neutral countries or former allies of Germany.*

*3. No claim or action shall be admissible against persons who shall have acquired or transferred title to property on the basis of the measures referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article, or against international organisations, foreign governments or persons who have acted upon instructions of such organisations or governments.*

### **First Act on the Regulation of Nationality**

125 In order to separate those entitled to reparations and those subject to reparations, the First Act on the Regulation of Nationality of 22 Feb. 1955 was created. Whoever made use of this, as the Plaintiff's father did as a Danzig national, is entitled to reparation. The rejection of nationality is an explicit expression of will. To disregard this expression of will on the part of a Danziger fulfills the elements of a crime according to Charge No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

Proof: - see Statutes of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials

### **Second Act in the Regulation of Nationality**

126 Austria had been incorporated into the German Reich without resistance in 1938 and had therefore ceased to exist under international law. In the Moscow Conference in 1943 it was determined to re-establish Austria, but it was stated that the Austrians must also participate in reparation payments.

Proof: Moscow Conference 1943

127 In 1953 the "Germans" renounced the participation of the Austrians and released the Austrians with the 2nd Act on the Regulation of Nationality by law from the Nationality Act of the German Reich. Only thereby the State Treaty of Austria from the year 1955 with the 4 powers could be concluded and thus the subject of international law "Austria" come into being again.

Proof: State Treaty of Austria

128 However, it was made a condition that they do not enter into any connection with the "Germans" and that the human rights are not only on paper, but also respected.

Proof: State Treaty of Austria

129 In order to be able to pay the reparations from the Second World War, the Germans were released from outstanding claims from the First World War. The last rate was paid off in 2010. However, in 2010, the Second Act on the Regulation of Nationality was also repealed. Thus, according to "German" opinion, the Austrians are again nationals of the nationalist German Reich.

Proof: Repeal of the Second Act on the Regulation of Nationality

Proof: There is no personal declaration of intent to renounce German Reich Nationality

130 With the unverified execution of Bavarian EU arrest warrants, Austria adopts nationalist law, enters into a legal relationship with Germany, and violates human rights - see Review/ Facts up to the year 2004, Marg. No. 137-152.

### **g. The Two + Four Treaty**

131 In 1989, then-Chancellor Helmut Kohl beamed, "Anything is possible, even a peace treaty." Until the then Federal Finance Minister, Graf Lambsdorff, reminded him that over 50 states would then come and demand reparations. That is why Helmut Kohl then wanted to adopt the regulation from the GG.

It was agreed the 2 (Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and German Democratic Republic (GDR)) + 4 (powers) Treaty. According to Article 7, Germany thus becomes fully sovereign.

But only when the conditions according to Article 1 of the Two + Four Treaty are realized.

Condition is it that a constitution must be proclaimed according to Article 146 GG, in which the national borders are defined, as this was regulated in Article 23 Scope GG.

The GG has already been amended 60 times. But, for example, it still says Art. 120: "*The Federation shall bear the costs of the consequences of war and occupation.*" Or Art. 133: "*The Federation shall enter into the rights and responsibilities of the unified economic territory.*" And Art. 146 GG is still there, too.

Why not simply overwrite the GG with constitution and delete the corresponding articles? The Saarland also had its own constitution and a nationality act, just like the GDR. But they were still nationals of the German Reich.

132 But why then do the Allies make it a requirement that a constitution be adopted under Article 146 of the Basic Law, when the deputies of the FRG cannot adopt a constitution by which they lose their nationality of the German Reich? The World War began with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig and will not end until the Danzigers have agreed to a peace settlement. Therefore the Danzigers decide how a constitution for Germany regulates the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig.

133 In 1990, the Two-plus-Four Treaty could not yet be realized. The nationals of the German Reich must first fulfill the conditions of the Potsdam Agreement and a representation of the Free City of Danzig recognized under international law had to be created first.

The conditions according to Article 1 of the Two + Four Treaty are to be fulfilled in the future.

Proof: Two plus Four Treaty - "will", "will be", - "that with their realization the final character of the borders of the united Germany is confirmed.

Therefore, as long as the conditions of the Two-plus-Four Treaty are not realized, this treaty is not effective.

Proof: Unification Treaty

134 Article 1 (2) of the Two-plus-Four Treaty:

(2) *The united Germany and the Republic of Poland shall confirm the existing border between them in a treaty that is binding under international law.*

When?

Neither the Poles nor the FRG and GDR can decide on the territory of the Free City of Danzig. Only a political representation of the nationals of the Free City of Danzig, recognized



by international law, can decide on it.

The nationals of the German Reich cannot dispose of any territory.

It is called the German Reich in the borders of Dec. 31, 1937. But this regulation is based on the fact that Austria was incorporated into the German Reich without resistance in 1938 and was to re-emerge as a sovereign state. In 1937, the "Germans" themselves had given up a definition of the territory of the state. The Weimar Constitution had no scope. The national territory was defined by the German federal states. These became extinct in 1933. Finally, there is no state authority for the nationals of the German Reich in a territory recognized under international law for the nationals of the German Reich.

In 1963, the territories annexed by the Benelux countries were bought. But of course not from the nationals of the German Reich, but from the proprietors of the German nationality in the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG, the Danzigers.

Proof: The annexed territories and their inhabitants were bought for the payment of reparations - for the Danzigers.

Article 7 of the Two-plus-Four Treaty:

*(1) The French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America hereby terminate their rights and responsibilities relating to Berlin and to Germany as a whole. As a result, the corresponding, related quadripartite agreements, decisions and practices are terminated and all related Four Power institutions are dissolved.*

*(2) The United Germany shall have accordingly full sovereignty over its internal and external affairs.*

However, full sovereignty does not come into effect until a constitution has been promulgated in accordance with Article 146 of the Basic Law.

Only then can a border treaty recognized under international law be concluded. Only when there is a constitution recognized under international law can border treaties under international law be concluded. A constitution of Germany under international law must include the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig, otherwise the Versailles Peace Treaty is in effect annulled.

### **The Unification Treaty:**

135 Since a constitution of Germany could not yet be adopted, the two partly sovereign states, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, agree on the Unification Treaty. According to Article 3, the German Democratic Republic accedes to the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany. Two sentences later, Article 4 (2), both jointly withdraw from the Basic Law, declaring that the scope of the Basic Law is abolished. Article 4 (6) confirms that a constitution still has to be adopted under Article 146 of the Basic Law.

136 As a result of the Plaintiff's activities, the Unification Treaty was amended in July 2021, confirming that the two partially sovereign states of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic still formally exist and that the Two + Four Treaty has yet to be realized.

