The Homepage of the Interest Group

https://www.ig-gmg-geschaedigte.de/

Article 20 Basic Law; Paragraph 4 is one of the fundamental rights of every citizen

(1) The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social federal state.
(2) **All state power emanates from the people. It is exercised by the people** in elections and votes and by special legislative, executive and judicial organs.
(3) Legislation is attached to the constitutional order; the executive power and the **judiciary are bound by law and justice.**
(4) All Germans have the right to resist anyone who undertakes to abolish this order if no other remedy is possible.

+++ Swiss Social Democrat judge Andreas Zünd breaks European Convention to protect German SPD from complaint – the German office employee Axel Müller-Elschner guides his hand – all 47 judges of the European Court of Justice are legally responsible for breaking the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms +++

20220206__Three OPEN LETTERs to all judges of the ECtHR (ENG)__Drei OFFENE BRIEFE an alle Richter des EGMR (DEU).pdf (1.63 MB)

+++ The German judges carry out "judiciary" using Nazi methodology – Those primarily responsible are the party politicians +++

20201217_Offener Brief an die hauptverantwortlichen Parteipolitiker & die verfassungswidriges „Richterrecht" sprechenden Richter.pdf (71.28 KB)

Previous Open Letters:
+++ The revelation of party oligarchs and kleptocrats – Open Letter to Hubertus Heil (SPD), Federal Minister of Labor and Social Affairs, and to Jens Spahn (CDU), Federal Minister of Health +++
20200925_Offener Brief an BM Hubertus Heil BM Jens Spahn.pdf (163.81KB)
+++ A sharp headwind comes up. Open letters to the Federal Constitutional Court.+++
Offener Brief an Voßkuhle & Co (verallgemeinerte Variante).pdf (56.81KB)

update: homepage 26.04.2022 websites 12.05.2022 Herunterladen > Startseite_20220426 (DEU).pdf
download > Homepage_20220707 (ENG).pdf

Our interest group of GMG-damaged directly insured persons is a committed association of pensioners or pensioners-to-be who act on an equal footing. As a result of the "Healthcare Modernization Act" (GMG), which came into force in 2004, and through the fraud established parallel to the "legislative process", these became or will become GMG victims

This fraud consists of the unlawful allegation that savings proceeds from private capital life insurance concluded via the employer are to be equated with pension payments/company pensions, which the statutory health insurance companies are allowed to skim off after the end of the insurance period.

The basic principle consists in the blurring of the 3rd pillar of old-age security, private retirement provision through savings, with the 2nd pillar of old-age security, company pension schemes. This blurring was conceived by party politicians and has been continuously promoted since 2004, with the aim of being able to skim off the private savings of pensioners with the help of the statutory health insurance companies, which have long been subordinate to the Federal Ministry of Health. The politicians find their decisive support in the judges, who they themselves have unconstitutionally chosen, with their seeks implanted in them during their studies to imagine themselves as part of the elite, their ineradicable seeks to foist a hidden meaning on the laws, which cannot found and is allegedly only accessible to them, and their craving to seek the true rulers of the democratic "constitutional state". The judges have actually found these in the established political parties,

to which they, as “servants of the rulers”, can serve with their arts of perverting language and perverting/bending the law.

Measured by the number of state and public-law organizations involved, this state-organized fraud based on bending the law and breaking the constitution is the biggest scandal in the history of the Federal Republic of Germany; contributors are:

- the established political parties (SPD, CDU/CSU, Bündnis 90/Die Grünen, ...),
- the executive (all governments in power since 2002),
- the legislature (with notable exceptions, the members since the 15th German Bundestag),
- the judiciary (all senates responsible for contribution law in all German social courts, the Federal Constitutional Court),
- of course, all those responsible (board members, legal representatives, appeals committees) of the statutory health insurance companies executing the fraud,
- the insurance companies (who falsely report a pension payment upon payment) and the employers registered as alleged policyholders (breach of the Insurance Contract Act § 1 by both),
- the supervisory authorities for financial service providers, BaFin and the Federal Ministry of Finance (BMF),
- the (general) public prosecutors, who as political officers of the Minister of Justice (executive) who are bound by their instructions, prevent criminal prosecution for the perpetrators from public-law organizations
- and unfortunately now also the so-called "Fourth Estate" (press, radio, television).

The trigger was and is the inability of the politicians of the established political parties to have an equally social, financially viable and legally compliant health policy, which has been demonstrated for several decades. The state-organized fraud, which has been practiced for 15 years now, has two main effects:

1) Pensioners with a private capital life insurance concluded via the employer for private provision (a risk component to protect the surviving dependents in the event of death, a second component for long-term savings (e.g. due to the usually not so lavish old-age pension) are cheated of 20% of their savings over a period of 10 years after the insurance ends.

2) In order to establish this fraud, the judiciary (all social courts and the Federal Constitutional Court) was systematically and persistently criminalized with the result that democracy and the rule of law in the Federal Republic of Germany were eliminated. This has long-term effects on society as a whole.

What solutions do we see resulting from this for our two main goals:

1) Of course, we want the money that was illegally stolen from us back and, as befits criminal reparations, with the statutory interest. As of the end of 2018, the accumulated stolen goods had a volume of 25.9 $^{+}/_{-}$ 0.1 billion EUR. The statutory health insurance companies have reserves of over 30 billion EUR (as of the beginning of 2019). This means that the statutory health insurance companies are currently holding the stolen goods in reserve and nothing stands in the way of an immediate repayment, except for the unwillingness of the perpetrators.

2) We see an obligation, as far as is within our power, to work towards the restoration of law and order and thus the restoration of democracy and the Rule of Law. We don't want to look the other way and we don't want to duck away and simply leave the destroyed democracy to future generations. That has happened all too often in German history. Restoring democracy and the Rule of Law is a Herculean task and, judging by the visible damage done, it may take years to decades.

