Verwaltungsgemeinschaft
Freie Stadt Danzig

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

Nov. 09, 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

Notification of current acts of war
To the already submitted request for examination whether the Constitution of Germany preserves the existing peace treaty regulations and
To the lawsuit of Ukraine ./. Russian Federation and in
proclamation of disputes against Ukraine and against the states which joined the lawsuit of Ukraine against the Russian Federation.
Here: the current legal situation in the Federal Republic of Germany with a request to examine whether the Applicant may deny nationality of Germany to nationals of the German Reich.
Exhibit: 1 once again the already sent application for examination of the Constitution and joining the lawsuit with the Constitution of Germany and the proofs of nationality of the Free City of Danzig
2 no valid authorization
3 no valid authorization

Preliminary remark
According to the general rules of international law, the personnel statute/sovereignty applies. Contract autonomy/freedom of contract includes the choice of judge in the event of a dispute. Civil law takes precedence over criminal law, otherwise martial artists would be notorious perpetrators of violence.
In national legal relationships, the legal provisions governing the appointment of judges are, in effect, part of the general business provisions of a contract. Each party has an equal stake in the law, and neither party can claim that the judge is biased on the basis of nationality.
Therefore, in the case of national legal relations, the conduct of arbitration proceedings must be expressly agreed.

In international legal relations, the case is exactly reversed. A party has no stake in the legal provisions for the appointment of the judge. A party may object to the judge on the grounds of fundamental suspicion of bias on the grounds that the judge would rule in favor of its own national.
Arbitration proceedings are compulsory/mandatory in international legal relations.

Citizens unite to form states so that a state authority protects their rights and enforces judgments.
Prosecution measures always cause trouble for the person concerned, even if they turn out to be innocent. Knowingly false accusations are therefore also punishable.

In the U.S., there are "punitive damages," which are fines that can be 100 times the actual damage if the damage was committed fraudulently.

A state authority must always be neutral towards its citizens and therefore only enforces judgments unless there is imminent danger.

States protect their citizens from other states interfering with their rights. If it happens nevertheless, the personal statute, the general rules of international law are violated.
This is a legal reason for war. Between states that are members of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice in The Hague has jurisdiction.

But Article 33 of the United Nations Charter requires that disputes between states be resolved by arbitration. This did not mean the International Court of Justice in The Hague. After all, when the United Nations Charter was promulgated, many states were not yet members of the UN.

But what about the personal statute, the right of the individual?
The Declaration of Universal Human Rights states that no one may be discriminated against, but who decides when it does happen? And who determines the damages and who enforces the claim for damages?

The Federal Republic of Germany was conceived as the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig.
The state people of the Federal Republic of Germany are the people of Danzig, while the nationals of the German Reich have been given the status of Danzigers as refugees and displaced persons of German ethnicity.
Under international law, the legal succession of the Free City of Danzig is only completed when the Danzigers proclaim a constitution of Germany and the Danzigers' claims for reparations/compensation have been paid.
In the London Debt Agreement of 1953, the nationals of the German Reich undertake to pay reparations to all states that were at war with the German Reich.
For this reason, the First and Second Law on the Regulation of Nationality was created in 1955. Section 15 of the Courts Constitution Act: "Courts are state courts." was therefore abolished. Since then, courts in the Federal Republic of Germany have in principle been arbitration courts.
Criminal courts are public authorities. Civil law takes precedence over criminal law. Therefore, in principle, a criminal court/authority only has jurisdiction if damage under civil law is proven.

In the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards, 168 states recognized that arbitral awards take precedence over state courts.
According to the 12th Chapter of the Swiss International Private Law Act, anyone can sue any state thereafter. The only requirement is that a party is not domiciled in Switzerland when a legal relationship arises in which compensation can be claimed. For example, under this law, any Austrian can sue another Austrian under this 12th Chapter sIPRG.

Any treaty also any state treaty can be terminated. Also each border treaty. A contract is terminated only when both sides agree to the termination. In the case of unilateral termination, the treaty is not terminated until the other party has been compensated for the damage resulting from the unilateral termination.

The Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare of 1907 is not a freely agreed treaty under international law, but defines customary international law. The Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare is therefore mandatory international law. Anyone who violates it does not recognize

any law and cannot claim any right. According to the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, looting and expropriation of the civilian population are prohibited even during active hostilities. Unfortified towns enjoy protection. After the end of active fighting, the occupier must uphold the law of the land/ordre public, Article 43 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare.

Who decides whether the occupier is violating public policy? An international court of arbitration.

The primary duty of every civil servant and state judge is to protect his citizens from harm and is generally liable if he does not fulfill this duty.
If a wrong national judgment is enforced, joint and several liability arises in case of doubt. This means that every citizen is jointly liable with his fellow citizens and usually pays for this with taxes.

Only civil servants and state judges can violate the general rules of international law, not private individuals. In the event of a violation of the general rules of international law, a state authority arrogates sovereign powers to a foreigner and violates the personal statute/personal sovereignty.
In the event of a breach of the general rules of international law, each national is jointly and severally liable. This means that every citizen is liable with all his or her assets until the damage has been paid.

No liability arises from the enforcement of an international arbitration award. The disputing parties may at any time refuse the enforcement of an arbitration award on the grounds that the right to be heard has been denied. Any party whose right to be heard has been denied may conduct further arbitration proceedings. The responsibility for an arbitration award always lies with the parties.
If, on the other hand, an international arbitration award is not enforced, the state authority interferes with foreign law and thus violates the general rules of international law and makes every inhabitant of its state fully liable.
The Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany makes explicit reference to this:
Article 25 of the 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:"*
This means that court judgments and official orders that violate the general rules of international law are also null and void. For example, the refusal to enforce an arbitration award.

If a state authority does not enforce an international arbitration award, then this state authority is taking sides to the detriment of its own population.
A state authority must also enforce an international arbitration award against its own nationals. If the state authority does not enforce the judgment against its own national, then all nationals of the state are jointly and severally liable. Although enforcement cannot then be carried out domestically, it can be carried out against any assets of a national abroad. An innocent party is then liable.

If an international arbitration award is not enforced, there is a suspicion that the state organs are controlled by a foreign power working against its own people. Basically, this is fraud against the taxpayer, usually referred to as treason.

This is the Hitler method/the Nazi principle.
How do you conquer a state without military force? You infiltrate the state organs by deceiving the population in legal relations.

If Ukraine and the Russian Federation recognize the general rules of international law, the personal statute, the personal sovereignty, then any eastern Ukrainian who prefers to live in western Ukraine can sue eastern Ukraine for secession from Ukraine or the Russian Federation for loss and relocation costs and would be justified.

But any eastern Ukrainian who prefers to live under western Ukrainian sovereignty can sell their property and emigrate to western Ukraine. If there are only a few of them, then a real purchase price is paid and only the relocation costs can be claimed. If many eastern Ukrainians prefer to live in western Ukraine, demand will fall and they will have to sell their property. In turn, prices for comparable properties in western Ukraine will rise. Eastern Ukraine must then pay a corresponding compensation.

The same is true, of course, in the reverse case.
So what is the war being waged in Ukraine for?
The right to real estate varies. But as a rule, it can be expropriated if, for example, a highway is built. The loss of the property is usually compensated according to the market value.
As a rule, no one has an absolute claim to property if the public interest demands a relinquishment. This is, after all, the basis of tax law. Unilateral renunciation must be settled by real payments.
This applies in both national and international law.

Now the inhabitants of Nagorno Karabakh have been forced to leave their homes. Without financial compensation, this process is simply a land grab.
The same applies to the Rohingyas from Myanmar.

What do the Palestinians want from the Israelis?
The ancestors of the Israelis almost all had European nationalities but held on to their faith and were therefore discriminated against and eventually murdered by the SS, a multinational satanic sect. A Jewish state in which the Jewish population finds protection cannot therefore be denied. The Jewish population has held fast to their faith and thus, in principle, to their state promised in the Bible. This is thus generally recognized. The sufferers of the discrimination against the Jewish population are now the Palestinians. The Palestinians must hold themselves harmless against the perpetrators and people responsible for this discrimination.

What is happening now with the Declaration of Universal Human Rights?

Wars are being waged again, for whom and for what?
There is armament again, for whom and for what?
For human rights? Certainly not.

It is part of customary international law, part of the general rules of international law, to observe the personal sovereignty, the personal statute. The self-determination of peoples begins with the self-determination of the citizen. Whenever this self-evident fact is not respected, whether within a state or between states, sooner or later violence and war ensue.

The United Nations does have the blue helmets. But they have only observer status. Without an arbitration ruling, they cannot have any other status.

What has caused the United Nations to fail in its goal of saving humanity from the hostage of war is the lack of arbitration. But those who reject arbitration, in which each party is directly involved in the appointment of the judges itself, are simply relying on force to enforce illegal claims.

Wars are being waged again in Europe, and the World War is not yet over. The Second World War began with the invasion of the unarmed Free City of Danzig, which was under the protection of the League of Nations, and it is over only with a peace settlement to which the Danzigers agree. This was agreed in the Two-plus-Four Treaty of 1990 on the Final Settlement for Germany as a whole. According to it, a constitution of Germany must be decided by the Danzigers. This constitution must regulate the legal succession of the existing peace agreements.

This constitution is now available and is divided into three parts. In the first part, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig becomes the Constitution of Germany and adopts the provisions of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, specifically: one state with two nationalities, a) the nationality of the Free City of Danzig is retained and b) the nationals of Germany.
The second part regulates the legal succession of the League of Nations and the United Nations as an international protecting power for the nationals of Danzig.
In the third part, the Swiss Private International Law Act, Chapter 12, becomes part of the Constitution of Germany with minor amendments.
With the German Constitution, an international court of arbitration becomes the supreme judicial power of the state and thus a neutral state. The supreme executive becomes an international protective power in which every state or population group can participate to the same extent. This also preserves neutrality.

With the current example of the Applicant to examine whether the Constitution of Germany upholds the existing peace treaties, in principle every state must confess whether it upholds these treaties or whether a new world peace treaty is agreed in principle. In this process, not only heads of state should negotiate, but all sections of the population should be heard and thus all existing or possibly arising disputes should be eliminated.