Proof: Plaintiff's lawsuit in Washington DC; Proof: Information to the German Federal Government as to who is in charge

Proof: Treaty of 31 August 1990 between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic on the establishment of German unity (Unification Treaty)

[https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1997/10/13/2c391661-db4e-42e5-84f7-bd86108c0b9c/publishable\\_en.pdf](https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1997/10/13/2c391661-db4e-42e5-84f7-bd86108c0b9c/publishable_en.pdf)

Status: Last adjusted by Section 11 by order of Aug. 15, 2022 | 1401

ARTICLE 4

## AMENDMENTS TO THE BASIC LAW RESULTING FROM ACCESSION

2. Article 23 shall be repealed.

6. Article 146 shall read as follows:

*"Article 146*

*This Basic Law, which is valid for the entire German people following the achievement of the unity and freedom of Germany, shall cease to be in force on the day on which a constitution adopted by a free decision of the German people comes into force."*

([https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/7fa618bb-604e-4980-b667-76bf0cd0dd9b/publishable\\_en.pdf](https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/7fa618bb-604e-4980-b667-76bf0cd0dd9b/publishable_en.pdf)

*old version Article 146:*

*This Basic Law shall become invalid on the day when a constitution adopted in a free decision by the German people comes into force. Bonn, May 23, 1949)*

### **B. Review/ Facts as of the Year 2004**

#### **a. Transformation of the Federal Republic of Germany into a nationalist dictatorship**

137 In Coburg/Bavaria, the Nazis first seized power in 1929.

In 2004, the obviously politically motivated prosecution of the Plaintiff by Coburg authorities began. Obviously, this demonstrative political persecution was ordered and covered by the highest authorities.

#### **aa. Conversion by Repealing the Laws**

138 With the First Act to Adjust the Federal Law of April 19, 2006, the entry into force of essential laws was repealed - see Exhibit 4, Repealed Laws.

The Introductory Act to the Civil Code still states the entry into force. Introductory Act to the Civil Code: Art 1

*(1) The Civil Code shall enter into force on January 1, 1900 ... .*

139 With the Second Act to Adjust the Federal Law of Nov. 27, 2007 in Art. 4 Adjusted Occupation Law, Section 3: *"The rights and obligations of the occupying powers are preserved."* was reminded of this.

The Coburgers did not and do no longer follow the law on which they took their oath, but obviously unlawful directives - see Exhibit 5, Crimes.

#### **bb. No prosecution of criminal offenses, but systematic prosecution of acts that are not criminal offenses (see Marg. No. 100).**

140 With the German state of Bavaria leading the way, the Federal Republic of Germany is not simply a de facto dictatorship, but definitely a nationalist dictatorship.

According to Section 92 of the Criminal Code, anyone who interferes with the independence of the courts is liable to prosecution, as is the exercise of arbitrary power.

In order to fulfill the requirements of the Potsdam Agreement: *"to preserve the democratic state under the rule of law out of its own unremitting efforts,"* constitutional protection agencies were created at the federal and state levels.

Federal Law for the Protection of the Constitution - BverfSchG

*Section 1*

*(1) The protection of the constitution shall serve to protect the free democratic basic order, the existence and security of the Federation and the Länder.*

*Section 4 Definitions*

*(2) The free democratic basic order within the meaning of this Act shall include:*

*(a) the right of the people to exercise state power in elections and votes and through special legislative, executive and judicial bodies, and to elect their representatives by universal, direct, free, equal and secret suffrage,*

*b) the binding of legislation to the constitutional order and the binding of executive power and the administration of justice to law and justice,*

*e) the independence of the courts,*

*f) the exclusion of any rule of force and arbitrariness, and*

(g) human rights as set forth in the Basic Law.

141 Bavarian Law on Police Duties

As a result of a reform of the Law on Police Duties, the police now have the following duties:

*Art. 11 General powers*

*(1) The police may take the necessary measures to avert a danger to public safety or order existing in an individual case, ...*

*(2) A measure in the sense of para. 1 may be taken by the police in particular, ..*

*3. to avert dangers or to eliminate conditions which threaten or injure life, health or the freedom of the person or property, the preservation of which appears to be in the public interest...*

*4 Unconstitutional in the sense of sentence 1 No. 1 is an act aimed at disturbing or changing the constitutional order of the Federal Republic of Germany or one of its Länder in an unconstitutional manner without committing a criminal or administrative offense.*

The police are organized as follows: Division I is responsible for administration. Division II for forensic investigations. Division III is for state protection and counter-terrorism, Division IV for organized crime, Division V for central services, Division VI for investigations and operational special units, and Division VII is the authorized body for cooperation, for example with the fire department.

It is not clear which department is responsible for common crimes such as theft, fraud and assault.

What difference there is supposed to be between the Office for the Protection of the Constitution and the Office for the Protection of the State is not discernible.

**cc. Abolition of the Separation of Powers**

The sober facts are:

142 At least 50% of the deputies are determined by the parties on the basis of the election laws and are not directly elected. This violates Article 38 of the Basic Law and is unconstitutional.

Proof: Party Act - 1. and 2. voices

143 Judges are not independent - violation of Article 97 of the Basic Law and thus unconstitutional.

Proof: Based on a preliminary inquiry of two suspected Romanian bank robbers about Irish courts, the EUCJ found on May 27, 2019, that German prosecutors are not independent and may not issue arrest warrants. 5,000 arrest warrants had to be reissued. Didn't all police officers, prosecutors, judges and lawyers know that? In response, a judge from Thuringia asks whether he is independent. He writes that the powers are not separate but intertwined. He is judged and promoted by politicians. The EU Court of Justice is silent on this and is obviously dominated by the Nazis.

Proof: Silence of the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg to the question of a Thuringian judge, Case No. C-276/20 – 1

144 In Coburg/Bavaria it is so that one and the same person at the same court changes the position from prosecutor to judge and then again to prosecutor. For example, Dr. Koch at the Coburg Regional Court. Prosecutors are appointed as disciplinary superiors of judges. For example, Mr. Lohneis, the Chief Public Prosecutor at the Coburg Regional Court, is appointed President of the Coburg Regional Court and thus becomes the disciplinary superior. Once again, this is a violation of Article 97 of the Basic Law.

Proof: Official website of the Bavarian Ministry of Justice, for example, on Mr. Lohneis

<https://www.justiz.bayern.de/presse-und-medien/pressemitteilungen/archiv/2016/3.php>

or on Mr. Lückemann - first Attorney General at the Bamberg Higher Regional Court and then disciplinary superior of the judges at the Bamberg Higher Regional Court  
<https://www.justiz.bayern.de/presse-und-medien/pressemitteilungen/archiv/2013/108.php>

145 Cases received by the court are not randomly assigned to judges - a violation of Article 101 of the Basic Law and thus unconstitutional.

Proof: According to Article 101 of the Basic Law, incoming cases must be assigned to judges on a random basis. At Coburg District and Regional Court, incoming cases are assigned to judges alphabetically. One always stands before the same judge, even if one has rejected this judge because of bias.

Proof: see roster allocating court business at the Coburg District and Regional Courts.

Proof: The Plaintiff was always convicted by Mr. Bauer, although the latter had been rejected, among other things, for falsifying the minutes.

146 Court minutes are not kept verbatim - violation of Article 103 of the Basic Law and thus unconstitutional.

Proof: Court records are not kept verbatim. It is only recorded that the witness testified. What he testified, whether for or against the defendant is not recorded. This is a denial of the right to be heard, a violation of Article 103 of the Basic Law. But motions must still be recorded in the minutes. But even these are not recorded in the minutes and therefore there is a falsification of the minutes for the purpose of deception in legal relations.

Proof: Mr. Bauer did, for example. Mrs. Public Prosecutor Ursula Haderlein at the Coburg Regional Court and then President of the Coburg Regional Court comments that the criminal offense of protocol falsification does not exist and refuses to prosecute. Of course, she should have prosecuted the criminal offense of falsification of documents.