It doesn't give the impression that this path is a viable one with this policy and these politicians. If that's the case, then it just has to be a different policy and different politicians. We insist on our fundamental rights under Article 20, Paragraph 4 of the Basic Law “All Germans have the right to resist anyone who undertakes to abolish this order if no other remedy is possible.”

The state-organized fraud is not the work of opaque organizations. The basis is breach of the constitution, fraud, bending the law and various other criminal offenses and these are to be assigned to the individual persons, i.e. the perpetrators. Against injustice, we use enlightenment according to law and order. Whenever possible, we not only name the crime, but also the names of the perpetrators.

What We Know

The GMG legislation was a series of constitutional breaches

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse“
[IG_S04] 20200704_Zusammenspiel_GKVen_BMGS_BSG (mit IG-Ref).pdf und
[IG_S05] 20181212_Die GMG-Gesetzgebung eine Serie von Verfassungsbrüchen_(v1.2).pdf
20181212_Die GMG-Gesetzgebung eine Serie Verfassungsbrüchen_(v1.2).pdf

The Red-Green Federal Government came to power on October 27, 1998. As early as 2001 and 2002, the statutory health insurance funds recorded annual deficits of around EUR 2 and 3 billion, respectively. On March 21, 2002, in a joint circular from the health and pension insurance providers (including the AOK national board), they announced that they were dreaming of collecting contributions for "original capital benefits".

In confidential talks, they certainly made it clear to selected representatives of the Red-Green Government (Ulla Schmidt, Gerhard Schröder, ...) what they meant by that. Today we also know that they meant the payment of contributions from the "savings balance" of the insured.

The fact that Mr. Franz Knieps gave up his job as managing director "politics" in the AOK federal association overnight in order to be employed by Ulla Schmidt as "department head" from February 1st, 2003 cannot seriously be assumed; the course for this will already have been set in 2002.

It is no coincidence that Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, in his government statement on March 14, 2003, moved “funded private provision” as the second pillar under “the umbrella of the [company] pensions scheme”.

In April 2003, the parties took positions in the Bundestag on individual health policy issues with different bills that were viewed through the party lens and none of which were able to win a majority. As early as February and March 2003, some ministerials in the BMGS were working on a draft for a health modernization law GMG. Neither in its 3rd rough draft nor in the 1st working draft were there any ideas for increasing contribution rates; There was only one idea for changes in the SGB V. This changed abruptly with a "compressed version of a draft" (May 8, 2003). The style and the structure of this document was now completely different; obviously Franz Knieps had now warmed up. In the working draft developed from this, there were already 164 proposed changes for SGB V and, above all, there was the idea of doubling the contribution rate for company pensions; at least €1.6 billion in additional income per year. In the explanation, this unbearable nonsense about solidarity appeared for the first time, as if the pensioners, when they were still working, hadn't also paid for the elderly in solidarity.

The "water" or the deficits of the statutory health insurance companies climbed incessantly. Around June 20, 2003, Gerhard Schröder asked Angela Merkel for a top-level discussion on health care reform, in vain, because Mrs. Merkel remembered how she was taken by surprise by him with the topic of the Riester pension at a meeting in June 2000.

In June 2003 there were again 3 different bills from the coalition, CDU/CSU and FDP, the 1st reading of which took place on June 18th, 2003 in the Bundestag. As arranged long beforehand between the parliamentary group leaders, these were referred to the Committee on Health and Social Security and to a number of "opinion-providing" committees.

The BMGS (Ulla Schmidt) invited an abnormal number of 136 associations and 41 so-called "experts" to the 4-day hearing in the Committee, only with the aim of drastically increasing the feeling among

parliamentarians that they are completely overwhelmed. The ruse worked, parliamentarians gave their passive consent to relinquish their constitutional rights and duties and "allowed" legislation to be devolved to an "extra-parliamentary commission" without any legal authority. There were no protests against the undermining of parliamentary democracy.

In the meantime, the CDU/CSU was also soft for an unconstitutional undermining of parliament. Seehofer's prerequisite for the "consensus talks" was that the SPD waived its draft law as a basis for discussion. The consensus talks took place from 07/03/2003 to 08/22/2003 (after the 1st session without FDP) in the CDU state representation in Baden-Württemberg. But the SPD kept the essentials in hand, namely the organizational and the design of the draft law on the basis of the "consensus results".

On the basis of the cornerstones, Franz Knieps then "further developed" the draft law for a GMG, so that it secured "a monopoly position" for the statutory health insurance companies. The doubling of the contribution rate in § 248 SGB V, suggested by the SPD and agreed in the consensus talks, was included in the draft anyway. But a working version from 08/11/2003 suddenly contained the ominous change in § 229 SGB V, which only makes sense with the subsequent ongoing bending the law and the ongoing breaching of the constitution, and it contained this strange justification, which identifies the statutory health insurance companies as the origin of the desire to collect contributions for “original capital benefits”.

Since the first reading of the draft law DS 15/1525 took place on September 9th, 2003, the draft "to be read" could "unfortunately" only be finished on September 8th, 2003 (although in reality this would have been possible 14 days earlier). But that's how the BMGS (Ulla Schmidt) made sure that no member of parliament could know what he had to decide about. And there was no way someone could work through the draft law overnight and then ask where in the consensus results this strange change in § 229 SGB V would have been agreed.