Initial situation regarding the current case of the Applicant

The Free City of Danzig was created under Articles 100-108 of the Versailles Peace Treaty. Under Article 102, the Free City of Danzig came under the protection of the League of Nations. The League of Nations was, in relation to Danzig, an international protecting power and supreme executive of the Free City of Danzig.
Under Article 103, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is agreed upon between representatives of Danzig and the League of Nations. The Constitution of the Free City of Danzig is thus an international treaty. The legislature of the Free City of Danzig is authorized to act only within the framework of this treaty. Amendments require the express consent of the League of Nations. Thus, the League of Nations is also part of the legislature of the Free City of Danzig. In case of disputes, an international arbitration tribunal shall decide and thus be the supreme judicial authority of the Free City of Danzig.
According to Article 76 of the Constitution of Danzig, a Danzig national is entitled to protection from foreign countries, both at home and abroad. This means that Danzig decisions must be enforced by all states. Appeals against them are admissible only before an international court of arbitration.
Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution guarantees German law at the time of Jan. 1920.

The precedents for this are available.
The Nazis also came to power in Danzig and began to introduce National Socialist arbitrary law. Danzig nationals have complained against this.
The Permanent Court of International 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 the majority - see Decision Series A/B No. 65.
This decision is based on Article 43 of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare and is therefore mandatory.
Therefore, Great Britain announced that it would take over the executive power in the Free City of Danzig if the amendments to the law were not reversed. As a result, the changes in the law ceased to exist.
The Danzig nationals have never renounced their rights and never will. Territory can be negotiated, but not the law of the land, the ordre public.
The decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague Series A/B No. 65 is therefore always mandatory.

The Second World War began with the invasion of the unarmed Free City of Danzig. The nationality of the German Reich was imposed on the Danzig nationals, which deprived them of their right under Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution.
The United Nations was established as the legal successor to the League of Nations, as a wartime alliance to protect the Danzigers.
The statutes of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials were adopted in London in 1944, before the end of the war, to prosecute Nazi crimes against the Danzigers.
The 4 powers acted, in effect, as the supreme executive of the Danzigers.

Charge No. 1: violation of the Briand-Kellogg Pact (non-aggression pact). Toward no other state was there a clearer violation of this pact.

Charge No. 2: Violation of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare and the judgment of the Permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague, Series A/B No. 65. Towards no other state was there a clearer violation. With the forced granting of the National Socialist nationality of the German Reich, the Danzig nationals were deprived of their ordre public. The male population was pressed into military service against their own protecting powers and the Danzigers were forced to finance the war against their own protecting powers, the supreme executive of the state. The Danzigers were effectively enslaved. Those who held on to their Danzig nationality were sent to the first concentration camp of World War II at Stutthof.

Charge No. 3: Crimes against Humanity was added after the end of the war. Danzig had been declared a fortress. The escape of the Danzigers was forbidden; the Danzigers were to serve as living shields against the Soviets. The complete extermination of the Danzigers was effectively ordered.
In the concentration camp Stutthof only 35% of the inmates had survived.

Today, only the Holocaust against the Jewish population and human experiments by the Nazis in the concentration camps are remembered.

The civil punishment as a reckoning of the crimes against the Danzigers, was postponed to the conclusion of a peace treaty.
If state A leads a war of extermination against state B and only one citizen of state B survives, from state A 100 women, what do the 100 women owe to the one? But probably everything.

The Federal Republic of Germany was conceived as the legal successor of the Free City of Danzig.
To the state people of the Federal Republic of Germany became the "owners of the German nationality in the meaning of Article 116 (1) Basic Law (GG)". In the meaning of Article 116(1) GG" refers to Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution: "German law at the time of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed."

The nationals of the German Reich received the status of a Danziger as refugees and expellees of German ethnicity in the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law (GG) for the Federal Republic of Germany". With the status of a Danzigers, the nationals of the German Reich had a right to German law at the time of Jan. 1920. A refugee or displaced person must first acquire the right to a share in the state property and share in the territory.
The status of a Danziger must be obtained by the nationals of the German Reich from their own unremitting efforts - see Potsdam Agreement. For example, an identity card of the Federal Republic of Germany may be held only by those who can prove with facts that they have the status of a "German in the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law". That is, he must prove with facts that he upholds German law at the time of Jan. 1920. Only those who are "German in the meaning of Article 116 (1) GG" can be civil servants.

The rights of the Danzig nationals should be enjoyed by all people, that is why the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was created. Essential to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is

Article 8
Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.
Article 9
No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.
Article 10
Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.
Article 15
Everyone has the right to a nationality.
No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality
Article 17
No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

These are all rights that are precisely defined in German law at the time of Jan. 1920.

But what now, for example, about the over one million Rohingya refugees who have fled violence in Myanmar since the early 1990s?
Or what about the Armenian-born Azerbaijanis now displaced from Nagorno Karabakh?
What about the eastern Ukrainians who fled to western Ukraine and, conversely, the western Ukrainians who emigrated to eastern Ukraine?

In which court can these people sue for compensation?
If the constitution is enforced by Germany, these people can sue for damages against their states before an international court of arbitration, just as the people of Danzig successfully sued their government for compliance with their rights.

Two easily verifiable facts
With the German state of Bavaria leading the way, the Federal Republic of Germany is not simply a de facto dictatorship. That would still be bearable. Even in a dictatorship one knows what is allowed and what is not. Bavaria is again a national socialist dictatorship. It is acted completely arbitrarily. Once one gets from the public prosecutor's office right, then one is accused and condemned in the same case by the same public prosecutor's office. One applies again Section 2 of the National Socialist German Penal Code*: "If an act is not punishable according to the letter of the law, but according to the healthy popular feeling, then the act is punished as it comes closest to the Penal Code."* What is the healthy popular feeling is decided by each prosecutor according to his own view. In the meantime, there is the Bavarian Police Tasks Act. According to it, one can be arrested even for actions that are neither punishable nor disorderly. The state security police is responsible. This can be compared to the "Gestapo", the secret state police of the Nazis.

In order to check whether Bavaria is a de facto dictatorship, one must look only in the Internet for example under Attorney General Lückemann. Then you will find that Mr. Lückemann was Attorney General at the Bamberg Higher Regional Court and was then appointed President of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court and thus disciplinary superior of these judges.
Through Irish courts, two suspected Romanian bank robbers have asked the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg (ECJ) whether German prosecutors can issue arrest warrants. The ECJ had to rule that German prosecutors are not independent and cannot issue arrest warrants. 5,000 arrest warrants had to be reissued. Didn't all police officers, prosecutors, judges and lawyers know that? What is being taught at the universities?
Court minutes in court are not kept verbatim, contrary to the law. For this reason alone, the Federal Republic of Germany should not be a member of the EU and the European Court of Human Rights should reject all German judgments.
Court judgments are handed out without the judge's signature, contrary to legal requirements, and letters from the courts are stamped with " Bavaria District Court" or "Bavaria Regional Court" or "Bavaria Higher Regional Court". Such courts do not exist.

Especially in the German press there are reports about the Polish judicial reform. EU pledges to Poland in the amount of 35`000`000,-€ are blocked because of this judicial reform. But even after the Polish justice reform Poland is just a model right state in the comparison to Bavaria.

How can it be that with the German state of Bavaria, as in the last century, the Federal Republic of Germany is again a National Socialist dictatorship?

The definition of "Nazi":
Hitler had always talked of peace and then repossessed the Saarland in violation of the Versailles Peace Treaty, Austria was incorporated into the German Reich, Czechoslovakia was placed under German protectorate, and finally Danzig was invaded and the German Reich invaded Poland. But Hitler extended a friendly hand to France and Great Britain until he invaded France. He made a pact with Stalin and then invaded the Soviet Union.
To the Germans he promised to do what was best for them. First to revise the Versailles Peace Treaty, then the Jewish population were the parasites on the Germans and the warmongers. The Sinti, Roma and Slavs were inferior populations. Yet the "Slavs" were nothing more than Eastern Germans who had adopted the Arian/Christian faith and later the Greek Orthodox faith. The Slavic language is a mish-mash of Greek, Latin and German. For example, the German, "Das ist schmackhaft" in Polish is "Do jest smatzna." Then the Germanic, the Germanic belief was the ideal. But then "Slavic" Ukrainians and Muslim forces served with the SS, in the end the SS included 30 different nationalities. What was the law?
In the German Imperial Empire, the principle was, "Always practice loyalty and honesty."

Everything that was originally associated with "German" was completely destroyed by the Nazis. Germans had become robbers and, in case of doubt, murderers.

That is why a Nazi is not a nationalist, anti-Semite, racist and fascist. A Nazi twists the terms. True is usually the opposite of what is claimed. A Nazi lies and deceives to destroy any binding legal system, to provoke violence.
The true rulers in the German Reich was the SS, officially "Sturmschutz", in truth "Black Sun" as a symbol that always the opposite of what is claimed is true, just as the swastika represents the twisted swastika.

The SS never surrendered.
Of 128 of the highest judges in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), 120 were members of the Nationalist German Workers Party (NSDAP). In total, 77% of the judges in the FRG, were members of the NSDAP or members of the SS. The Federal Intelligence Service preferred to employ members of the SS. The daughter of Reichsführer of the SS, Heinrich Himmler, an ardent supporter of Nazi ideology to the point of death, was employed by the Federal Intelligence Service. An SS officer was used by the Chilean dictatorship to fight the opposition. Through this SS man, poison for mass executions is said to have been supplied to the Chilean dictatorship via the Federal Intelligence Service (BND).
SS-Obersturmbannführer Otto Skorzeny became group leader of Department D (Sabotage and Decomposition) in 1944. After the war, he served as a military advisor in Argentina and Egypt. Mr. Skorzeny found protection in Spain. There he maintained an SS network and became a general agent for numerous German and Austrian steel producers and machine manufacturers. He was also involved in arms trafficking.
The German Federal Criminal Police Office was founded by an SS officer. Schleyer, who later became the President of the Employers' Association, was an SS officer. Industrial managers who had paid the SS to run the concentration camps and human experiments and were convicted as war criminals were later awarded the Federal Cross of Merit.