147 But neither "judgments" nor minutes are served with a signature and do not constitute documents in the sense of the law. This is a violation of Sections 125, 126 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Sections 275, 345 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, Sections 315, 317 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Mrs. Ursula Haderlein was the prosecutor responsible for the criminal prosecution for Danzig identity cards. If one wants a retrial, then the case is transferred to the Bamberg Regional Court. There, Mrs. Ursula Haderlein is now the disciplinary superior of the judges and Dr. Koch is the public prosecutor – see Exhibit 5 – Crimes.

But this is not criticized by the constitutional protection and state protection, but protected.

148 The Bavarian state government is therefore not formed by directly elected deputies and is therefore unconstitutional. The Bavarian police are definitely protecting a government that is not formed by directly elected deputies and is therefore unconstitutional.

The constitutional principles for fair trials are completely disregarded and arbitrary action is taken. The Bavarian police protect judges who are not independent, who are not permitted to be exceptional judges, and their arbitrary decisions.

To eliminate these conditions would be the task of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution and the Office for the Protection of the State.

But according to amendments to the Bavarian Police Duties Law, the latter has to prosecute anti-constitutional acts, even if they are not punishable by law or order.

This provision corresponds to Section 2 of the Nationalist Criminal Code, which the Permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague has declared unlawful. *"If an act is not punishable according to the definitions of the Criminal Code but is punishable according to popular feeling, that act shall be punished as it comes closest to the provisions of the*

*Criminal Code."*

This is in line with Nazi ideology: True is usually the opposite of what is claimed.

Accordingly, every legal act of the Plaintiff invoking the law of the Federal Republic of Germany is prosecuted as a criminal offense and every criminal act against the Plaintiff is labeled as legal. To this end, all exculpatory evidence of the Plaintiff, such as notarized contracts and land register entries, is suppressed.

Harmless offenses, such as alleged trespassing and the alleged threat to demolish his own house, are prosecuted by the State Protection Department. Even such simple offenses obviously constitute a threat to the National Socialist dictatorship if the Plaintiff acts.

Proof: see Exhibit 5; Crimes, some examples

149 But, of course, it is not the sole task of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution and the police to maintain lawful order, but of each individual inhabitant of the federal territory.

*Article 25 Basic Law: „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.”*

150 Before the amendment of Section 15 of the German Reich Nationality Act, the Coburg authorities were still able to plead that they did not know that the Plaintiff is a Danzig national who is also recognized by the Federal Government under international law. But they already knew since May 23, 2008, that the Plaintiff invokes his Danzig nationality, and therefore deprived him of his liberty, while also violating the principle of speciality in extradition proceedings against the Swiss Confederation. This is a legal reason for war.

Proof: extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice; Case B 224'163/TMA

151 Although the Coburgers now have no excuse, the Coburgers continue to apply nationalist law against the Plaintiff, thus violating the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare and in sum committing the crime of genocide/genocide.

Proof: see Exhibit 5; Crimes

152 But the "German" Foreign Minister Mrs. Bearbock criticizes human rights violations of other states and thus deceives foreign countries about the true legal situation in the Federal Republic of Germany.

She thus proves that she is a follower of the Nazi ideology: true is always the opposite of what is claimed. She announces to change the previous foreign policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. Ms. Bearbock belongs to the "Green" Party. In the federal states of the German Democratic Republic, only 4-8% vote for the "Greens". There, people are still aware of the manipulation by the media. First everything was red and from one day to the next everything was black.

#### **b. Examination of the nationals of the German Reich for compliance with the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany**

153 The examination whether the nationals of the German Reich maintain the democratic state under the rule of law from their own unremitting efforts is the task of the Danzigers.

The 4 powers do not withdraw in blind confidence that the "Germans" will or will not comply with the conditions of the Two-plus-Four Treaty at some point.

The Danzigers are responsible for checking whether the "Germans" comply with German/Danzig law.

154 The "Germans" are sovereign only when the conditions of the Two-plus-Four Treaty are realized.

The "Germans" were already deprived of their official power of representation in the preliminary negotiations for the Two-plus-Four Treaty, in which Article 23 Scope of the Basic Law was omitted.

Proof: omission of Article 23 Basic Law on July 17, 1990

155 Section 1 of the Federal Constitution Protection Act: *...of the existence and security of the Federation and the Länder....*

With the abolition of the scope of the Basic Law, Article 23 there is no defined existence of the Federal Republic of Germany.

### c. Enforcement of the Two-plus-Four Treaty

#### aa. Passport Laws

156 In 1990, then Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher notified the United Nations that "Germany" replaced the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. The Federal Republic of Germany no longer exists in the official list of countries.

#### Passport Act

157 *Section 1 Passport requirement*

*(1) Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany ... are required to carry a valid passport....*

*(4) Passports may be issued only to Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law; the passport is the property of the Federal Republic of Germany.*

*Section 6 (2) first sentence: In their applications, applicants **shall provide all information needed** to confirm the applicant's identity and **status as a German***

With the insertion of Section 40 a into the Nationality Act of the German Reich, the inhabitants of the Federal Territory are no longer "Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (1)". After the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig informed that without his explicit consent Section 40 a is null and void, this Section 40 a was deleted without a sound. Thus, the old legal status has not been restored. For the sake of clarity, therefore, Section 15 was overwritten. According to this, the nationals of the German Reich are "Germans within the meaning of Article 116 (2) of the Basic Law".

To prove that they want to be "Germans within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law," they must reject a government that is not formed by directly elected deputies.

They must reject judges who are not independent. They must reject judges who are not assigned to incoming cases in accordance with Article 101.

They must insist on verbatim records of court hearings.

They must insist that judgments and court records be served with the original signatures of the judges. They must insist that extracts from the land register are handed over in accordance with the 4-eyes principle, i.e. signed by 2 clerks.

158 With a few exceptions, such as Mrs. Karin Leffer, no national of the German Reich can provide evidence or cite facts proving that they do not recognize nationalist law.

Almost all residents of the German Reich are instigators and accomplices in an identity card forgery for deception in legal relations and the issuer of the identity cards are perpetrators.

159 This also applies to the ambassadors of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Proof: When applying for the issuance of an identity card, no one submits proof that he or she is a "German in the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law" or a declaration of intent that he or she is not a national of the nationalist German Reich and that he or she proves this declaration of

intent by action.

**bb. In force of certain provisions of the Transitional Treaty**

160 "The Exchange of Notes of September 27/28, 1990."

The Allies confirm in an exchange of notes that, following the conclusion of negotiations on the Two-plus-Four Treaty, provisions of the 1954 Transitional Treaty still remain in force. These provisions remain superior to all international treaties of the Federal Republic of Germany and are law of the United States of America - see basis of complaint.

*"The Federal Republic shall in the future raise no objections against the measures,.... as a result of the state of war, or on the basis of agreements concluded, or to be concluded, by the Three Powers with other Allied countries, neutral countries or former allies of Germany."*

161 *"on the basis of agreements concluded by the Three Powers."*

France and Great Britain, in particular, are bound by the Versailles Peace Treaty and thus obligated to protect the Danzig, but also the United States of America through the peace treaty with the German Reich.

162 In the London Debt Agreement, a final settlement of reparations issues is agreed upon. The Two-plus-Four Treaty is a treaty by which the Danzigers can enforce their rights. Finally, in the exchange of notes of Sept. 27/28, 1990, it was again confirmed that reparations are still to be paid.