This draft law was then referred to the Committee for Health and Social Security and to a number of "opinion-advisory" Committees, as had been arranged long beforehand by the parliamentary group leaders. And what did the Health and Social Security Committee do with it? - Nothing, because he was again get busy with a completely pointless hearing of 52 "expert" associations. So it came about that the lead Committee recommended the adoption of the draft law with the votes of the SPD, CDU/CSU and Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (of course always tightly group-uniform), without the Committee members having had time to deal with the draft law. And what did the advisory Committees do with the bill? - Nothing, because they didn't even have meetings during the period in question to be able to deal with anything at all. All of them were told (by whom?) to deliver their recommendations on the draft law till September 24th, 2003 latest. Again, there were no protests from parliamentarians against the undermining of basic democratic rules.

The 2nd and 3rd reading took place on September 26th, 2003. Before its vote on September 24, 2003, the committee for health and social security had decided to implement 21 amendments to the draft law. The amended, final draft law DS 15/1525 could therefore have been available to the members of the Bundestag on 09/25/2003 at the earliest. And the parliamentarians then accepted the GMG draft law with only 11 no-exceptions, 3 abstentions and 24 apologies (and of course the dissenting votes of the FDP), although they couldn't know the content of the draft law with its 174 two-column (or about 433 single-column) pages

So the ominous change in § 229 SGB V was unconstitutional in the world. Its importance as the "predetermined breaking point of Franz Knieps" only became clear when the bending the law and the breaching of the constitution really picked up speed from 2006 with the help of the replacement of the chairmanship of the 12th Senate of the Federal Social Court (BSG). This predetermined breaking point was implemented by the social courts and later by the First Senate of the Federal Constitutional Court by equating savings from private capital life insurance with company pension payments.

No member of the 15th German Bundestag noticed what was built into the draft law, no member of parliament had time to notice, but no member of parliament has defended himself against this ongoing violation of the constitution. With the exception of 9 glorious exceptions, all others functioned well as voting cattle for their parties.

It may be that Mr. Seehofer's "most beautiful night" came from the certainty that he had represented the interests of his "own" lobbyists on a massive scale (e.g. prevention of the Positive List). It is quite possible that the members of the CDU/CSU consensus committee did not realize that the SPD played a wrong game and is still playing it today. Then, despite the warning, the CDU/CSU was again pulled over the barrel by Gerhard Schröder & Ulla Schmidt & Co. That's what can happen to you if you take part in undermining parliamentary democracy. But it is also possible that Horst Seehofer was initiated into the planned mass fraud by Ulla Schmidt.

The change in § 229 SGB V was and is the starting point for the 15 years of state-organized fraud against approx. 6 million pensioners on the basis of bending the law and breaching the constitution by the statutory health insurance companies.

Prelude to undermining parliamentary democracy

> Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse“: ***[IG_S07]*** 20190909_Vorspiel zur Aushebelung der Parlamentarischen Demokratie - Verstecken der BetrAVG Änderungen im HZvNG.pdf
> 20190909_Vorspiel zur Aushebelung der Parlamentarischen Demokratie - Verstecken der BetrAVG Änderungen im HZvNG.pdf

We, the former or current irrevocable beneficiaries (owners) of savings proceeds from private capital life insurance, should really not be interested in the tinkering with the "Law for the Improvement of Company Pensions (BetrAVG)" by the Red-Green Government under Chancellor Schröder. However, since 2004, the perpetrators of the state-organized fraud on around 6 million pensioners have been trying to classify our savings from private provision as company pension payments (pensions, ...) in order to contribute towards health and long-term care insurance for our private property after the end of the insurance period.

The Red-Green Government under Schröder has twice intervened massively in the provisions of the BetrAVG:

The **first time** the law was changed was Article 9 of the “Law on the Reform of Statutory Pension Insurance and the Promotion of a Funded Pension Fund (Retirement Assets Act – AVmG)” and had the goal of a) extremely weakening the statutory pension insurance by reducing the pension level and b) promoting the funded company pension scheme as a replacement.

It unleashed a storm of indignation in 2001; the law came into the world only through the mediation committee between the Bundestag and the Bundesrat. The influence of the most diverse interest groups (trade unions, political parties from left to right) resulted in a concentrated botch. The result was legal regulations that were rightly described in a SPIEGEL overview article at the time as a "Riester reform ruin".

The **second time** the law was changed was Article 3 of the "Act on the Introduction of a Funded Supplementary Ironworks Insurance and Amending Other Laws (Federal Miners' Supplementary Insurance Reform Act - HZvNG)" and had the aim of a) extremely weakening private provision and b) promoting funded company pension schemes as a replacement.

It did not trigger any recognizable reaction in 2002, because among the members of the Bundestag and the Bundesrat, the member of parliament Dr. Heinrich L. Kolb (FDP) apparently who was the only one who understood that the goal was to link the second and third pillars of the three-pillar model with the undermining of the previously undisputed private provision with all the foreseeable new problems created by legal Contradictions between labor, tax and social security law. His speech was not held in the second reading of the law in the Bundestag, but was disposed of in the annals of the Bundestag.

In view of the legal uncertainty produced, this work can only be described as "Riester reform ruins 2". It is therefore worthwhile to hide serious legal changes in "side stuff"; few notice it. This Bundestag made up of nothing but people who take orders and this unsuspecting Bundesrat are running like clockwork. With such controllables one can organize even more.

Comrades Schröder & Co. have thus introduced the worst and most disgusting methods of predatory capitalism into the "social" pension system (Don't worry, dear employee, we'll take care of you when the statutory pensions are falling, we'll get the money for it out of your pocket).

Unfortunately, the question of motives depends on assumptions. The deliberate weakening of private provision for oneself is likely to have something to do with the comrades' addiction to control and regulation. The result of private provision is something that politicians fundamentally cannot accept, something that is none of their business - private property.