The core idea of the SS is: "Life means struggle. Only the strongest survive." Those who are weak die out, the sooner the better for the stronger.
Laws protect the weak. So every binding law must be eliminated. Which law do the judges follow then?

In the Weimar Republic, Hitler had still been charged with perjury, because of course it was

recorded verbatim. The Reichstag had been set on fire, allegedly by communists. Hitler used this to capture the opposition. Accused were 8 persons. The trial for this was broadcast on the radio even then. 7 of the defendants were able to achieve an acquittal. Only one young, inexperienced communist remained as the perpetrator.
Hitler therefore introduced the practice that court hearings were no longer recorded verbatim and verdicts were handed out without the judge's signature.
As I said, the Nazi judges were taken over as judges in the Federal Republic of Germany and they continued the practice, contrary to the law.
One must imagine that. There sits a minute-taker in the courtroom, whom one can also reject because of bias. But he/she only notes: "The witness has testified." What he testifies, whether for or against the accused, is not recorded.
For this reason alone, the Federal Republic of Germany should not be in the EU and in the Council of Europe.

At the instigation of the Applicant, the German Federal Minister of Justice, Marco Buschmann, has now announced that a law will be promulgated whereby court hearings will be digitally recorded. He justifies this by saying that court hearings can drag on for months with tens of witnesses, and judges and prosecutors cannot rely on their memory to determine whether these statements were understood correctly.

The Two-plus-Four Treaty
The Two-plus-Four Treaty (Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and German Democratic Republic (GDR)) + 4 Powers Treaty on the Final Settlement for Germany as a Whole from 1990 has not been realized.

That the Two-plus-Four Treaty is not realized can be easily read. According to Article 1 of this treaty, a constitution must be adopted in accordance with Article 146 of the Basic Law (GG), in which the borders are defined, as was regulated in Article 23 Scope of the Basic Law. But instead of adopting a constitution, the two partly sovereign states, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, concluded a Unification Treaty. According to Article 3 of this treaty, the GDR first accedes to the GG, two sentences later the FRG and GDR jointly withdraw from the GG, in which they declare that the scope of the GG, Article 23 is abolished, in Article 4 (2) and in Article 4 (6) it is confirmed that a constitution according to Article 146 GG still has to be decided.

How can it be that the two easily verifiable facts
a) with Bavaria as the forerunner, Germany is once again a National Socialist dictatorship and
b) the Two Plus Four Treaty has not been implemented, i.e. the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare is still in force?
How can it be that these two easily verifiable facts are being concealed from the public?

It can only be because of the World Economic Forum (WEF).

Numerous multinational companies with subsidiaries in the Federal Republic of Germany belong to the WEF. They all have legal departments with lawyers who are independent bodies for the administration of justice. These lawyers should criticize the legal situation in Bavaria in particular and therefore take legal action at the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg (ECJ) and the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. But this is not happening. The supposedly free press with independent journalists should be reporting on this. But the so-called free press is financed and thus controlled by the WEF's strategic partners through advertising.

Mr. Klaus Schwab is the founder and director of the WEF and therefore responsible for it.
In 1971, Mr. Schwab established the non-profit foundation European Management Conference, which was renamed the World Economic Forum (WEF) in 1987
Mr. Klaus Schwab advocates that everyone should participate in a company's success, not just the shareholders. But the more powerful the World Economic Forum becomes, the greater the income disparities become.

It does sound very elitist when Klaus Schwab calls his foundation the World Economic Forum. His foundation is the forum of the global economy. In other words, the forum that sets the guidelines for the global economy. And then he also sets up the Young Global Leaders Foundation. So his foundation determines the world leaders.
That sounds very much like the ideas of the SS.

As head of the WEF, Mr. Klaus Schwab had to witness the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. That was an event that changed the world. German Chancellor Helmut Kohl was beaming: "Anything is possible, even a peace treaty."
The East Germans (East Prussians, Silesians, Pomeranians) had been expropriated and expelled without compensation. In West Germany they had to buy everything anew and were cheap labor for West German industry. They did receive a small amount of compensation, but it was far from full compensation. The East Germans were supposed to get their East German properties back in the event of a peace treaty. Poland also had this expectation. Nobody was able to acquire any property in East Germany or West Poland. All properties were under Polish state administration with the expectation that these properties would be returned to the German owners by paying reparations to Poland. The Soviet Union wanted a peace treaty and was prepared to return north-east Prussia to the Germans for the payment of 80,000,000,- DM.
Who was to pay for this? The West Germans, of course, especially industry. The then Chancellor Helmut Kohl also wanted Germany within the borders of 1937.
But then suddenly the Germans didn't want a peace treaty, they wanted a state treaty, the Two-plus-Four Treaty.

But even then, the reparations would have had to be distributed fairly among all Germans. The East German territories comprise one third of the area of today's FRG. Theoretically, the East Germans should have received a third of the real estate.
But then Mr. Helmut Kohl lied and claimed that the Soviet Union had made it a condition of the unification of the FRG and GDR that the expropriations of the communists must not be reversed. The GDR, which used to be called Central Germany, even by the GDR, the Middle German Radio still reminds us, became East Germany. The true East Germans were simply hushed up.

Especially as head of the WEF, Mr. Klaus Schwab was aware of the enormous shift in assets that would have taken place in the event of a peace treaty, to the detriment of his strategic partners. Suddenly a huge fortune would have flowed into the hands of individuals and companies, including Poland and the Soviet Union, which were not strategic partners of the WEF.
In the Unification Treaty between the FRG and the GDR, the principle of restitution/return before compensation was agreed for small property owners and small companies. But this did not apply to large companies and landowners on the grounds that they had helped Hitler to seize power in a special way. But the same applied to West German companies and large landowners. The assets of the large Central German companies and landowners were sold to West Germans at low prices for the benefit of the state coffers.

Instead of a peace treaty, the then Chancellor Helmut Kohl invoked the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, according to which the Federal Republic of Germany became the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig. Under international law, this legal succession is completed when the people of Danzig proclaim a constitution of Germany.
It was therefore agreed in the Two-plus-Four Treaty that a constitution must be promulgated in accordance with Article 146 of the Basic Law (meaning that the people of Danzig must promulgate a constitution), in which the borders are defined, as was regulated in Article 23 Scope of the Basic Law (GG). A border treaty under international law must then be concluded with Poland.
Mr. Klaus Schwab, as a national of the German Reich, had to and must know that the Second World War is only over when there is a constitution of Germany and the Danzigers will have received reparations.

A concrete example of the WEF's strategic partners dominating state bodies is the WEF's

strategic partner, Koninklijke DSM N.V.. Koninklijke DSM N.V. has a Code of Business Conduct. This ensures compliance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. All forms of corruption are rejected. If the Code of Business Conduct cannot be complied with in a country, Koninklijke DSM N.V. will look for solutions itself. Every partner of Koninklijke DSM N. V. is obliged to comply with the Code of Business Conduct. This means that the Code of Business Conduct also applies to the WEF. Every six months, all employees must sign an undertaking to comply with the Code of Business Conduct and to report any breaches of the Code in the future. Employees are therefore liable.
The Code of Business Conduct is therefore something like the constitution of Koninklijken DSM N.V.

In reality, Koninklijke DSM N.V. violates the Code of Business Conduct to the greatest possible extent. Anyone who reports violations and attempts to enforce compliance is economically destroyed. The company does not shy away from serious bodily harm and deprivation of liberty.

The Applicant is himself a victim because he represented an employee of Koninklijke DSM N.V. and won an arbitration proceeding against Koninklijke DSM N.V.. Mr. Nordmann from the law firm Walder & Wyss filed a 77-page complaint against this. For formal reasons alone, this appeal should not have been accepted. Only one marginal number out of 226 is devoted in passing to the 6 claims arising from the arbitration award. The main subject of the complaint is the political persecution of the Applicant due to his Danzig nationality. The Applicant therefore bought the claims against the DSM Group.

As expected, the Swiss Federal Court ruled incorrectly. Naturally, the Applicant lodged an appeal. The Aargau Canton Police then broke down the Applicant's front door and delivered him to Germany in handcuffs. All those involved were aware that the extradition of the Applicant had been expressly refused by the Swiss Federal Office of Justice. The criminal offense of deprivation of liberty was deliberately committed. The Applicant was not to be given the opportunity to enforce the arbitration award. In order to destroy the arbitral award, the Applicant's client was forced to appoint a duty lawyer, under threat of incapacitation if she refused. An action is to be brought against the DSM Group. The Applicant's client was no longer a party, and so on.

The lawyer for Koninklijke DSM N.V., Mr. Nordmann, boasts that the entire Swiss state apparatus dances to his tune. After years of requests and finally because of a lawsuit against the DSM Group in the USA, Mr. Nordmann presented the powers of attorney of the CEOs of the DSM Group. Mr. Feike Sijbesma thus assumes responsibility for the serious bodily injury that led to the Applicant's disability and for the deprivation of his liberty. The deprivation of liberty occurred expressly because of the Applicant's nationality of Danzig. Mr. Feike Sijbesma sits on the supervisory board of the WEF, at the Dutch Central Bank and is a Carbon Commissioner at the World Bank. Mr. Feike Sijbesma was responsible for the corona measures in the Netherlands and thus for the ban on the sale of Ivermectin. Ivermectin has been an approved drug for a long time and also works reliably in the case of corona disease. He is responsible for the nitrogen regulations in the Netherlands, which is driving many Dutch farmers to ruin and increasing hunger in the world.

Obviously, Mr. Feike Sijbesma is above the law.