Proof: Versailles Peace Treaty; Proof: Two-plus-Four Treaty; Proof: Transitional Treaty

163 *" as a result of the state of war."*

The "Germans" are still at war with the Danzigers.

An act of war does not have to be carried out by military means, especially if the opponent is obliged on the basis of international law not to defend himself militarily.

An act of war in the sense of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare exists if, after the end of active hostilities, the ordre public to be protected is not observed.

Persistent violations by the actual ruler count as genocide.

Proof: The provisions of the Hague IV. Convention apply until a peace settlement to which the Danzigers have agreed.

Proof: The World War has not ended until the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig has been clarified and Danzigers have been compensated.

164 The Danzigers are responsible for determining that German/Danzig law is not being observed and whether acts of war within the meaning of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare are being committed again.

Proof: The Danzig nationals are obligated to uphold their ordre public on the basis of the Versailles Peace Treaty and the Danzig Constitution

165 The Free City of Danzig is responsible for restoring the rule of law and recognizing today's European borders as binding under international law.

Proof: The Free City of Danzig is a state under the rule of law in which the rights of the individual outweigh the interests of the majority

Proof: Borders cannot be confirmed in Europe without the consent of the people of Danzig

166 With the Constitution of Germany, the nationals of the Free City of Danzig, recognized under international law, have fulfilled their obligations under international law.

167 The Constitution of Germany must be enforced by the Executive of the Free City of Danzig. Until the Constitution of Germany has been fully implemented, enforcement is primarily the responsibility of the founding states of the United Nations.

### **C. Facts concerning Swiss Federation**

168 Because the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig is obviously politically persecuted, he traveled to Switzerland in 2009.

169 The Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office, represented by Mr. Lohneis, Chief Public Prosecutor, filed an extradition request for the execution of 3 arrest warrants and for bringing the Plaintiff to trial. The responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig identified himself with his Danzig identity card. The responsible representative refused extradition for execution of three arrest warrants on the grounds of apparent innocence. In the warrant for alleged illegal possession of weapons, the innocence is already stated in the warrant itself. The Swiss Federal Office refused the extradition for execution and only authorized the extradition for presentation for trial, so that the international arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court would be cancelled. Nevertheless, the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig refused the extradition on the grounds that the "Germans" will not comply with the conditions and terms of the extradition. The Swiss Federal Court ruled that the Federal Republic of Germany is a reliable contracting state and approved the extradition. On December 21, 2012, the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig was extradited.

170 Of course, the Nazis did not comply with the terms and conditions of extradition. Unauthorized law enforcement measures were carried out in relation to Danzig. The extradited person was affected by an unauthorized mail and visitation ban and was psychiatrically examined twice, he was supposed to disappear in a closed psychiatric ward. The responsible representative informed the extraditing Canton of Aargau Prosecutor's Office, the Swiss Federal Office and filed a claim for damages at the High Court in Bern. Only the Bern High Court wrongly informed that it had no jurisdiction. Finally, the illegal detention could no longer be maintained and the responsible representative was released from detention on Oct. 18, 2013.

171 In order to cure the violations of the Extradition Convention, Mr. Lohneis submitted a request for extended extradition. The Swiss Federal Office subsequently refused the entire extradition on the grounds that extradition was not requested for criminal acts, but for political reasons. Prof. Dr. Breitenmoser of the University of Basel needed only 10 minutes of file inspection to determine that the criminal offense of deprivation of liberty had been committed.

172 Compensation must be made ex officio. The Swiss legal commentary states that Switzerland would have to sue in The Hague. The responsible representative sued for compensation in Switzerland, without judicial result.

The sovereignty of Switzerland is violated. It does nothing about it. Although Switzerland subsequently refused to extradite him, the Bavarians nevertheless continued the prosecution in the Danzig case, which could only have come about through the violation of the general rules of international law. No compensation has been paid to date. Thus the Swiss Confederation follows Bavarian judges. Not only as here in the concrete case, but generally after the Lugano Convention on the recognition also of Bavarian judgments without examination.

173 The Swiss Confederation would have to complain to the Council of Europe about Germany and either demand its exclusion from the FRG or withdraw itself. Switzerland would have to complain to the United Nations about the violation of the International Covenant on Civil Rights and, if necessary, file a state suit and ultimately a complaint with this court.

But Switzerland does not do that, it does not defend its sovereignty. The question is whether Switzerland is still sovereign.



174 After the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig/Plaintiff no longer had to expect to be arrested and extradited, he took up a commercial activity. A Dutch woman, Dr. Hospers asked him to represent her. Dr. Hospers is a scientist who can almost be called brilliant. Her doctoral thesis is still cited after 20 years. 360 times so far. At Altana, research on a drug should be stopped. Dr. Hospers remonstrated on the grounds that the statistics had been misinterpreted. Since then, work has had to be carried out according to Dr. Hospers' method. Research has been resumed. Today, this drug is a best-seller.

175 After only the first half hour of conversation, the Plaintiff determined that there was a stress-related loss of performance. As a senior forestry inspector, the Plaintiff has performed piecework and knows that when working at peak performance under stress, a 15-minute break must be taken within an hour, otherwise there is a risk of a long-lasting loss of performance. Football players are a well-known example. After 45 minutes of play, there is a 15-minute break. Initially, the Plaintiff was only to take on organizational tasks. Dr. Hospers was dismissed by the dependent subsidiary, Koninklijken DSM N.V., DSM Nutritional Products AG, despite her illness. No lawyer could be found to fully represent the Dutch woman. Therefore, the Plaintiff took over this task. From the files of the Dutchwoman, the Plaintiff found out that she initially started with 100% performance. But then 1.55 of the normal performance was demanded at the same wage. In addition, Dutch completed an additional degree. The load was at times 200% of the normal performance. The Dutchwoman managed this effortlessly without neglecting her social contacts. But then she was asked to work on 3 top 50 projects. The CEO, Mr. Feike Sijbesma explained that the future of Koninklijken DSM N. V depends on these Top 50 projects. The Dutch woman realized that a project could not be realized and remonstrated against it. But the entire middle management insisted that this project must be worked on with priority. In the department with 40 scientists, there is no one who could take a project off Dr. Hospers' hands. Results must also be delivered for the other two projects.

According to her employment contract, Dr. Hospers is entitled to full pay until retirement if she becomes ill. In contrast, she can be dismissed if the required performance is not provided.

The Plaintiff understood from the files/emails that Dr. Hospers worked until 10 p.m. during the week and on weekends and even on vacation. Inevitably and predictably, she suffered a drop in performance. The project, against which she had remonstrated, was discontinued for exactly the reasons Dr. Hospers had given.

176 Dr. Hospers was sent by the DSM Group to the psychiatrist Dr. Hodzic. Without any justification/examination, he determined that Dr. Hospers was able to perform at 80%. The family doctor, however, according to clear findings, only 40%. Dr. Hodzic wanted Dr. Hospers to take psychotropic drugs under supervision. This is pure poison in the event of a stress-induced drop in performance.

The DSM Group informed the Invalidity Office by submitting a memo that Dr. Hospers had agreed to a reduction in working hours to 80%. But Dr. Hospers did not sign this memo.

Dr. Hospers was coerced into agreeing to a 20% wage reduction through constant meetings. In addition, she was presented with inapplicable law, according to which she could be immediately terminated and thus lose her residence permit. Finally, Dr. Hospers was paid only 80% of her salary and her working hours were reduced to 80%. But she does not have this 80% working capacity. She could not recover. She has trouble to be present this 80% spread over the whole week.