Efforts to "convert" private provision into company pension schemes were certainly reinforced by the dramatic emptying of the social security funds in 2001, 2002, ... as a result of their own failed policies and the beginning "exchange of ideas" with the central associations of statutory health insurance "how to get access to pensioner´s savings" which resulted in Schröder's government statement on March 14, 2003: "We [...] have launched funded private provision, which is the second pillar of pension insurance. To place this private provision as a second pillar under the umbrella of "[company]" old-age provision and old-age security ...".

The criminalization of the judiciary after the introduction of the GMG was part of the plan from the beginning (from 2002)

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse": ***[IG_S06]*** 20190116_Die mit dem GMG einhergehende Kriminalisierung der Justiz- Teil I (v1.1).pdf
20190116_Die mit dem GMG einhergehende Kriminalisierung der Justiz- Teil I (v1.1).pdf

The "Healthcare Modernization Act" (GMG) came about at a time when it was already fashionable in politics and the judiciary to disregard the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany. "Well-known" representatives of the judiciary also made statements about the value of laws and the binding nature of the law, which in view of the foundations of our parliamentary democracy with its model of the three independent pillars of the legislature, executive and judiciary can only be described as intellectual arson.

A decisive aspect of the GMG was, in view of the deficit in the social funds of the statutory health insurance companies (GKVen) of approx. 9 billion EUR, which was last reached in 2003, the raising of money at any price. As early as 2002, the representatives of the 7 statutory health insurance associations, in coordination with the SPD-led government, decided to access the private savings of pensioners from private capital life insurance of the 3rd pillar of old-age provision (so-called "direct insurances") in order to restructure the finances. (see "The GMG legislation was a series of constitutional breaches")

With preparation from 2002 to 2004, this led to the establishment of a state-organized system for defrauding around 6 million pensioners on the basis of perverting the law and breaking the constitution. The associated criminalization of the judiciary after the introduction of the GMG was part of the plan from the beginning of the representatives of the GKVen and the Red-Green Federal Government under Chancellor Gerhard Schröder; in particular the Federal Ministry of Health and Social Security (BMGS) under Ulla Schmidt.

The basic principle was and is the blurring of the boundaries between the second, corporate and the third, private pillar of old-age provision and, as a result, the contribution of private savings.

On the one hand, unnoticed by everyone, a point of attack for the legal protection of fraud was built into § 229 SGB V in the GMG legislative process, undermining parliamentary democracy ("Predetermined breaking point" by Franz Knieps) (see "The GMG legislation was a series of constitutional breaches"). On the other hand, criteria were developed in close cooperation between the GKVs and the BMGS under Ulla Schmidt, which do not (cannot) mean a legal repeal between the 2nd and 3rd pillars, but which should support the blurring of the boundaries in law-breaking and unconstitutional application.

For legal support of the state-organized fraud, the law on the election of judges was used to establish an "unconditional" supporter of party political interests in Hartwig Balzer, using the age-related replacement of the chairmanship in the 12th Senate of the Federal Social Court (BSG). Since the change in November 2004, and increasingly since 2006, the 12th Senate of the BSG on the subject of "GMG, contribution law, payment of contributions from private savings" has been and is still producing law-breaking and

unconstitutional decisions, all of which can be proven to be based on the in 2002/2003 developed illegal criteria.

The feelings of omnipotence caused by their state-backed bending of the law have even inspired the judges of the 12th Senate of the BSG to develop and apply additional law-bending criteria and to continuously confirm the constitutionality of their criminal activities. In other words, perversion of justice (a crime under the Criminal Code), pretentiousness and breaching of the constitution have become the standard means of "justice" administration by the 12th Senate of the BSG since late 2004.

With the first justification of a non-acceptance of the Federal Constitutional Court (BVerfG) 1 BvR 1924/07 of April 7th, 2008 on the subject of "GMG, right to contributions, payment of contributions from private savings", a chamber of the First Senate chaired by Judge Hohmann-Dennhardt also swung fully to the line bending the law and breaching the constitution. The justification for the non-acceptance is a "copying of first-graders" from the first law-bending judgment of the BSG, which is interspersed by the criteria developed by the GKVs and the BMGS under Ulla Schmidt for collecting about 20% of the savings from private old-age provision (3rd pillar) as legally redefined company pensions (2nd pillar). Ferdinand Kirchhof was also involved in this decision, in which retrospectively even the BSG is allowed to legislate and which is garnished with a servile allegiance to politicians (the method "forms a suitable and necessary means of strengthening the financial basis of statutory health insurance"). Lo and behold, all further constitutional complaints were not accepted in his new career step as "Vice President of the Federal Constitutional Court" and under his chairmanship during his entire term of office. There is only one exception to non-acceptance, the decision 1 BvR 1660/08. In it, the relevant savings portion is classified as private for a privately continued capital life insurance after the employer's insolvency, but the previously saved share is released again with the legal criteria for cashing in. These are two contradictory legal views in a decision of the Constitutional Court, which has the task of creating legal clarity and not legal uncertainty

It's just stupid that all the effort with the bending of the law and breaches of the constitution in the First Senate was completely in vain, because the First Senate is not responsible for processing these constitutional complaints according to the Federal Constitutional Court Act (BVerfGG). Not only did Kirchhof & Co have the constitutional complaints “stolen”, they also permanently broke the BVerfGG. Everything produced by the First Senate in this regard is just rubbish and to this day there has not been a single legally compliant decision by the BVerfG on the subject of "GMG, right to contributions, payment of contributions from private savings".

The obligation to pay contributions for health and long-term care insurance from private savings from so-called "direct insurance" is one of the Red-Green Government under Schröder and the BMGS under Ulla Schmidt thought up in cooperation with the executive boards of the at that time 7 central associations of statutory health insurance and by the fraudulent statutory health insurance companies and the courts (all social courts; First Senate of the BVerfG) criminally (bending of the law, breaching of the Constitution) and deliberately enforced untrue assertion (lie) without any legal basis.