The political reorganization of the Free City of Danzig.
Due to the repeal of essential laws, the Applicant initially founded the Association for the Right to Demand German Law in 2006. Finally, the Applicant and others politically reorganized the Free City of Danzig and informed all relevant bodies, including the UN, of this on May 23, 2008. In April 2017, the Applicant officially stood trial for the first time as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig. The press reported on this as a bizarre trial. Poland then prepared an expert opinion on the justification of reparations and estimated these at € 690,000,000,000,- in 2018. The Applicant asked whether this included the Free City of Danzig. Poland then demanded € 850,000,000,000,-
On October 1, 2019, the Applicant, as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig,

was sentenced to 8 months' imprisonment, suspended on probation, by the Coburg Regional Court for Danzig ID cards. However, the judgment states that an appeal can be lodged and that the Applicant stands up for a better legal order. The grounds for appeal can be found on the very first page of the judgment. But the Applicant only asked the German Federal Court of Justice whether it is an organ of the Federal Republic of Germany, in which case the Applicant must be acquitted without any justification or documentation.

However, if the Federal Court of Justice is an organ of the German Reich, then the Applicant is of course guilty. The Federal Court of Justice responds analogously that it leaves it to each resident of the Federal territory to decide whether they consider the Applicant to be guilty or innocent.

Ms. Karin Leffer and the Applicant filed a lawsuit in Washington DC in Nov. 2019 against the Federal Republic of Germany, the Kingdom of Belgium, the entire EU and the Swiss Confederation on the grounds that no court proceedings can be conducted throughout Europe in which the procedural guarantees under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights are observed. The defendants dispute the jurisdiction of the court. Therefore, an amended complaint was filed to prove that the Two-plus-Four Treaty has not been implemented and cannot be implemented without the political organization of the Free City of Danzig. The plaintiffs claim that the USA is still the occupying power and responsible.
The Applicant personally demands compensation in the amount of € 160,000,000,000,- and the power of disposal over German foreign trade surpluses. Poland is awarded € 690,000,000,000,- by the Applicant and demands Danzig as territory. Poland then moved the celebrations to commemorate the start of the Second World War to Poland. The Applicant asked whether Poland represents Danzig in foreign policy and whether Poland receives the German Federal State of Brandenburg as compensation for Danzig.
Poland then moved the celebrations back to Danzig and demand €1,300,000,000,000,- in reparations.

The Applicant pointed out to the German Government that the insertion of Section 40a into the Nationality Act of the German Reich without its express consent was null and void. As a result, Section 40a was dropped and Section 15 was overwritten. Accordingly, the Applicant cannot become a national of the German Reich even upon application. The Unification Treaty between the FRG and the GDR was amended, thus proving that the two partially sovereign states of the FRG and the GDR still exist. This means that the conditions for the promulgation of a constitution for Germany are met. The Applicant pointed out to the Federal Government that the rule of law must first be re-established. The German Federal Minister of Justice, Mr. Marco Buschmann of the FDP, wants court proceedings to be recorded. This is an essential step towards restoring the rule of law.

The Applicant initiated arbitration proceedings against the UN, the WEF, etc. Essentially, it is a matter of checking whether there is anyone who does not recognize the Free City of Danzig. Therefore, the Applicant announced that it would issue Danzig identity cards and Danzig Gulden, backed by the German gold holdings. The Applicant sent these arbitration proceedings to over 40 embassies and over 10 official bodies in the Federal Republic of Germany, including the Bavarian state government and the Coburg police. The Applicant filed a criminal complaint against himself in order to check whether the issue of Danzig ID cards and Gulden was suspected of being a criminal offense. When asked, the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office stated that there was no suspicion of a criminal offense.
This seems to clear the way for the Applicant to receive his expropriated property back.
This primarily concerns the Applicant's real estate.

The current personal case of the Applicant:
In 1999, the Applicant was granted justice. He had won a building permit. The Bavarian Administrative Court in Bayreuth confirmed that the Applicant's rights had been unlawfully infringed by the refusal of planning permission.
The Applicant had filed an action for damages in the amount of €1,115,000 for the unlawful infringement of his rights. Judge Barausch at Coburg Regional Court rejected this claim in

2006 without giving reasons.

On the basis of the building permit obtained, the Applicant developed 9,600 m² of land. In 1999, the Applicant took out a loan of DM 345,000,- from Generali Lloyd and DM 144,000,- (= € 73,626.03) from Deutsche Bank 24 for the construction. In addition, the Applicant had assets of DM 180,000,- in shares. The shares had reached a high and could only fall. For this reason, the Applicant used this share capital to convert all the apartments into condominiums. As expected, the share prices fell. The Applicant therefore sold the upper floor in 2002 with 81/278 m² for €165,000,- and rescheduled the debt. The loans from Generali Lloyd and Deutsche Bank, entered in the land register in the total amount of €237,000,- were redeemed by DSL Bank. A block of shares in the amount of € 77,500,- was pledged to DSL Bank. The DSL Bank loan was thus repaid in accordance with the contract with a term of 10 years. In 2007, the shares were already worth enough to repay the loan from DSL Bank. Profits could still be made on the shares for another 5 years. But then DSL Bank sold the Applicant's shares and reported the sale value as the Bank's equity. This is at least an attempt at theft.
But that's not all. Obviously, DSL Bank wants to profit from the Applicant's political persecution and wants to auction off the Applicant's real estate. Of course, the Applicant pointed out to the foreclosure court that the Applicant no longer had any debts. Nevertheless, the foreclosure sale was scheduled. DSL Bank does not want to auction off the remaining debt from the €237,000 loan, but the land charge registered for Deutsche Bank 24, which was already repaid by DSL Bank itself in 2002.

Apparently, this land charge was assigned to DSL Bank. But a land charge registered on a property is no proof of whether a loan was granted on this land charge and whether this loan was repaid or not. However, the fact that DSL Bank did not want to auction off any remaining debt from the € 237,000,- means that it was admitted that this loan had been fully repaid and, on the contrary, that further profits were to be expected from the increase in value of the shares. The term of the loan was 10 years. At the forced sale hearing in 2007, the Applicant presented the calculation according to which the Applicant no longer had any debts. However, instead of taking this calculation on file, Mr. Welsch, the judicial officer, ordered the Applicant out of the room. Obviously, no one was willing to make an offer under these circumstances. The forced sale was canceled.

Mr. Legal Officer Welsch should have filed an ex officio criminal complaint on suspicion of fraud. At this time, Ms. Barausch had moved from the Coburg Regional Court to the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office, where she was a group leader.
DSL Bank did not set a new date within the statutory period of 6 months. The proceedings were thus discontinued. In 2008, DSL Bank assigned the land charge for Deutsche Bank 24 to the dubious company VABA III GmbH. The Applicant had traveled to Switzerland in April 2009 due to the ongoing political persecution. VABA III GmbH again scheduled a forced sale for Sept. 22, 2009. The application for this does not identify the issuer of the application. Under German law, this is an anonymous letter, not a declaration of intent, not a deed. A document is the original of a declaration of intent and must clearly identify the issuer. In addition to a signature, the name of the issuer must appear in block letters or on the letterhead. This is not the case and the application is therefore meaningless, a letter that ends up in the wastepaper basket or is sent back.

The Applicant had traveled to Switzerland in April 2009 due to the ongoing political persecution. All documents were packed in boxes and stored by a forwarding agent in Germany and were not accessible.
Otherwise, the Applicant would have been able to submit the statement of account with which the land charge of Deutsche Bank 24 had been repaid in full in 2002, with a prepayment penalty.

The Applicant therefore did not send any documents, but made claims of bias that could not be refuted. For example, that the roster allocating court business did not comply with Article 101 of the Basic Law or Section 16 of the Courts Constitution Act. According to previous case law, all decisions of such courts were invalid. Mr. Legal Officer Welsch was also rejected due

to bias. Nevertheless, the forced sale was carried out. For this purpose, VABA III GmbH issued a power of attorney to the lawyers Reiser Biesinger GmbH. There is no printed name at all and the signature is illegible. The fact that the power of attorney originates from VABA III GmbH can only be inferred from the stamp - see Exhibit 2. The sub-authorization of Reiser Biesinger Lawyers GmbH is signed with an illegible name that cannot be assigned to any of the persons to be read on the letterhead. Neither Mr. Reiserer, Mr. Biesinger, Mr. Powletzka, Mr. Röttgen, Mr. Christ, Mr. Bollacher, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Peters nor Mr. Fallenstein - see Exhibit 3. Law firm GmbH grants power of attorney to a Mr. Fröhlich. But the power of attorney does not state where Mr. Fröhlich lives.
So who grants a Mr. Fröhlich the power of attorney to submit applications and to which Mr. Fröhlich? Someone from Berlin, Hamburg or wherever?
So this is another reason why a forced sale should not have been carried out.

Ms. Karin Leffer distributed a short letter to the interested parties in which it was pointed out that the forced sale was not legal. Mrs. and Mr. Fruhnert bought the Applicant's real estate at auction for €139,000,- according to the expert opinion with a value of €800,000,-. The Applicant informed Mr. Fruhnert in writing that they had not acquired any property and were only renting. Further pursuit of the matter was pointless under the circumstances. The legal situation had to be clarified first. To this end, the Applicant had politically reorganized the Free City of Danzig and informed all relevant authorities of this on May 23, 2008.

Now the Applicant sent Mr. Fruhnert the arbitration proceedings that had been initiated, with the calculation of the outstanding rents and that the outstanding rents had been paid for the upper floor of 81/278 m², five months' rent was outstanding and the Applicant was terminating the lease for personal use. Mr. Fruhnert confirmed receipt, but did not want to know anything about the lawsuit. The Applicant therefore did some research and found the notarized contract with DSL Bank, as well as the court documents, which clearly showed that the Applicant no longer had any debts and that the forced sale was a void administrative act. Mr. Fruhnert no longer confirmed receipt with his signature. The Applicant asked the bailiffs, who are responsible for official service, to serve the documents on Mr. Fruhnert. However, they did not do so. The Applicant also sent the documents to the land registry office with the request to make a correction to the land register. But this does not happen. The Applicant therefore filed criminal charges and a criminal complaint on suspicion of theft, fraud, receiving stolen property and trespassing. In the end, the Applicant decided to make the serving himself. An unfriendly gentleman opened the door. The Applicant introduced himself and that he was the owner. The unfriendly gentleman did not introduce himself and did not want to acknowledge receipt of the letter. Meanwhile, a woman in the background called the police. That's fine with the Applicant. After all, he needed a witness to prove that he had served his letters. The police officer promised to ask the Bailiff, Mr. Ulrich Zillig, why he did not serve the letter.