After one year, the Invalidity Office claimed that it had sent a notice to Dr. Hospers that the case was closed because she no longer had any work absences.

But Dr. Hospers had informed the Invalidity Office not only by mail but also by email that she was still far from her former capacity.

The letter is not in the files, but the email with attachments is. The Plaintiff took over the representation and thus the correspondence and can confirm that the Invalidity Office did not send a notice announcing that the proceedings would be discontinued.

The Plaintiff sued the Invalidity Office and was granted justice. The proceedings were

continued. A polydisciplinary expert opinion established that Dr. Hospers' permanent loss of performance was clearly caused by the DSM Group.

177 Dr. Hospers did not receive any financial support from any side for more than 2 years, despite all possible assurances.

178 The Plaintiff took from the files that Dr. Hospers, a Dutch national, signed the contract with the DSM Group in Germany. In addition, the envelope with which the contract was sent to Germany, the cover letter to the contract with address in Germany and the confirmation of residence in Germany are available.

According to Article 2 of the Swiss Code of Civil Procedure, this is not applicable to international legal relationships, but arbitration proceedings are to be conducted in accordance with Chapter 12 of the Swiss Private International Law Act (IPRG).

Arbitration proceeding was conducted.

179 Against the Arbitral Award of Oct. 14, 2015, the DSM Group filed an appeal of 77 pages and 226 marginal figures with the Swiss Federal Supreme Court. This complaint should already not have been accepted for formal reasons. The main subject of the complaint is the political prosecution of the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig, the Plaintiff. The total of 6 claims from the Arbitral Award were only casually mentioned in one margin. It became apparent that the court proceedings would be unfair, so the representative/Plaintiff bought the claims.

As expected, the judgment was obviously wrong.

The Federal Court claimed Dr. Hospers had signed the contract in Switzerland, therefore arbitration should have been conducted according to the provisions of the ZPO.

180 The representative filed two motions of bias. As a result, the front door of the representative of the Free City of Danzig was broken down by the Aargau Cantonal Police on April 15, 2016 and the representative was extradited to Germany in handcuffs.

The refusal of extradition was presented a total of 52 times to all possible offices, the police, politicians and courts.

Everyone, including every policeman, knew very well that this would constitute the criminal offense of deprivation of liberty, because extradition had been expressly refused. The arrest warrant against the representative of the Free City of Danzig, which was only issued due to the violation of the principle of speciality (extradition is only granted for the specifically authorized case), expressly read: "Mr. von Prince is the representative of the Free City of Danzig." The representative was thus in Switzerland at the instigation of Switzerland and thus had the status of a diplomat.

It was obvious that the representative was arrested and extradited so that he could not enforce the Arbitral Award of Oct. 14, 2015.

181 After the extradition to Germany on 15. April 2016, the Plaintiff was explicitly held in detention only because of his nationality of the Free City of Danzig.

The Freiburg Prison Enforcement Chamber in Sept. 2016: *"Mr. von Prince remains in captivity. He is convinced that he is a national of the Free City of Danzig and considers Danzig identity cards to be legitimate."*, Case No. 12 StVK 381/16

182 The Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office had no evidence of any action on the part of the plaintiff. Nevertheless, he was held in captivity. The Plaintiff's health was already severely compromised. The ability to concentrate was only 1 -2 hours a day. Therefore, the duty attorney made a proposal that the Plaintiff be released on the day of the trial. To do this, he had to withdraw his motions of bias and confess. What the Plaintiff should confess was not known to the Plaintiff. The trial was held on April 7. The judge confirmed the agreement, as did the prosecutor. However, the prosecutor returned after a short break and said that his boss did not agree with the agreement. Afterwards, the Plaintiff learned that there had been

an agreement between the Coburg Prosecutor's Office and a Swiss judge that the Plaintiff should not be released. It was negotiated, but the Public Prosecutor's Office was unable to produce any evidence.

183 Only by lucky circumstances with severe health damages the representative survived and was released on April 13, 2017. Nevertheless, the arrest warrant was not revoked because of the Danzig nationality and the representative had to return to Switzerland. There he was now prosecuted for alleged illegal residence. For a European, the criminal offense of illegal residence does not exist in Switzerland, just as it does not exist for a Danzig national. The Agreement on the Visa Freedom between Switzerland and Danzig is still Swiss law. The Plaintiff has the same status as a Swiss citizen with regard to residence in Switzerland. Naturally, the motion to bias was filed. Nevertheless, the judge heard the case on Oct. 23, 2017, which was too much for the ailing health. In the night of Oct.27,2017 the representative had to visit the emergency room because of stomach bleeding. At the hospital they discovered 4 large stomach ulcers and a 12 finger intestinal ulcer.

184 While these proceedings for alleged illegal residence were still ongoing, the representative was arrested for illegal residence on the basis of a second proceeding of which the representative was not informed. At the same time, an asylum procedure was still ongoing. Only because of the immediate payment of 2`600.-CHF the Plaintiff was released.

185 The Plaintiff specially commissioned a lawyer to check whether the Plaintiff was wanted again with an arrest warrant, without being informed that an alleged procedure on this had taken place. Upon reminder, the attorney received information that the Plaintiff was again wanted on a warrant.

186 That the Plaintiff was only arrested, extradited and subsequently prosecuted, for acts that are not punishable, in order not to be able to enforce the arbitral award, has been proven.

This obviousness was proven by the fact that a mandatory attorney was imposed on the Dutch woman, announcing that she would be incapacitated if she refused. A lawsuit is to be filed against the DSM Group. The DSM Group wanted a lawsuit in a state court so that the arbitral award would be destroyed. But the Dutch woman was no longer a party. The Plaintiff had represented Dutch in the Federal Court. So they knew that the Plaintiff had been extradited and was being held in captivity and could not represent Dr. Hospers.

187 The two motions for partiality against the federal judge had been accepted as substantiated appeals and the court costs had been paid for them. But no decision was made on these appeals. Although Dr. Hospers was no longer a party, the court fees of the Federal Court in the amount of 10`000.-CHF, were withdrawn from her account under protest, in breach of bank secrecy.

188 The imposed duty attorney submitted the 77-page complaint of the DSM Group to the Rheinfelden District Court as an argument for Dr. Hospers. Thereupon, the duty lawyer was threatened with professional consequences by the lawyer of the DSM Group, Mr. Nordmann.

189 In absentia, Dr. Hospers was ordered to pay 18`000-CHF in court costs of the Rheinfelden District Court and 14`000.-CHF to the DSM Group. Although Dr. Hospers would have to receive half a year's loss of earnings according to Swiss law alone, she was not awarded a cent. At the same time, the polydisciplinary expert opinion confirmed that Dr. Hospers is an invalid because of the DSM Group. Because of the Plaintiff's extradition, Dr. Hospers had suffered a shock and within a few weeks lost 10 kilos in weight and turned gray. Since then she has been a helpless person.

190 Dr. Hospers filed an objection against the court costs of the Rheinfelden District Court, and the Swiss postal service confirmed that the court's registered reply letter had been

lost. Nevertheless, the court costs were extorted from her under threat of criminal prosecution and police summons.

191 The Netherlands would have to sue Switzerland in this court for violating Article 387-427 of the Versailles Peace Treaty.