The insurers of the capital life insurance are the in no way inferior to the statutory health insurance companies when it comes to crime

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse“: ***[IG_S08]*** 20200110_Die Versicherer stehen den gesetzl. Krankenkassen in puncto Kriminalität in nichts nach.pdf
20200110_Die Versicherer stehen den gesetzl. Krankenkassen in puncto Kriminalität in nichts nach.pdf

Capital Life insurers' contracts (missleading called "insurance certificates") are extremely flawed three-party contracts between the insurer, employer, and employee (insured). The state supervisory authorities (BaFin), which are legally and technically subordinate to the Ministry of Finance, have changed absolutely nothing about this.

The insurances of the employees/insured were or are private capital life insurances linked to the “direct insurance” of the employers (with the insurer), are therefore neither “direct insurance” nor company pension

schemes according to BetrAVG. The savings due at the end of the insurance term were and are the private property of the employees/insured.

The request by the lobbyists of the statutory health insurance companies in 2003 to the insurers to participate in state-organized fraud came at a time when the GMG was not even legally binding.

All capital life insurers have been involved in the state-organized fraud since January 1st, 2004 and report illegally and intentionally - as if they did not understand what kind of insurance business they operate - at the end of the insurance the payment of company pension payments to the statutory health insurance companies of the insured.

We have to speculate, albeit very plausibly, about the motives of the legally responsible board members. In the years 2001 to 2004, an extremely large number of these capital life insurance had a loss of around 1/3 of the payout value in the case of survival. It can be contemplated whether the total failure of government insurance regulators was a) incompetence, or b) unwillingness, or c) both and whether this in particular establishes the connection between the unbridled involvement of insurers in state-organized fraud (according to the win-win perspective: the state supervisory authority does not look too closely if the insurers then also use the savings proceeds "purely privately").

Irrespective of the motive considerations, all board members of all capital life insurers have been guilty of Fraud in a Particularly Serious Case (§ 263 Federal Criminal Code (StGB)) and of Betraying Private Secrets (§ 203 StGB) since 2004 to the present day.

In order to discourage those affected by insurer fraud filing a lawsuit, the insurers have installed the so-called “insurance ombudsman”. This post is filled by the insurers from former "reputable, impartial, confidence-inspiring" judges, who have demonstrably acquired special merits in disregarding the law and thus the elimination of democracy and the Rule of Law in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The criminalization of the judiciary after the introduction of the GMG Part II the German social courts

TODO ***[IG_S09]***

This document summarizes how the Federal Social Court (BSG) was involved from the beginning in the planning of the law-bending and constitution-breaking "jurisprudence" of the social courts, the creation of the self-referential injustice system by the BSG judges, the understanding of the judges of the social courts as outsourcing service providers of the statutory health insurance companies and the orgiastic commission of criminal offenses by the judges at all levels of the federal German social justice system dealing with contribution law.

The criminalization of the judiciary after the introduction of the GMG The Federal Constitutional Judges know who sets the route

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse“: ***[IG_S10]*** 20200828_Die mit dem GMG einhergehende Kriminalisierung der Justiz- Teil III Das Verfassungsgericht_(v5).pdf
20200828_Die mit dem GMG einhergehende Kriminalisierung der Justiz- Teil III Das Verfassungsgericht_(v5).pdf

If a private savings proceeds from capital life insurance taken out via the employer are skimed off by the respective statutory health insurance company, then one cannot avoid the alleged approval of this state-organized fraud by the Federal Constitutional Court (BVerfG). Logically, one deals first with these alleged blessings from the years 2008 to 2010 in the resolutions 1 BvR 1924/07 of April 7th, 2008, 1 BvR 739/08 of September 6th, 2010 and 1BvR 1660/08 of September 28th, 2010. It is found that 1 BvR 739/08 refers to 1 BvR 1927/04 in terms of content, i.e. it is only a kind of rehash of the same question.

1 BvR 1924/07 is a non-acceptance resolution of the 2nd Chamber of the First Senate consisting of the Federal Constitutional Court judges Christine Hohmann-Dennhardt (Chair), Reinhard Gaier and Ferdinand Kirchhof on 2 constitutional complaints about this illegal contribution. If one compares the statements made

in the justification with the content of the judgment B 12 KR 1/06 R of September 13, 2006, which was almost 2 years ago, one finds that the constitutional judges, for lack of ideas of their own, simply have copied the judgment of the 12th Senate of the Federal Social Court (BSG) in large parts and above all in its legal assessments like first graders. To their credit, they didn't even cover up the source of their "wisdom".

In doing so, however, they also uncritically adopted the legal criteria developed in 2003 between politicians and statutory health insurance companies and which simply do not exist in the legal basis, such as “ *providing-related purpose*”, “*inflow rooted in an employment relationship*”, “*old-age security target*”, “*occurrence of an insured event at the end of the insurance*”, "*only false retroactivity*" and the in intoxication of legislative omnipotence invented criteria by the BSG such as "*no unreasonable interference with the financial situation*", "*strengthening the financial basis of statutory health insurance*", "*no violation of the protection of legitimate expectations*". So they practiced Bending the Law too which is a Crime (§ 339 StGB) under the provisions of the Federal Criminal Code.

As if that weren't enough, they also had to garnish their decision with a servile address of allegiance to politicians "suitable and necessary means of strengthening the financial bases of the statutory Health insurance", when everyone knows that theft is a very suitable means of filling up the coffers. And with a two-year delay, they gave the BSG license to take legislative action, which can be classified as a breach of the Constitution. Overall, with this decision, these 3 Federal Constitutional Judges violated the Constitution according to Art. 20 (2), 93 (1) No. 4a, 97 (1), 101 (1), 103 (1) Basic Law; quite an achievement for a constitutional court.