But then the Applicant received the following email:
From: Coburg KPI K5 (PP-OFR) <pp-ofr.Coburg.KPI.K5@polizei.bayern.de>
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 3:55:52 PM
Subject: Written statement as a defendant, here: criminal procedings BY4301-006325-23/4
Dear Mr. von Prince,
I am enclosing a written statement in the criminal proceedings regarding the incidents on May 19, 2023 at 9:05 p.m. in Forsthub.
I would ask you to complete the mandatory information about yourself on the enclosed personal data sheet and return it to the Coburg police station
The server of the Aplicant informs:
CAUTION: The sender of this message is not from the Bavarian Police (external sender). Please be particularly careful with regard to any links and/or attachments contained in the message.

This turns a relatively harmless incident such as trespassing - the Applicant did not even enter the house, but only wanted a confirmation of receipt at the door - into a state security matter.

Mr. SS Criminal Chief Inspector Bergner conceals the testimony of the police officer who was on site and can confirm that the Applicant had to personally serve letters because Mr. Bailiff Ulrich Zillig did not serve them and the criminal application and the criminal complaint filed by

the Applicant on suspicion of theft, fraud, receiving stolen goods and trespassing.

In the meantime, the Applicant has searched through his documents and finds the statement of repayment of the land charge of Deutsche Bank 24.

This land charge was repaid by paying

On Sept. 06, 02 from the PDS Bank in the amount of	26`570,35€
On Oct. 23, 02 from the DSL-Bank in the amount of	51`766,27€
In total	78`336,62€

This includes €4,709.46 in early repayment penalties for Deutsche Bank 24.

The following additional costs were incurred when refinancing the loan from Deutsche Bank 24 to DSL Bank:

Expert opinion Architect Heuberger: November 8, 2001 (1´624,- DM)	€830.35
Declaration of division from the district office May 13, 2002	€355.00
LJK partial apartment July 24, 2002	€246.00
LJK partial apartment Oliver Meusel Aug.05, 2002	€131.00
LJK partial apartment Manuela Fechter Aug.05, 2002	€131.00
Real estate transfer tax September 24, 2002	€5,775.00
Registration of land charge on October 29, 2002	€437.00
LJK various fees Nov.28, 2002	€831.60
Notary costs for declaration of division May 23, 2002	€589.57
Notary fees for land charge July 27, 2002	€158.49
Notary costs purchase contract July 24, 2002	€1,260.86
Notary costs land charge Oct.04, 2002	€501.99

Mr. Fruhnert claims that he legally acquired the property at Gleisenauer Str. 14, 96271 Grub am Forst through the forced sale on Sept. 22, 2009. A land charge was auctioned that had been entered in the land register for Deutsche Bank 24 in the amount of €73,626.03 in 1999.
Mr. Fruhnert claims that he is registered in the land register as the owner of the property at Gleisenauer Str. 14, 96271 Grub am Forst.
The Applicant pointed out to Mr. Fruhnert that a land register entry is not proof of ownership, but merely a presumption. A land register entry is not a deed. The land registry makes entries on the basis of a deed. Changes of ownership of a property must be confirmed by a notarial deed.

The Applicant received a penalty order of € 1,600 for trespassing and threatening. The Applicant rejects this. It is to be negotiated. The Applicant objected to the judge on grounds of bias because the Applicant's witnesses for the defense, the police officers who were on site and the bailiff who did not serve the summons were not summoned.
The Applicant's criminal complaint with notarized contracts, court letters and extracts from the land register were withheld. The Applicant was sentenced in absentia.

Although the legal situation has now been clarified, the Coburg authorities are continuing as they began in 2004. Every lawful act by the Applicant constitutes a criminal offense, every punishable act against the Applicant is declared legal. All evidence of innocence is suppressed and exonerating witnesses are not heard.

Conclusion
So the Applicant's tenant refuses written confirmation of having received registered letters. The bailiffs, who are legally obliged to officially serve letters, do not do so. The Applicant can therefore not receive written confirmation that the tenant has been served notice.
Attempts to effect personal service will be prosecuted under criminal law.
This means that no civil proceedings can be carried out.
The land registry allegedly confirms that the tenant is the owner of the Applicant's property

without providing any evidence of this because there is no proof.
The superior for the bailiffs and the land registry is the director of the Coburg District Court, Ms. Barausch, who was previously a judge at the Coburg Regional Court and who rejected the Applicant's action for damages, who, as group leader of the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office, was responsible for the criminal prosecution for fraud and who rejected the criminal complaint against Mr. Judicial Officer Welsch on suspicion of obstruction of justice.

With the criminal complaint against the Applicant for trespassing because he personally served the mail, an attempted theft, attempted fraud, completed theft, completed fraud and the criminal offense of receiving stolen goods were fulfilled.
But the state protects thieves, fraudsters and fences. This turns these crimes into gang robbery.
But not only that.
Nationals of the National Socialist German Reich act in the interests of a national of the National Socialist German Reich
against

a) a "holder of German nationality within the meaning of Article 116 (1) of the Basic Law", a Danzig national, who has yet to receive compensation/reparations,
b) a German who may not be deprived of his property and inheritance under Article 14 of the Basic Law, who may not be deprived of his nationality, his ordre public, his property, his share of state assets and territory under Article 16 of the Basic Law,
c) a Danzig national who, according to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution, is subject to German law at the time of Jan. 1920, the law of the Federal Republic of Germany, which is guaranteed by the League of Nations or the legal successor to the League of Nations, the United Nations, and who is protected by the League of Nations or the legal successor to the United Nations.

The Applicant is prosecuted because he wants to initiate civil proceedings to claim his property. This is construed as an action against the state. The Applicant can be arrested on the basis of the Bavarian Police Duties Act.

The elements of the offense according to the statutes of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials are again fulfilled.
Violence is again used against a Danzig resident. This again constitutes the offense of a war of aggression, punishable under Charge No. 1 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.
The Applicant is again deprived of his Danzig nationality, his right, his ordre public, his claim to his property and inheritance, his claim to a share of the state assets and territory. The criminal offense according to Charge No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trial is fulfilled.
If the Applicant insists on his right, he is imprisoned. During the Applicant's detention from Dec. 21, 2012 - Oct. 18, 2013, the Applicant was still medically monitored during his hunger strikes, which the Applicant conducted so that his detention complaints could be dealt with.
No longer in 2017. The Applicant only survived this detention with serious damage to his health due to fortunate circumstances.
If the Applicant now wanted to enforce a fair trial by going on hunger strike, he would probably starve to death rather than being granted a fair trial.

So there is definitely a war being waged against the state under the rule of law, the Federal Republic of Germany.

The legislative proposal by Federal Minister of Justice Marco Buschmann to digitally record court hearings was rejected and this measure was postponed until 2030.
The entire press and the EU must know that Germany should not be in the EU for this reason alone.

This example proves that politicians are being put under pressure.

This is an act of war by nationals of the German Reich against a national of the Free City of Danzig.
The nationals have therefore lost all rights again. Their assets must be confiscated without compensation.
The provisions of the Transition Treaty apply:
Transition Treaty and " Enemy State Clauses" in the Light of the Sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Germany under International Law
- Elaboration Scientific Services of the German Bundestag
Author: Editor: redacted.
Transition Treaty and "Enemy State Clauses"`: Elaboration WD 2 - 108/06 : Completion of work: June 21, 2006 : Department WD 2: Foreign Affairs, International Law, Economic Cooperation and Development, Defense, Human Rights and Humanitarian Aid
"...1.4 The exchange of notes of September 27/28, 1990.
According to this, the following provisions of the Transition Treaty remain effective after 1990:
- from Part One: Art. 1 para. 1 sentence 1 to "... repeal or amend legislation" as well as paras. 3, 4 and 5, Art. 2 para. 1, Art. 3 paras. 2 and 3, Art. 5 paras. 1 and 3, Art. 7 para. 1 and Art. 8,
- from the third part: Art. 3 para. 5 letter a of the Annex, Art. 6 para. 3 of the Annex,
- from Part Six: Art. 3 para. 1 and 3,
- from the seventh part: Art. 1 and Art. 2, - from the ninth part: Art. 1, - from the tenth part: Art. 4.

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.*

With whom did the victorious powers conclude agreements? These are the Danzigers from the peace treaties of the First World War. Treaties can be negotiated.
On the basis of the state of war? With whom can a state of war still occur after the agreement of the Two-plus-Four Treaty? If the nationals of the German Reich again commit acts of war within the meaning of the Hague IV. Convention on Land Warfare, specifically violating Article 43 or public policy towards the Danzigers. In a state of war, there is no negotiation, only enforcement.
This exchange of notes is not a friendly reminder, but still a military order issued by the Free City of Danzig's still existing supreme executive.

Anyone who resists this order becomes an enemy of the supreme executive of the Free City of Danzig.

The current war in Ukraine
The democratically elected pro-Russian president of Ukraine was removed by violent, professionally trained demonstrators. Crimea and eastern Ukraine have seceded. The Minsk peace talks followed. Nevertheless, the fighting continued. The Russian Federation rightly sees itself threatened by Nazis under the protection of NATO. It demands security guarantees, preferably the neutrality of Ukraine. This is rejected.
Mr. Russian President Putin called the President of France to point out to him that the President of Ukraine, Mr. Selenskyi, was not adhering to the Minsk Agreement.
The Russian Federation moved up to the gates of Kiev with a military column 60 kilometers long. Promising peace talks were held and the Russian Federation withdrew from Kiev.

However, Mr. Selenskyi apparently received the promise that he would receive support in a war with the Russian Federation and that he would soon join the EU and NATO. This would give him economic support from the EU and allow him to reduce military spending.
War has been deliberately stirred up. Mr. Selenskyi promised that Crimea would be conquered by September 2022. But that was wishful thinking. Mr. Selenskyi's demands are almost outrageous: Weapons, weapons, weapons and financial support. But all weapons are useless if there are no soldiers willing to sacrifice their lives.