If Dr. Hospers had not sold the claims against the DSM Group to the Plaintiff, then the Netherlands would have to sue for violation of the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards before this Court.

#### **Conclusion on Switzerland.**

192 Switzerland has taken sides with Koninklijke DSM N.V. and has thus itself entered into the obligations under the DSM Group's Code of Business Conduct, violating it to the fullest extent possible and incurring liability.

193 Switzerland is in breach of the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards.

194 Switzerland follows the instructions of the strategic partner of the World Economic Forum.

195 Switzerland has given up its sovereignty. It follows unchecked judgments of the de facto Bavarian nationalist dictatorship.

196 Switzerland has violated both the Visa Agreement with Danzig and the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons between the EU and Switzerland.

197 Switzerland violated the Neutrality Treaty by handing over a person at war to the enemy power. To make matters worse, it has extradited a Danzig national to whom Switzerland also owes protection from foreign countries. And this although a Danzig national is forbidden to defend himself militarily, i.e. he cannot be an active participant in the war and the use of force by a foreign state always constitutes a war crime. In addition, Switzerland took sides at the expense of the Danzigers entitled to reparations in favor of the German Reich's reparation debtors.

198 Switzerland has violated the general rules of international law by extraditing to another state a person who was there at the instigation of Switzerland. To this must be added the aggravating fact that this violation by Switzerland resulted in deprivation of liberty under Swiss law.

199 Switzerland concluded a treaty with the World Economic Forum. Treaties of a state are always state treaties. Has Switzerland now recognized the World Economic Forum as a state or is Switzerland no longer a state in the sense of international law?

Swiss authorities, the courts and the government do not follow Swiss law or international law, but follow the directives of the WEF.

Definitely, the strategic partners of the WEF dominate Switzerland. Obviously, Switzerland has subjected itself to the WEF with the contract with the WEF, even if this is not explicitly stated in the contract.

#### **D. Facts concerning the Kingdom of Belgium**

200 The Plaintiff was apparently wrongfully prosecuted by Switzerland. Arrest warrants were issued against him without informing the Plaintiff that there were any proceedings at all in this regard. Legal recourse against this should be excluded. Apparently, arrest warrants were issued in order to extradite the Plaintiff to Germany without proceedings, as had already happened.

201 The European Court of Justice had ruled on May 27, 2019 that German public

prosecutors may not issue arrest warrants because they are not independent. Bavarian judges are not independent either. An arrest warrant from the Coburg/Bavaria Regional Court may not be executed under EU law. see Marg.No.143.

202 Therefore, the Plaintiff decided to travel to Belgium, even at the risk of being arrested. But it was better to be extradited with Belgian proceedings and to be under Belgian sovereignty than to be extradited from Switzerland without proceedings and thus to be subject to the pure arbitrariness of the Bavarians. In addition, the Plaintiff wanted from Belgium, the legal recourse to the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg (EUGH) to exhaust. The Plaintiff traveled to the German-speaking part of the Kingdom of Belgium. This part of Belgium was ceded to Belgium by the German Empire in the Versailles Peace Treaty. One should therefore be familiar with the Versailles Peace Treaty.

203 The Plaintiff was arrested immediately after his arrival because of the EU arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court.

[https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:3b151647-772d-48b0-ad8c-0e4c78804c2e.0004.02/DOC\\_1&format=PDF](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:3b151647-772d-48b0-ad8c-0e4c78804c2e.0004.02/DOC_1&format=PDF)

Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on the European Arrest Warrant and the Surrender Procedures between Member States.

*(5) The objective set for the Union to become an area of freedom, security and justice....*

*(12) This Framework Decision respects fundamental rights and observes the principles recognised by Article 6 of the Treaty on European Union and reflected in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (1 ), in particular Chapter VI thereof. Nothing in*

*this Framework Decision may be interpreted as prohibiting refusal to surrender a person for whom a European arrest warrant has been issued when there are reasons to believe, on the basis of objective elements, that the said arrest warrant has been issued for the purpose of prosecuting or punishing a person on the grounds of his or her sex, race, religion, ethnic origin, nationality, language, political opinions or sexual orientation, or that that person's position may be prejudiced for any of these reasons.*

*(13) No person should be removed, expelled or extradited to a State where there is a serious risk that he or she would be subjected to the death penalty, torture or other inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.*

204 The Plaintiff was prepared for this and had all the proofs of innocence with him. For example, the official confirmation of the Government of Lower Franconia that he is a Danzig national, as well as the official confirmation of the United Nations and the Nationality Act of the Free City of Danzig.

Furthermore, the complaint to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg for violations of Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights, with 168 pages of official documents as evidence.

205 *Article 1*

*Definition of the European arrest warrant and obligation to execute it*

*1. The European arrest warrant is a judicial decision issued by a Member State*

A judicial decision in the sense of EU law must come from a judge who is independent. This was, after all, the decision of the EU Court of Justice that arrest warrants may not be executed by German public prosecutors because they are bound by instructions. Similarly, the ECJ has criticized the Polish judicial reform because the judges of the Disciplinary Chamber for Judges are appointed by politicians.

The Plaintiff has submitted that there are judges acting at the Coburg Regional Court who are not independent. Judges are appointed and promoted and transferred by politicians.

Prosecutors of the courts are appointed as judges at the same court and then again as prosecutors. Prosecutors of the court are appointed as disciplinary superiors of judges. Just demonstrative at the Coburg Regional Court.

The arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court should have been disregarded for this reason alone.

*2. Member States shall execute any European arrest warrant on the basis of the principle of mutual recognition and in accordance with the provisions of this Framework Decision.*

*3. This Framework Decision shall not have the effect of modifying the obligation to respect fundamental rights and fundamental legal principles as enshrined in Article 6 of the Treaty on European Union.*

The judges at the Coburg Regional Court are non-permitted exempt judges. Court records are not kept verbatim, judgments are not signed and, what is more, they are stamped with "Regional Court " of Bavaria. Such a regional court Bavaria does not exist. The Plaintiff had presented an example.

It is violated all procedural guarantees under Article 6 of the Treaty on European Union, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. Since the procedural guarantees according to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU are not given at the Coburg Regional Court, Belgium should also therefore not have made an arrest and should have refused the extradition.

206 Article 2

Scope of the European arrest warrant

*1. A European arrest warrant may be issued for acts punishable by the law of the issuing Member State by a custodial sentence or a detention order for a maximum period of at least 12 months or, where a sentence has been passed or a detention order has been made, for sentences of at least four months.*

Extradition was requested for Danzig identity cards. The penalty for this is a fine up to 3 years in prison. However, extradition is only allowed if the minimum sentence is 12 months:

The arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court stated that the Plaintiff was wanted for Danzig identity cards, but with the false accusation: "forgery of documents". The forgery of an identity card is not forgery of documents, not a forged statement of intent.

But even if a Danzig identity card had been a forgery, then the correct accusation would be: "forgery of identity cards". The information on the ID cards was correct and did not certify anyone's false identity.

The EU arrest warrant lists the criminal acts for which extradition is allowed. Identity forgery is not one of them. Only similar cases such as illegal entry or falsification of an official document. But with a Danzig identity card, no one could enter a country illegally. The accusation that a Danzig identity card was a forgery of an official document would have presupposed that a Danzig identity card was recognized as an official document. But since a Danzig identity card was not forged, certainly not by the Plaintiff, it could not be extradited under that provision either.