Top performers must of course be supported. In the case of the only real decision 1 BvR 1660/08 on the subject of unlawful contribution payments for private property, Mr. Kirchhof had already been promoted to Vice President and Chairman of the First Senate of the Federal Constitutional Court. Nevertheless, he continued to chair the chamber for the “settlement” of constitutional complaints under Article 93 Paragraph 1 No. 4a of the Basic Law, because his "skills" in social law can not be surpassed, and he did not let this job be taken away from him until he left the BVerfG.

In decision 1 BvR 1660/08, it was actually decided that for shares of the savings from capital life insurance, which had to be completely private because the employer had gone through insolvency, may actually contributions not be required by the statutory health insurance. One can speculate for a long time about what the 3 Federal Constitutional Judges Kirchhof & Co drove. The justification in the resolution for this total private portion also fitted in very well with the other savings portion that the employee had saved up during the employer's "lifetime", but in order to prevent the conclusion that the whole property was completely private, the repertoire of law-breaking arguments has then reintroduced unearthed. A judgment by the LSG North Rhine-Westphalia, which was one year old at this point in time, may help with the interpretation, in which the question of the compatibility of required contributions for private shares with Article 3 of the Basic Law was raised; such questions must of course be nipped in the bud.

If you, as a person affected by state-organized fraud, file a Constitutional Complaint yourself, you experience things that you would never have thought possible in a constitutional state and which ultimately lead to the conclusion that "the constitutional state no longer exists".

According to §§ 13, 14 of the BVerfGG, these constitutional complaints are to be processed by the Second Senate. After filing, one is bombarded with lies by employees of the judiciary administration or by the Federal Constitutional Judge Kirchhof in all variants, from “the Plenary Resolutions on the distribution of business have changed the competence” to the most recent one brought by Mr. Kirchhof “the regulatory content of § 14 BVerfGG standardizes the competence of the First Senate”. This is nothing more than the application of the "method of legal interpretation of laws" innate in most lawyers, that in normal usage is called “perversion of language” and in the judiciary is called Perversion/Bending the Law (§ 339 of the Federal Criminal Code (StGB)) and is legally a Crime.

The business planning of the First Senate is based on specialist legal topics organized in departments, in accordance with the structuring of the legal areas in the specialist jurisdiction. The only problem is that there are no departments in the BVerfG, but Senates whose internal division of tasks should reflect the tasks of the BVerfG according to Article 13 of the BVerfGG. The First Senate's law-breaking business planning is not an

invention of Vice President Kirchhof, but was at least practiced by the then President and Chairman of the First Senate Mr. Papier. This brings with it a startling realization: All j Federal Constitutional Judges at least in the First Senate of the BVerfG have no idea what their job is. In order to determine and punish a Breach of the Constitution, it is secondary in which specialist area of law it was committed. For example, you do not need any knowledge of social law to determine violations of **F**undamental Rights and Rights Equivalent to Fundamental Rights through the legal abuse of § 229 SGB V, but you should be able to read and understand the Basic Law and the BVerfGG. This finding explains a good deal of incompetence, which can be seen in the decisions of the BVerfG that are known to us. All 16 Federal Constitutional Judges have known this for decades, because the business plan has to be approved by the plenum of the Federal Constitutional Court.

It harbors the **potential for a state crisis**, because all decisions made by the First Senate on the basis of illegal business plans are **legally ineffective**.

This "jurisdiction" is based not only on stupidity, but also on intent. Not for nothing were the Federal Constitutional Judges chosen by the Party Oligarchs according to their party political usefulness. In order to be able to do justice to the claim to power and as Federal Constitutional Judge to be the only one who can "interpret" the Basic Law and not to be thrown off course by the accusation of abuse of power, have the Constitutional Judges of the First Senate developed in a law-bending decision a “principle”, with which the effect of § 18 BVerfGG is to be undermined and none of them can be excluded from participating in the proceedings because of “previous involvement” in a legal issue. Mr. Kirchhof then extended this principle by bending the law in such a way that the accusation of bias under § 19 BVerfGG can also be overturned by declaring oneself to be impartial.

The BVerfG groans public effective under the burden of the vast number of constitutional complaints and Kirchhof & Co "have to" simply leave them lying around for years. But they can also act completely different if the actual client (in the form of the SPD member of the Federal Parliament Lothar Binding) requests a report on the "handling" of constitutional complaints on the subject of GMG. Then a BVerfG Vize President kicks his heels together, immediately writes the report (in which the self-evident non-acceptance does not have to be expressed) and manages to settle several constitutional complaints due to non-acceptance on the same day. Is nothing more with independent third pillar of our democracy, but a Federal Constitutional Court as a willing henchman of the Party Oligarchy.

The resolutions of the Chambers Kirchhof & Co are garnished with an eternity claim "*The decision is incontestable*". When considering the legal situation, this decision formula by the chambers turns out to be a hollow saying with thick cheeks.

All of this leads to the incredulous question of where all this comes from, and one deals with the description of the organization of the BVerfG on its hompage/website. But even then, the dismay only increases. In the administration of the BVerfG, the President is supported by the trained administrative lawyer Director Weigl, but the description of functions, officials, organizational units, reporting channels, responsibilities, etc. can only be summarized under the collective term chaos.