Until the war in Ukraine, the Federal Republic of Germany adhered to the iron principle that no weapons should be supplied to crisis regions. For example, it refused to supply armored vehicles to Saudi Arabia because these vehicles could also be used against demonstrators.
The former German Minister of Justice Ms Lamprecht of the SPD, who changed the Nationality Act of the German Reich on the initiative of the Applicant and confirmed that the Two-plus-Four Treaty had not been realized, was opposed to the promise of arms deliveries to Ukraine and was therefore torn apart by the Nazi press and had to resign.
Chancellor Olaf Scholz was torn apart by the Nazi press because he was supposedly the only one against the delivery of tanks to Ukraine. The entire press claimed that all NATO states, above all the USA, had promised Ukraine the delivery of tanks. But when Mr. Olaf Scholz agreed, the USA claimed that they had been forced by Mr. Scholz to deliver tanks.
The Nazi press wants Germany to supply Taurus missiles. But for technical reasons these have to be directed from the German side. The delivery of Taurus missiles would definitely lead to war against the Russian Federation and thus to a world war.

The German Foreign Minister, Ms. Bearbock of the "Greens", is a Young Global Leader by the grace of Mr. Klaus Schwab. She promises Ukraine unconditional support for as long as it wants it. At the same time, she is determining defense policy.
The German "Green" Economics Minister confesses that he is influenced by an economist from the WEF. He loudly proclaims: "The Russian Federation uses gas as a weapon" and claims that the Russian Federation does not supply gas. Yet it is he who no longer buys Russian gas. That is why Germany is in an economic downturn. The President of Ukraine is calling for sanctions against the Russian Federation and a ban on the purchase of Russian gas and oil. But the Russian Federation adheres to the supply contracts and routes gas to the EU via Ukraine.
Older people in the GDR still remember how they were lied to by the press. First everything was red and then from one day to the next everything was black.

In the GDR, the AfD (Alternative for Germany) has approval ratings of 35%, while the Greens do not reach 5% in some cases. But the "Greens" determine politics in the FRG. The Office for the Protection of the Constitution has applied for immunity to be lifted 7 times against the Thuringian AFD MP Klaus Höcke for alleged incitement of the people. The majority in parliament agreed 7 times. But not a single conviction was handed down. A newly elected member of parliament for the AfD in Bavaria was arrested today for alleged incitement of the people. But not because of publicly expressed opinions, but because there were allegedly clues on a laptop belonging to German " fraternities". The German fraternities were founded 200 years ago to unite the small German states. The national colors black, red and yellow go back to these fraternities.

A prominent voice from the Russian Federation: Solovyov: Will take Germany again.
"I mean, if Germany continues to be ruled by Nazis, Germany will suffer the same fate as every time anti-Russian rulers came to power in Germany. It always ended with a Russian soldier marching into Berlin"

Treaty on the Final Settlement in Respect of Germany, September 12, 1990 (Two-plus-Four Treaty)
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,….
Foreign armed forces and nuclear weapons or their carriers will not be stationed in that part of Germany or deployed there.
So even after the realization of the Two-plus-Four Treaty, no NATO units may be stationed in the GDR.
The Russian Federation could therefore invade the GDR without NATO forces being allowed to intervene there.
But with the Constitution of Germany, the Russian Federation can participate in an International Protecting Power and thus as part of the executive and thus ensure its own security.

What is the motive for eliminating the rule of law?
Who benefits from the fact that all guarantees of the rule of law are no longer guaranteed?
These are the strategic partners of the WEF. Ordinary citizens can no longer peacefully assert their rights against the WEF's strategic partners.

Mr. Nordmann, who represents the DSM Group, admonished the Swiss Federal Supreme Court in his 77-page appeal against the Arbitral Award of 14 Oct. 2015: "Imagine if this example sets a precedent."
Since then, the Nazis have been in a panic.

The coronavirus is quickly released. The WHO had previously changed the definition of a pandemic so that a moderately severe flu could be called a pandemic. The corona measures were only counterproductive with enormous damage in every respect. The Applicant, for example, is proven immune. Nevertheless, as the lesser of two evils, he has to contribute around €10,000 to the costs.
The sale of effective remedies, such as Invermectin, has been partially banned and the prices for them have been greatly increased.
In Montreal, agriculture was presented as the scourge of mankind, responsible for hunger and misery in the world and that agricultural production must therefore be reduced.

Brilliant rhetoric is used to argue and even self-appointed or elected experts are listened to and decisions are made over the heads of the population.
There are now calls for the protection of the civilian population in the Gaza Strip. Where are the police to prosecute those who have murdered civilians?

Where are the court proceedings in which the pros and cons are weighed up point by point and everyone can take part in a public hearing?

Why don't the Palestinians sue Israel for damages and thereby settle their dispute? Because neither side will bow to arbitration?
Why does the Charter of the United Nations, Art. 33, say that states undertake to settle disputes by arbitration if necessary in order to protect their populations from the hostage of war? That is the first duty of every state.
Disputes are part of everyday life and then a court is called upon and enforced with a neutral power that serves each party equally.

Every war is waged with the assertion that the people want to receive or obtain their rights.
Citizens are taken hostage by governments that, in case of doubt, do not represent the interests of their citizens. The supposedly democratic politicians behave towards their people like absolutist rulers, masters of life and death.
But the people cannot enforce their will in fair court proceedings.

Before which court should an eastern Ukrainian who prefers to live in western Ukraine sue for damages?

But only before an international court of arbitration.
The Applicant has proven that arbitration proceedings are part of the general rules of international law and are mandatory in international legal relationships.
Arbitration proceedings are agreed in Article 33 of the United Nations Charter for the peaceful settlement of disputes. 168 states have ratified the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards of 1958. Chapter 12 of the Swiss Private International Law Act regulates arbitration proceedings. Anyone can make use of this if at least one party is not domiciled in Switzerland.

With the Constitution of Germany, an international protective power becomes the supreme executive, which every nation can join to the same extent.

The Constitution of Germany is enforced by expropriating the nationals of the German Reich without compensation. Anyone can avert this expropriation without compensation by applying for German nationality.

Like every other national of the German Reich, Mr. Klaus Schwab must be expropriated without compensation.
Then one should realize on an international level which persons one is dealing with.
Mr. Klaus Schwab can end these measures against him very easily by

a. providing clarification himself and asking his strategic partners to take a stand on how it can be that their legal departments remain silent about the Bavarian dictatorship and
b. by applying for German nationality.

This becomes known and the Constitution of Germany is quickly enforced. The wars and the arms race come to an end.
Instead of building tanks, seawater can be desalinated to irrigate deserts. There are no more climate problems and no more hunger.

Strategic partner of the World Economic Forum
A concrete example of the fact that strategic partners of the WEF dominate state bodies is the strategic partner of the WEF, Koninklijke DSM N.V.. Koninklijke DSM N.V. has a Code of Business Conduct. This ensures compliance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. All forms of corruption are rejected. If the Code of Business Conduct cannot be complied with in a country, Koninklijke DSM N.V. will look for solutions itself. Every partner of Koninklijke DSM N. V. is obliged to comply with the Code of Business Conduct. This means that the Code of Business Conduct also applies to the WEF. Every six months, all employees must sign an undertaking to comply with the Code of Business Conduct and to report any breaches of the Code in the future. Employees are therefore liable.
The Code of Business Conduct is therefore something like the constitution of Koninklijke DSM N.V.

In reality, Koninklijke DSM N.V. violates the Code of Business Conduct to the greatest possible extent. Anyone who reports violations and attempts to enforce compliance is economically destroyed. The company does not shy away from grievous bodily harm and deprivation of liberty.
The Applicant has himself been a victim.
The Chief Public Prosecutor of the Coburg Regional Court, Mr. Lohneis, had requested the Swiss Confederation to extradite the Applicant to enforce three criminal convictions and to bring him to trial for alleged illegal possession of weapons. The weapons in question were hunting weapons which the Applicant had to purchase ex officio in order to exercise his profession as a professional hunter. That was a Bockbüchsflinte. This is a breech-loading rifle with a rifle barrel and a shot barrel. Once a bullet had been fired, the barrel had to be tilted to pull out the empty cartridge case in order to insert a new cartridge by hand. In order to relieve wounded game of unnecessary suffering, the Applicant had to possess a handgun. This was a decommissioned army pistol of the cheapest design, a small-caliber rifle and an air rifle were the other weapons. You could just as well call every policeman an illegal gun owner. In

Switzerland, everyone has an assault rifle and an army pistol. There was no bilateral criminal liability in this case. The Swiss Federal Office of Justice refused extradition to enforce three criminal convictions and only authorized the person to be brought to trial for alleged illegal possession of weapons so that an international arrest warrant could be revoked. The Applicant nevertheless refused extradition on the grounds that the conditions and requirements of extradition would not be complied with. The Swiss Federal Supreme Court approved the extradition on the grounds that the Federal Republic of Germany is a reliable contracting state. The Applicant was proved right. During the extradition, unauthorized prosecution measures were carried out in relation to the Free City of Danzig. In order to remedy the violations of the extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice, Mr. Lohneis requested extended extradition, expressly under the same case number: B 224/163 TMA. The Swiss Confederation subsequently refused the entire extradition on March 10, 2014 on the grounds that the request was not for extradition for criminal acts, but for political reasons.
After the Applicant no longer had to expect to be arrested and extradited on a daily basis, he registered a business consultancy.
The Dutch woman Dr. Hospers asked the Applicant to represent her.

Dr. Hospers was an almost ingenious scientist. Her doctoral thesis has been cited 360 times to date, even after 20 years. Research on a drug at Atana was to be discontinued. Dr. Hospers remonstrated against this. Statistics had been misinterpreted. The research was resumed. Today, this drug is a bestseller. Since then, Dr. Hospers' method has had to be followed.

She accepted a position with the dependent subsidiary of Koninklijke DSM N.V., DSM Nutritional Product AG, based in Switzerland. The contract was sent to her at her place of residence in Germany, where she signed it. The contract was countersigned in Switzerland.