*4. For offences other than those covered by paragraph 2, surrender may be subject to the condition that the acts for which the European arrest warrant has been issued constitute an offence under the law of the executing Member State, whatever the constituent elements or however it is described.*

207 Extradition could have been refused without violating the Framework Decision.

Article 4

Grounds for optional non-execution of the European arrest warrant

*The executing judicial authority may refuse to execute the European arrest*

warrant:

3. where the judicial authorities of the executing Member State have decided either not to prosecute for the offence on which the European arrest warrant is based or to halt proceedings, or where a final judgment has been passed upon the requested person in a Member State, in respect of the same acts, which prevents further proceedings;

5. if the executing judicial authority is informed that the requested person has been finally judged by a third State in respect of the same acts provided that, where there has been sentence, the sentence has been served or is currently being served or may no longer be executed under the law of the sentencing country;

The Plaintiff has demonstrated that the EU arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court is based on a violation of the principle of speciality vis-à-vis Switzerland. In other words, the Coburg authorities have already violated the requirements and conditions of extradition and the competent Swiss authorities have issued an unappealable 1st class acquittal in the matter of Danzig IDs.- Case No. EK.2013.5653/RI.

208        *Article 30*  
*Expenses*

1. *Expenses incurred in the territory of the executing Member State for the execution of a European arrest warrant shall be borne by that Member State.*

2. *All other expenses shall be borne by the issuing Member State*

The costs include the compensation in the event of an acquittal.

If only because the arrest warrant could only have come about by violating the principle of speciality, an acquittal should have been granted.

But the Plaintiff had to confess that he is a responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig and that a Danzig identity card resembles an official document.

Because of the confession, the Plaintiff was sentenced to 8 months imprisonment, suspended, for forgery of documents.

209        However, the judgment states that it is subject to appeal. On the very first of 56 pages, there are grounds for appeal. But the Plaintiff only wanted to know from the German Federal Supreme Court: "If the Federal Supreme Court is an organ of the Federal Republic of Germany, then an acquittal must be made. Or is the Federal Supreme Court an organ of the German Reich. Then the Plaintiff is guilty."

The Federal Supreme Court answered unequivocally. There are 14 formal errors on only one page of text. A copy was sent. Any judicial signature is missing. It is certified that there is no judge's signature on the original. The letter was certified with an open 8. But the case law has now been so consolidated that a signature that does not show at least one letter where it should be is called a paraphene, and a paraphene has no legal effect whatsoever. The judges of the Federal Supreme Court have thus decided that it is everyone's business whether he sees himself as a national of the nationalist German Reich or as a federal citizen.

210        Now that the Plaintiff has achieved the legal changes in the Nationality Act and the Unification Treaty, the Plaintiff expected that one would also return to rule-of-law conditions in Coburg and wanted the rent from his tenant or gave him notice of termination.

But in Coburg, people still act according to nationalist law. Notarial contracts, official and judicial documents are embezzled and exculpatory witnesses are not heard. Every legal act of the Plaintiff is declared a crime and every criminal act against the Plaintiff is legalized. In the specific case currently before us, the Plaintiff is convicted of trespass and menacing because the tenant refuses to acknowledge written notice of termination and the bailiff fails to serve it. The tenant claims to be the owner of the Plaintiff's real estate. The expert value is 1'000'000,-€.

The entire state power protects thieves, fraudsters and fences. Thus, these crimes become not only gang-related robbery, but war crimes.

211 The Kingdom of Belgium thus extradited, although even in the case of an acquittal, no compensation can be obtained from the requested state.  
The Kingdom of Belgium therefore goes into full liability.  
It was not a private person who was extradited because of a personal act, but the representative of the Free City of Danzig because of this function and the act resulting from it.

212 The Plaintiff had to confess, because already in the hearing on this case on April 07, 2017 the Public Prosecutor's Office could not provide any evidence of an act of the Plaintiff. Secondly, because the Plaintiff was in Switzerland at the time of the acts and the competent Swiss Public Prosecutor's Office issued a 1st class acquittal in the case.  
Third, because the entire proceedings had come about through a violation of the principle of speciality and were thus purely Swiss proceedings in which the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office and the Coburg Regional Court had no jurisdiction.

213 If the Plaintiff had not confessed, however, his personally inherited claims for damages would also have been forfeited. The Plaintiff's father submitted his expert-confirmed claims to the United Nations in New York in the amount of Shs 10`113`331.50. That corresponds to a today's value of approx. 60 -70`000`000,-€.  
In addition, of course, there is the share in the state property and share in the territory of the Free City of Danzig.

214 As already explained, the claims of the Free City of Danzig and its nationals were deferred until the conclusion of a peace settlement.  
By extraditing them, the Kingdom of Belgium jeopardized the reparation claims of the Free City of Danzig.  
The claims for damages are correspondingly high.

215 The German-speaking population in Belgium has to negotiate before the highest court in French and is disadvantaged in this respect.

A referendum of this German minority is demanded to decide whether they want to remain in the Kingdom of Belgium or join Germany. If the population decides to join Germany, claims of the Plaintiff and the Free City of Danzig will be dropped. If the population decides to remain in Belgium, the amount of the claims will depend on the extent to which the prosecuting authorities of Belgium participate in the clarification of who gave the order to prosecute the Plaintiff unlawfully.

## **E. Summary**

216 The Nazi principle of taking over a foreign state without military means by deception in legal relations did not work in the case of the Free City of Danzig. Therefore, World War II began with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig. The Danzig people should be completely annihilated. This did not succeed.

217 The Potsdam Agreement is not a treaty under international law, but what the Commanders-in-Chief agreed upon and is valid until the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig is finally realized. According to the Potsdam Agreement, the nationals of the German Reich who have lost all rights are given the chance to reassert German law. Therefore, German/Danzig law was re-established under the supervision of the Allied Forces. But then the nationals of the German Reich must obtain this right from their own unremitting efforts. If they do not fulfill this task, they will be annihilated and enslaved. Destroyed and enslaved means, the nationals of the German Reich must either take another nationality or they remain lawless. As long as the Allied forces were present, the nationals of the German Reich could not provide this proof. Who then monitors whether the nationals of the German Reich preserve German/Danzig law? Of course, the tiny minority of Danzigers against a huge majority of nationals of the German Reich.



218 The provisions from the Potsdam Agreement were recorded in the Transitional Treaty regarding reparations. An exchange of notes of 28/29 Sept. 1990 confirms that these provisions remain valid after the conclusion of the Two-plus-Four Treaty. It states: "*Lawsuits against expropriations without compensation on the basis of treaties or the state of war are not permitted*, see Marg.No. 112. The Allied forces are obliged to protect the Danzigers on the basis of the Versailles Peace Treaty. The Danzigers had the greatest losses in %, but have not yet received reparations. Therefore, expropriations without compensation can be carried out for the Danzigers. Towards whom was the war not ended and can be continued without military means? These are the Danzigers.

The enslavement and extermination of the Danzigers, which began with the invasion of the Free City of Danzig, was interrupted in 1945 and continued in 2004 by Coburg authorities and courts.

219 By the official documents of the United Nations, other official documents, court decisions and amendments to the law, the Plaintiff is recognized as a national of the Free City of Danzig. Nevertheless, the Plaintiff is deprived of his property, which he has built up from nothing, including his freedom, by the entire authority of the State. This is a violation of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare and, in sum, the criminal offense of genocide/genocide.