The work of the Constitutional Judges and employees of the organization BVerfG is not only regulated by the BVerfGG, but also by an additional Rules of Procedure (BVerfGGO). The relationship between the rules of these BVerfGGO and the experiences of oneself and others in the complaint proceedings before the BVerfG reveals beyond a doubt that these Rules of Procedure are unconstitutional in parts (at least §§ 22, 63, 64). This is supplemented by an illegal Leaflet, which employees of the "General Register" like to use in the first step to "get rid of" constitutional complaints. This is not a new situation in the Voßkuhle presidency. The previous version GO 1987 from December 15, 1986 was partly unconstitutional and was used during the presidencies of Zeidler, Herzog, Limbach, Papier and Voßkuhle; this was replaced by the BVerfGGO on November 19, 2014 in the Voßkuhle presidency, whereby the revision resulted in a worsening of the unconstitutionality.

The organization and the rules of procedure of the Federal Constitutional Court obviously do not pose any obstacles, as a Federal Constitutional Judge or as an employee of the administration of justice with the "General Register", "First Senate" and "Second Senate" offices of the Federal Constitutional Court, to design the processing of constitutional complaints according to their own ideas and against the legally guaranteed

rights of the complainants and, above all, beyond the law. However, **since 1986 at the latest**, the Presidents of the BVerfG found it simply more tingling to give oneself own rules and to place these own rules above the law or, even more clearly: to **place oneself above the Basic Law**.

Here too, as with the business planning of the First Senate, nothing would have happened without the approval of all 16 equal Constitutional Judges in the Plenum. When it comes to the question of responsibility, a distinction must therefore be made between the Presidents who have introduced new Rules of Procedure (Zeidler, Voßkuhle), the Constitutional Judges who have explicitly approved such an introduction, and all other Presidents and Constitutional Judges who have had them since 1986 at the latest used, knowing full well that they were breaking the law and breaking the Constitution. It is about, without detailing the individual case, violations of the constitution according to Art. 20 (2), 92, 93 (1) No. 4a, 94 (2), 97 (1), 101 (1), 103 (1) Basic Law.

The Constitutional Judges should therefore held accountable in accordance with their breakings of law, primarily Bending the Law (§ 339 of the Federal Criminal Code (StGB)) in conjunction with § 12 StGB, and in accordance with Article 34 of the Basic Law. The responsibility for their own actions of the officials in the middle or higher judicial service in the offices of the "General Register", "First Senate" and "Second Senate" of the judicial administration of the Federal Constitutional Court should not fall under the table; they are assumed to have the ability to judge, they knew and they know what they are doing. So that public prosecutors and criminal judges have no excuses, the criminal offenses were compiled “bite-size” for them with all available information including the evidence.

The Federal Constitutional Judge and Vice President of the BVerfG Kirchhof was dismissed from the BVerfG with great fanfare on November 30th, 2018. His significant contribution to the looting of around 30 billion euros from around 6 million pensioners was rewarded with the "Great Cross of Merit with Star and Ribbon of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany". What will remain? The responsibility for his actions.

The Federal Constitutional Judge and President of the BVerfG Voßkuhle will be dismissed from the BVerfG on May 6th, 2020. What will remain? No, not his ridiculous Code of Conduct, but responsibility for his actions as well.

The influence of the political parties CDU/CSU and SPD on the selection of the Constitutional Judges is obvious. There is only one real solution to the situation at the highest German court: elections with election results that put an end to these so-called “Popular Parties” ... the “state people” are on the right track.

The state lawyers - a profession between abuse and megalomania

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse“: ***[IG_S12]*** 20201212_Die staatlichen Juristen – ein Berufsstand zwischen Missbrauch und Größenwahn.pdf
20201212_Die staatlichen Juristen - ein Berufsstand zwischen Missbrauch undGrößenwahn.pdf

The state-organized deceived ask themselves, where does this irrepressible striving of the judges of the Federal Republic of Germany to disregard the Constitution and to speak forbidden judge's law come from.

As early as 1926, judges at the Reichsgerichtshof in Leipzig began to disregard the constitution of the Weimar Republic and to proclaim that law is the result of our decisions, and politics must also be subordinate to it. As a result, decisive parts of the jurists of the parliamentary Weimar democracy were instrumental in undermining and eliminating democracy and establishing the National Socialist dictatorship.
Examples include the constitutional lawyers Carl Schmitt and Ernst Rudolf Huber, who gave the criminal regime pseudo-legal legitimacy.

After 1945, the majority of former Nazi lawyers were initially slowed down by the denazification of the victorious powers. Although even then, some by acting of "well-meaning" politicians slipped through the cracks. Common excuse of the old, active Nazis among the lawyers, as well as the entire society: we only went along to prevent worse. A "chosen" people of active Nazis and their committed followers quickly mutated into nothing but former resistance fighters. When the intentions of the victorious powers, above all

the USA, changed in the course of the new East-West conflict from 1949, the German universities regained the freedom to make decisions about personnel policy.

Via the old cliques, this quickly resulted in the old Nazis once again enforcing and dominating the jurisprudence and judiciary of the newly formed Federal Republic of Germany. They occupied the judges' and university posts and influenced the "judiciary" and above all the training of the young lawyers of the young democracy. Denazification turned into renazification. Karl Larenz, for example, which belonged from 1933 to a circle of "pioneers" for National Socialist legal renewal ("Object and Method of Folkish Legal Thinking"), after his "cleansing" and "reinstatement in office and dignity" established the old Nazi methods into the Federal German "jurisprudence. Ernst Rudolf Huber, a scholar of Carl Schmitt and a leading constitutional lawyer with him during the Nazi era, advanced to become a fundamental constitutional theorist in the Federal Republic of Germany.