She initially started with a workload of 100%. She was then asked to take on deputies and worked 1.55% of the normal workload. She completed her studies on the side and worked 200% without neglecting her social contacts. At a meeting, the CEO of Koninklijke DSM N. V., Mr. Feike Sijbesma, also explained to Dr. Hospers that the future of the group depended on 50 top projects. Dr. Hospers was asked to work on 3 top 50 projects. She realized that one project had no chance of success. She remonstrated against it. But 6 managers demanded that this particular project be given priority. There was no one in the department with 40 scientists who could have taken a project off her hands. The other project managers also expected performance. Dr. Hospers inevitably and predictably suffered a drop in performance and was dismissed. When she approached the Applicant, she was only able to follow the conversation for 30 minutes. Based on the Applicant's professional experience, he immediately recognized that there was a stress-related drop in performance. When working at peak performance under stress, a break of 15 minutes must be taken after 45 minutes, otherwise there is a risk of prolonged loss of performance. Footballers are a well-known example. Peak performance under stress can lead to death within hours. A well-known example is the runner from Marathon who warned the Greeks against the Persians. He did not die from exhaustion, but from stress. If no breaks are taken, the batteries figuratively burn out and this can lead to disability.

Dr. Hospers therefore asked the Applicant for help. The Applicant was initially only to represent Dr. Hospers organizationally. The first lawyer immediately declined to represent Dr. Hospers vis-à-vis the DSM Group due to bias. Five other lawyers also refused to represent her. So the Applicant had to represent Dr. Hospers in court.
The Applicant took from the files: the envelope in which the contract was sent to Germany, the cover letter with the mailing address in Germany and the confirmation of residence in Germany. Dr. Hospers signed the contract with Koninklijke DSM N. V. there. This contract was countersigned by the dependent subsidiary of the DSM Group, DSM Nutritional Products AG in Switzerland. International legal relationships therefore exist. According to Article 2 of the Swiss Code of Civil Procedure, this may not be applied in the event of a dispute. Arbitration proceedings must therefore be conducted in accordance with Chapter 12 of the Swiss Private International Law Act (sIPRG).

The Applicant further gathered from Dr. Hospers' emails that she worked until 10 o'clock in the evening, on weekends and even on vacation. Finally, she suffered a drop in performance in Oct. 2011. Dr. Hospers' laptop was delivered to her home so that she should continue working. Immediately after the drop in performance, the one Top 50 project she had objected to was discontinued for exactly the reasons she had given. CHF 100 thousand of research money was spent in vain and Dr. Hospers became unable to work - negligent or even grossly negligent bodily injury.
Ms. Hospers slowly built up her capacity again. After a year, the family doctor certified a capacity of 40% based on close observation. However, the DSM Group sent Dr. Hospers to the Psychiatrist Dr. Hodzic, stating that Dr. Hospers would have been dismissed. Dr. Hodzic said without any examination that Dr. Hospers was 80% fit for work and that she should take psychotropic drugs under supervision. This is poison in the event of a stress-related drop in performance - a false medical opinion. But the DSM Group threatened to prosecute the family doctor for a false medical report. But the family doctor could not be intimidated.

According to her employment contract, Dr. Hospers receives her full salary until she retires if she is unable to work. But she can be dismissed if she does not meet the required performance.

Dr. Hospers was forced to renounce 20% of her salary and only perform at 80% of the required level. The DSM Group sent a memo to the Disability Office in which Dr. Hospers agreed to work only 80%. But Dr. Hospers did not sign this memo - forgery. Finally, Dr. Hospers was presented with false legal provisions according to which she could be dismissed without notice - fraudulent misrepresentation. But Dr. Hospers still did not agree. But then they simply withheld 20% of her salary - theft. Dr. Hospers was supposed to work 80%. She just managed to be present 80% of the time.
Dr. Hospers did not feel well. She went to the family doctor. He found elevated inflammation levels in her blood and certified that she was unfit for work.
Dr. Hospers was nevertheless dismissed in April 2014. She had to see Dr. Hodzic again. The Applicant took Dr. Hospers' first expert opinion. After all, he had recorded the conversation with Dr. Hospers. Dr. Hospers stated right at the beginning of the interview that she could not work under stress. But instead of asking about this, Dr. Hodzic deflected.

There is a list of questions that can be used to check for stress-related incapacity to work. The Applicant confronted Dr. Hodzic with this. The summons to Dr. Hodzic states that Dr. Hospers has not resigned, although she was dismissed. The first summons stated that Dr. Hospers had been terminated even though she had not been terminated. The first time, Dr. Hodzic certified that she was 80% fit for work. This meant that she could not be dismissed. Now Dr. Hodzic certifies that she is 100% fit for work. Because the Applicant informed Dr. Hodzic that his first report was unfounded, Dr. Hodzic qualified his assessment by stating: "100% fit for work from a psychological point of view." The family doctor, on the other hand, certified Dr. Hospers as unfit for work. There is a suspicion that there is an agreement between the DSM Group and Dr. Hodzic that he will either certify Dr. Hodzic's incapacity to work or his ability to work according to the notification of whether or not he has been dismissed - suspicion of an agreement to commit fraud.

The Invalidity Office announced that Dr. Hospers had recovered and that the proceedings had been discontinued. She would have received the letter. However, the Applicant has accepted all the mail and is a witness that no such letter was sent. Moreover, Dr. Hospers had pointed out to the Invalidity Office in November 2013 that she was still far from being able to work. This letter was not found in the files of the Invalidity Office - falsification of documents. But Dr. Hospers had also sent this letter by email. The Applicant sued the Invalidity Office. The pension proceedings were resumed.

However, Dr. Hospers did not receive any financial support from any side, despite having taken

out all possible insurance policies, but is supposed to continue paying her insurance policies, for example because of an early pension - suspicion of joint fraud.
In consideration of Dr. Hospers' health, the Applicant sued the DSM Group for minimal loss of earnings in arbitration proceedings and the other costs incurred by Dr. Hospers.
In the Arbitral Award of Oct. 14, 2015, Dr. Hospers was awarded damages.

Mr. Nordmann, a lawyer from the law firm Walder & Wyss, lodged a 77-page and 226-margin appeal against this decision. For formal reasons alone, this appeal should not have been accepted. But Dr. Hospers should have the complaint refuted by a lawyer within three weeks, otherwise the complaint will be accepted. This is an impossibility. The Applicant had already failed to find a lawyer to represent Dr. Hospers. The Applicant proved to the Federal Court that he can and may represent Dr. Hospers and refuted the DSM Group's complaint in due time, marginal number by marginal number.
The 6 claims from the arbitral award were only given one of 226 marginal numbers in passing. The main argument is that the contract should have been signed by Dr. Hospers in Switzerland. As evidence, Mr. Nordmann named Mr. Isler from the legal department of DSM Nutritional Product AG. But Mr. Isler was not present at the signing of the contract and of course he did not countersign the contract. In a trial, Mr. Isler would probably have made a false statement in court.
The main subject of the complaint is the political persecution of the Applicant due to his Danzig nationality. The Applicant therefore bought the claims against the DSM Group. Ms. Federal Judge Kiss did not want to take note of the change of party, so the Applicant rejected Ms. Federal Judge Kiss. She then resigned for personal reasons.

As expected, the Swiss Federal Supreme Court ruled incorrectly on March 9, 2016 without consultation or a hearing. Federal Judge Klett ruled that Dr. Hospers had signed the contract in Switzerland. The court was presented with the envelope sent to Germany, the cover letter with the address in Germany and the confirmation of residence. Nothing was suspended with regard to the claims, only that the case should have been heard in accordance with the ZPO.
Federal Judge Klett should have asked Mr. Isler to testify when and where Dr. Hospers signed the contract. Then Mr. Isler would either have had to make a false statement in court or confess that the court had been deceived by Mr. Nordmann.

Naturally, the Applicant lodged an appeal. The Aargau Canton Police then broke down the Applicant's front door on April 15, 2016 and extradited him to Germany in handcuffs.
This was already ruled out due to the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons between Switzerland and the EU. Under this agreement, the Applicant has the same rights of residence as a Swiss national. If the Applicant had been deported, he could have turned on his heel and re-entered Switzerland immediately. But the Applicant had notified all authorities of his refusal to be extradited. A total of 52 times. It was therefore known that an arrest warrant had been issued for the Applicant.
The Applicant was therefore not taken across the nearby highway crossing. Neither the Swiss border police nor the German federal police would have allowed this. The Applicant was taken to a small, usually unmanned border crossing, where the local police were waiting with an arrest warrant because they had been informed by the cantonal police that the Applicant would be extradited there.

The criminal offense of deprivation of liberty was deliberately committed. The Applicant should not be given the opportunity to enforce the arbitral award. In addition, the Applicant was not supposed to transfer the court costs for the bias applications, which were accepted as well-founded appeals, as usual, but to pay them in cash, which of course was not possible in prison. Without prior organization, the appeals would not have been paid.
The Applicant was only arrested and extradited so that the arbitral award could not be enforced.

Unexpectedly deprived of her representative, Dr. Hospers went into shock and lost 10 kilos in weight within a few weeks. She turned gray. She has been helpless ever since. It was known that Dr. Hospers' resistance to stress was zero. It was accepted that she would suffer further serious damage to her health - suspicion of intentional grievous bodily harm.
In order to destroy the arbitral award, a duty lawyer was imposed on the Applicant's client under the threat of incapacitating her if she refused - coercion, blackmail. Legal action is to be taken against the DSM Group. The Applicant's client was no longer a party. It was known that the petitioner had represented Dr. Hospers up to the Federal Court and now she has to take a duty lawyer. This proves that it was known that the Applicant was in custody abroad.
This proves that the Applicant was only extradited and deprived of his liberty in order to destroy the Arbitral Award of October 14, 2015.
No decision was made on the paid appeals. Nevertheless, CHF 10,000 was simply debited from Dr. Hospers' account under protest - theft.

A polydisciplinary expert opinion found that Dr. Hospers was overworked by the DSM Group and therefore had to retire. The Arbitral Award of Oct. 14, 2015 was thus confirmed.
As an argument against the DSM Group, Dr. Hospers' duty lawyer submitted the DSM Group's 77-page complaint to the Rheinfelden District Court. As a result, the duty lawyer was threatened by Mr. Nordmann with professional consequences - coercion.