220 The fact that the two sober and easily verifiable facts,

a) the Two-plus-Four Treaty has not been realized and

b) Bavaria is a National Socialist dictatorship, is concealed, allows only the conclusion that the World Economic Forum is behind it. The WEF was founded and is headed by the "German" Klaus Schwab. The WEF includes numerous multinational companies as strategic partners. They all have branches in Germany with legal departments. All these legal departments would have to criticize German legal relations. Klaus Schwab publicly boasts that all governments have been infiltrated and considers this legal.

221 Koninklijke DSM N.V. is also a member of the WEF. The CEO of Koninklijke DSM N.V. is Mr. Feike Sijbesma. Mr. Feike Sijbesma is a Supervisory Board member of WEF and at the World Bank. The Plaintiff has proven that Mr. Feike Sijbesma is responsible for criminal acts, such as deprivation of liberty, grievous bodily harm, predatory extortion, forgery of documents, etc. The Plaintiff can prove that lawyers and even judges are threatened by Koninklijken DSM N.V. in Switzerland.

222 With the promulgation of the Constitution of Germany, the nationals of the German Reich can escape permanent enslavement by taking the nationality of Germany.

Those who have proven themselves to be dyed-in-the-wool Nazis are not granted nationality of Germany and remain nationals of the nationalist German Reich or emigrate with nothing in their pockets.

223 The Danzigers have fulfilled their obligations under international law. Now the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement, confirmed by the preserved provisions of the Transitional Agreement, must be enforced.

224 The Constitution must be enforced above all by the United States of America, but also by Great Britain. The ordre public of Germany corresponds to the ordre public of America and Great Britain and thus has the same value system. The League of Nations and its legal successor, the United Nations, came into being largely through the influence of America and Great Britain. Great Britain sent the Plaintiff's father to the German Reich as a Danzig national, and the Bank of London held the Danzig gold reserves. Both the FED and the Bank of London store gold reserves of the Federal Republic of Germany. Both the United States of America and Great Britain still have forces stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is probably logical that the USA and Great Britain will join the International Protective Force, the

supreme executive of Germany.

In order to enforce the Constitution of Germany, the provisions of the Transitional Treaty concerning reparations are to be applied. That is why these provisions were expressly reaffirmed after the conclusion of the Two-plus-Four Treaty.

## **F. Statement of Claims**

### **The provisions of the Transitional Treaty shall be enforced.**

225 The Plaintiff has proven that he is entitled to write and promulgate the Constitution of Germany. This has been done.

226 For the realization of the Two-plus-Four Treaty, compliance with the provisions of the Transitional Treaty, confirmed by the Exchange of Notes of 28/29 Sept. 1990, is demanded. This is the expropriation without compensation of the nationals of the German Reich. Lawsuits against it are not allowed. With the realization of the Two-plus-Four Treaty Germany becomes a legal and reliable treaty state. The present borders of Europe are recognized as unchangeable under international law. Europe of law, freedom and security, NATO as an alliance of values, will be restored.

This is not the decision of the Plaintiff. That is the observance of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, confirmed by the 3 powers.

227 Plaintiff demands the expropriation without compensation of anyone who has an identity card of the Federal Republic of Germany without being able to present official confirmation that he is a German within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law". Likewise of companies that are registered in the Federal Republic of Germany and have branches in other states. Without the official confirmation of being "German within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law", there is a suspicion of identity card forgery for the purpose of deception in legal relations. Finally, only "Germans within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law" may benefit from the double taxation agreements.

If the persons concerned apply for German nationality, then they can demand compensation or reimbursement.

228 The embassies of the Federal Republic of Germany belong to Germany and not to the Federal Republic of Germany.

As a warning to the nationals of the German Reich and their companies, the ambassadors of the Federal Republic of Germany should be expelled. Unless they can produce official proof that they are "Germans within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law" or have applied for German nationality. Finally, they issue passports to "Germans" living abroad and are perpetrators of identity card forgery if they issue these passports without requiring proof that the applicant is "German within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law."

And the ambassadors of the Federal Republic of Germany are not civil servants if they cannot provide official proof that they are "Germans within the meaning of Article 116(1) of the Basic Law."

#### IV. CLAIMS

THEREFORE, Plaintiff, the representative of the Free City of Danzig BOWULF (ADALBERT) VON PRINCE requests the following relief:

A. That is be ordered:

That the confirmation of the borders between the Republic of Poland and Germany by means of a border treaty under international law is conditional upon the full settlement of the reparation claims and compensation payments of the Free City of Danzig and its nationals.

That a final settlement of the borders in Europe is also dependent on a peace treaty between Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

For this purpose Ukraine and the Russian Federation shall observe a ceasefire. Those who demonstrably violate this ceasefire must pay penalties.

The peace treaty between Ukraine and the Russian Federation is to contain that everyone who has left eastern Ukraine or still wants to do so will be fully compensated by the Russian Federation. In return, Western Ukraine undertakes to pay full compensation to anyone who has left or still wants to leave Western Ukraine. Germany acquires a corridor between western Ukraine and eastern Ukraine with the cooperation of the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Poland.

B. That is be ordered:

**The Swiss Confederation** has actively taken sides with the nationals of the German Reich subject to reparations at the expense of the Free City of Danzig entitled to reparations. It has not defended its sovereignty and has violated its neutrality. It has committed active acts of war in favor of the nationals of the German Reich, to the detriment of the nationals of the Free City of Danzig, and has violated the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare. It has violated the general rules of international law. It has violated the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards in favor of Koninklijken DSM N.V. to the detriment of a national of the Free City of Danzig. It has also, under Swiss law, unlawfully exercised sovereign authority over a foreigner in the case of a contract signed in Germany, and continues to do so. It has violated the Visa Agreement with Danzig and the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons with the EU.

Switzerland thus falls under the Enemy State Clauses of the United Nations Charter, Articles 53 and 107. The same conditions apply to the Swiss under the Treaty of Transition from Germany with regard to reparations.

Switzerland is obliged to restore its sovereignty and neutrality. To do this, it must confiscate German assets without reservation, especially those of Mr. Klaus Schwab and his compensation from the World Economic Forum.

In accordance with the general rules of international law, it must allow prosecution for deprivation of liberty and other crimes committed against the Plaintiff under German law and provide full administrative assistance in this regard.

C. That is be ordered:

**The Kingdom of Belgium** has taken note of the fact that the Plaintiff is wanted as a representative of the Free City of Danzig, with the false claim that a Danzig identity card would be a forgery.

The Kingdom of Belgium thus challenges the Versailles Peace Treaty and the cession of German territories decided in that treaty.

The Kingdom of Belgium had offered that the ceded territories could be bought back.

The Kingdom owes the Plaintiff damages and satisfaction not in the capacity of a private individual, but as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig.

Date: Oct. 14. 2023

Name: Beculf von Prince

BEOWULF VON PRINCE  
Schweizer Straße 38  
AT - 6830 Rankweil  
Austria



- Exhibits 1 Official confirmation of Danzig nationality by the government of Lower Franconia/Bavaria/Federal Republic of Germany  
2 Official confirmation of Danzig nationality by the United Nations  
3 Constitution of Germany  
4 Repealed Laws  
5 Crimes