It was only through fortunate circumstances that the Applicant was released on April 13, 2017 with serious damage to his health. However, the Applicant continued to be pursued with an arrest warrant expressly because of his Danzig nationality and therefore had to return to Switzerland. There he was now prosecuted for illegal residence and for Danzig identity cards. Once again. The criminal offense of illegal residence does not exist for a European in Switzerland and in the matter of Danzig ID cards, the competent Public Prosecutor's Office of the Canton of Graubünden had issued a first-class acquittal, which cannot be appealed, Case No. EK.2013.5653/RI, and the Swiss Federal Office of Justice therefore rejected the prosecution - criminal offense: persecution of innocent persons.

Dr. Hospers herself was not allowed to make any submissions to the court. She was sentenced in absentia to pay CHF 18,000 in court costs. Although Dr. Hospers was dismissed despite having a cold and although she should have received continued payment of her salary for at least 6 months on the basis of the statutory provisions alone, although she should have received her full salary until retirement on the basis of her employment contract, although the poly-disciplinary expert opinion established that her disability was caused by the DSM Group and that she is therefore entitled to a loss of earnings, she was not awarded any compensation by the court - perverting the course of justice.
Naturally, an appeal was lodged against this. Swiss Post confirms that Dr. Hospers did not receive registered letters from the court due to the fault of Swiss Post. Nevertheless, Dr. Hospers had to pay CHF 18,000 under threat of criminal prosecution and presentation to the police - predatory extortion.

Naturally, the head office of Koninklijke DSN N. V. in the Netherlands was informed and finally the company's specially established whistleblower office. Mr. Nordmann always replies, assuring that he is acting on behalf of Mr. Feike Sijbesma and that he is responsible.
Finally, an application was made to enforce the arbitration ruling directly in the Netherlands against Koninklijke DSM N. V. For this purpose, the violations of the Code of Business Conduct were translated by an interpreter. Dr. Hospers was unable to do this for health reasons, so that the Dutch lawyer of Koninklijke DSM N. V., Mr. Bekius, was informed. The enforcement of the arbitral award was an accommodating offer. When purchasing the claims from Dr. Hospers, the Applicant undertook to make further claims if the proceedings in the Federal Court did not end.
Instead of accepting the offer, Mr. Bekius submitted the Federal Court Judgment of March 9, 2016 to the Dutch court and claimed that the court should be deceived. The lawyer who was to enforce the arbitral award resigned without giving reasons. The Applicant informed the Dutch court that if Mr. Bekius was already submitting the Federal Court judgment, then he must also

submit the appeals against it. Mr. Bekius told the court: "Do not read what Mr. von Prince writes." - Fraudulent misrepresentation of the court.

There is a duty of attorney in the Netherlands, so the Applicant filed suit in San Francisco against both the DSM Group and the Swiss Confederation. A dispute arose over the jurisdiction of the court.
Meanwhile, Dr. Hospers sued the Applicant in Washington DC. There, the Applicant himself had filed a lawsuit for the realization of the Two-plus-Four Treaty.
For this reason, the Applicant conducted new arbitration proceedings. To this end, the Applicant sent the files of the previous court proceedings to the arbitrator. In the meantime, 12 applications for bias and two declaratory actions had been filed, which were not processed. The arbitrator ruled on the 12 applications for bias and 2 declaratory actions within a week. That was easy. He only had to decide whether the contract with the DSM Group was signed in Germany or in Switzerland.
The costs of the arbitration proceedings amounted to just €5,000.
The facts and offenses cited were thus confirmed.

The new arbitral award must now be enforced. The Applicant submitted this arbitral award to the Swiss tax authorities for offsetting against the taxes that Dr. Hospers must pay. Naturally, Dr. Hospers deducted the costs of the arbitration proceedings from her income. The tax authorities do not recognize these costs and the arbitration proceedings.

Contrary to Article 2 of its own Code of Civil Procedure, the Swiss Confederation is assuming sovereign jurisdiction in a contract signed by a Dutch woman in Germany, thereby violating the general rules of international law.
Switzerland is taking sides in the contract of Koninklijke DSM N. V. with the Code of Business Conduct and must abide by it itself. If Swiss courts rule on a treaty, then they must abide by the treaty. But they violate it to the greatest possible extent.
The Applicant purchased the claims from the contract with Koninklijke DSM N. V. because the main subject of the complaint against the Arbitral Award of October 14, 2015 was the political persecution of the Applicant due to his Danzig nationality. It was therefore known that the Applicant is a national of the Free City of Danzig, including the Swiss Federal Court.
The Swiss Confederation therefore deliberately took sides to the detriment of a person entitled to reparations in favor of those obliged to pay reparations. The amount of reparations can be negotiated.
But an arrest on the grounds of nationality falls under acts of war.
This means that the same provisions apply to Swiss nationals as to nationals of the German Reich.

The Swiss tax authorities do not recognize international and Swiss law. They do not prosecute the crimes mentioned and proven. The Swiss authorities are violating the general rules of international law and are holding every Swiss citizen liable with all their assets.
The Swiss authorities are thus acting against their own people and are hostile agents under international law.

They are therefore subject to the same regulations that apply to nationals of the German Reich - see, as already quoted, the provisions of the Transitional Treaty.

Since the Applicant has purchased the claims against Koninklijke DSM N. V., it has also assumed the obligations under the Code of Business Conduct and must report violations in the same way in the future so that violations no longer occur, otherwise the Applicant itself will be liable.

Therefore, the Applicant issues an arrest warrant against Mr. Feike Sijbesma. There is no other possibility of an effective complaint about the violation of the Code of Business Conduct.

The Applicant is confirmed as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig. According to Article 76 of the Danzig Constitution, a Danzig national is entitled to protection from foreign countries, both abroad and in the country. This protection is guaranteed to the nationals of Danzig by all states on the basis of the Hague IV. Land Warfare Convention.
Danzig decisions must therefore be enforced by all states. In this case, an arrest warrant.
The person concerned can only raise the objection that this arrest warrant is not compatible with the ordre public of the Free City of Danzig.

Arrest Warrant against Mr. Feike Sijbesma
Mr. Feike Sijbesma was born in Nieuw-Loosdrecht in the Netherlands. He is a national of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.
He was CEO of Koninklijke DSM N.V. from 2007 to 2020. Since 2020, he has been Honorary Chairman of Koninklijke DSM N.V.. His successors as CEO are Ms. Geraldine Matchett and Mr. Dimitri de Vreeze.
He is also

- Member of the Supervisory Board of the Dutch Central Bank
- Co-Chairman of the Global Center of Adaptation (GCA)
- Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN), member of the Lead Group and Founder/Co-Chair of the SUN Business Network (appointed by United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in 2016), and also supports Unicef's GenU.
- Senior Advisor to the Ocean Cleanup
- Senior Advisor African Improved Foods (AIF)

Mr. Feike Sijbesma himself created the Code of Business Conduct of Koninklijke DSM N.V.. This Code of Business Conduct ensures compliance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Every employee must sign it every six months to report any violations, also in the future. This creates personal liability for the CEO in particular.
Mr. Feike Sijbesma is suspected of being the instigator of subsequent criminal acts in order to cover up a bodily injury that led to disability.

He is suspected of instigating criminal offenses such as forgery of documents, false medical reports, coercion/extortion and, finally, obstruction of justice, extortion, prosecution of innocent persons and execution against innocent persons/deprivation of liberty in order to prevent the enforcement of an arbitral award against Koninklijke DSM N.V. in which it is proven that the Code of Business Conduct was violated.

As CEO of Koninklijke DSM N.V., the motive for instigating the aforementioned offenses was to spare Koninklijke DSM N.V. compensation payments for bodily injury that led to disability. But also that it was discovered that the Code of Business Conduct of Koninklijke DSM N.V. was violated and that Mr. Feike Sijbesma as CEO was also particularly responsible for the fact that the Code of Business Conduct could be violated.

Mr. Feike Sijbesma has appointed Mr. Philippe Nordmann, Attorney at Law, Walder Wyss AG, Aeschenvorstadt 48, P.O. Box 633, CH-4010 Basel, Switzerland, to represent the DSM Group.

The perpetrators are mainly civil servants and state judges. Mr. Feike Sijbesma therefore does not believe that he is at risk of criminal prosecution.

However, in his complaint against the Arbitral Award of 14 Oct. 2015, Mr. Nordmann deliberately made the political persecution of Mr. Beowulf Adalbert von Prince because of his nationality of the Free City of Danzig the subject of the proceedings. As the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig, Mr. von Prince was wanted by the nationals of the German Reich with an arrest warrant. Mr. Feike Sijbesma has thus taken sides in the interests

of Koninklijke DSM N.V. in favour of the nationals of the German Reich, such as Mr. Klaus Schwab. Mr. Klaus Schwab is the founder and director of the World Economic Forum, of which Mr. Feike Sijbesma is also a member of the Board of Trustees. There is a suspicion of collusion between Mr. Feike Sijbesma and Mr. Klaus Schwab. Koninklijke DSM N.V. also wanted to profit from the illegal war of aggression against the Free City of Danzig, which has not ended, and is therefore treated in the same way as nationals of the German Reich.

Mr. Feike Sijbesma may enjoy immunity from certain states. States that do not issue a national arrest warrant against Mr. Feike Sijbesma are suspected of siding with war criminals against the state for which the United Nations was once founded.
A state that does not issue a national arrest warrant against Mr. Feike Sijbesma must be classified as an enemy state under Articles 53 and 107 of the Charter of the United Nations and therefore cannot be a member of the UN.

Enforcement is therefore also ordered against all the assets of Koninklijke DSM N. V.

Mr. Feike Sijbesma can avert this arrest warrant by declaring in a public document that he had no knowledge of the aforementioned crimes and that, in accordance with his own obligation under the Code of Business Conduct of Koninklijke DSM N. V., he will immediately ensure that those responsible are brought to justice.

The arrest warrant will be forwarded to Interpol.

11.09.2023 Benedikt von Prince