A young lawyer in the judiciary of the Federal Republic of Germany who was shaped by such teachers was the former President of the Federal Court of Justice (BGH), Günter Hirsch. In 2007 he published an article in the FAZ (***[IG_O-JU_002]***, ***[IG_K-JU_001]***) in which he describes what he thinks of the German legal system and the constitutional requirement to speak the law: nothing at all. With blunt arrogance and conceited omniscience, he states that it is the job of the judges to speak judge's law, to reinterpret the laws according to their own standards. Because of the opinions he expressed, one must describe him as a "spiritual arsonist". It is absolutely incomprehensible that this newspaper article in 2007 did not trigger a storm of indignation in the "ruling circles".

This lawyer is not alone at all, it is frightening and repulsive that people with such an undemocratic basic attitude in our alleged Constitutional State have reached positions of power and continue to do so.
Judge Hirsch's statements confirm the journalist E. Müller-Meiningen jr., who in 1962 classified the Federal Court of Justice (BGH) as a "traditional company of the [Nazi-German] Reichsgericht" (***[IG_O-JU_100]***).

As a result of the experience that lawyers of the Weimar Republic eliminated the parliamentary Weimar Republic with their “judiciary” according to their own ideas, the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany specified in Article 20 (3) "... the judiciary [is] bound by law and justice" (where "justice" is the entirety of legal norms) and in Article 97 (1) “Judges are independent and subject only to the law”.
What are the lawyers doing to disregard this clear constitutional requirement?

They claim to be allowed and obliged to follow the methodological guidelines of a "Legal Science" (jurisprudence), which they took over from the Nazi jurists. This "jurisprudence" has nothing in common either with law or with science, but has its original source in canon law. Both are text-interpreting (hermeneutic) "sciences", one doing biblical exegesis (theological interpretation), the other doing, among other things, teleological interpretation of the legal texts. “Jurisprudence” is therefore a doctrine of faith. So what do jurists, especially judges, think they must do if they are to apply the laws for legal decisions? They allegedly interpret the laws on the basis of an interpretation methodology from Legal Theory.

The methodology is based on the nonsensical assertion that legal norms are abstract and need to be specified. "Subjective theory" and "objective theory" are compared, which is irritating enough in view of the applicable legal text written in German. The "search" for the meaning and purpose of the law and the objectified will of the legislature (which simply does not exist in view of the parliament made up of hundreds of members of parliament or is a majority decision formulated as a law) is described with justifications that all turn out to be empty clichés. In the methodology, the general prohibition of judge's law is indicated, but regardless of this, there is a constant attempt to derive its irrefutable necessity by referring to judge's law. The various methods are described without any convincing argument. In order to modify / expand / reverse the conditions (conditions of validity) and the regulatory content of laws bound to these conditions on the basis of individual judges' convictions ... (to subject them to a "legal perversion of the law"), is in particular "sense and purpose" and the "objectified will of the legislature" repeatedly chewed through, although this is not relevant for the judges to carry out their statutory task of administering justice. The procedures of the legislation of the Federal Republic of Germany are in no way included in this theory of "interpretation methodology". The actual task of the judges, to carry out judiciary according to laws prescribed by the legislature, is not mentioned or reflected in any way.

Historically, reference is made to models from the times of absolutism. In the 1920s and 1930s, the “scientific” approaches to interpretation methodology (especially the teleological approach) were developed. In the Weimar years, the interpretation methodology served to thwart the intentions of the democratic legislature. In Nazi criminal law, they were further developed in order to flexibly "extend the legal formula to cases not covered by it", i.e. to make decisions against the law. Historically, jurists' methods of interpretation were a means of using the judiciary to support and expand the power of dictatorships; today it is an **unconstitutional pseudo-theory flimsy justifying perversion of the law in the interests of the party oligarchy**. For example, if you apply the different methods without indoctrination to the topic of how contributions can be levied for private property as a result of the GMG, then the result for each method is: what is in the law applies. I.e. it is not the judge's method of interpretation that causes the perversion of justice, it is the judge's intent. The related jurisprudence of the social courts and the Federal Constitutional Court is, without exception, arbitrary justice based on the self-referential injustice system created by the BSG.

Jurisprudence and the judiciary in the Federal Republic are in a catastrophic state. The theoreticians and their users in the judiciary express themselves in strangely “quashed language”, which no longer has much in common with the syntax and semantics of German and the literal sense, does not produce any defined, reproducible content and which therefore increases the need for interpretation. Lawyers probably believe that this meaningless and vain chatter in the approximate can increase the philosophical aspect of their doings. Legal training (jurisprudence) leads to a supply of lawyers who only have insufficient command of the German language, whose ability to use normal human logic has been lost, who do not know what their task is and who are equipped with “methodical tools” taken over from the Nazi lawyers ' which motivates them to commit perversion of justice (crimes) and breach of the Constitution.

Man is thrown back if he does not know. The majority fills the existing gaps not with higher insight ("I know that I know nothing"), but with faith. The lawyers believe because they can neither speak **G**erman nor think **L**ogically. They probably "learn" intensively how their predecessors twisted the laws in the legal fields they have chosen. With what else could you fill such a long study, after which only the **GL** ability would matter if you were abiding by the law. Why do we need the training of more or less poorly qualified specialist idiots, when you can read and understand every legal text with a reasonable knowledge of **G**erman and can use normal human **L**ogic to resolve and check every construct of logically linked partial conditions in order to decide the applicability of the legal regulation content by a clear YES or NO (task of the judiciary).

The personal motivation of lawyers to support or commit judge's law is very diverse and ranges from the disguised supporter of the old Nazi ideology to the believer who cannot believe that he has wasted his life on false religion. They all have one thing in common, the irrefutable belief that they belong to an elite/"functional elite" and that they have the right to twist the regulatory content of the laws as they please.

The “legal scholar” Bernd Rüthers revealed the riddle of his motivation with his “The Secret Revolution of the Lawyers – from the Rule of Law to the Judiciary State”. The essay has turned out to be a nasty concoction. Although Rüthers reports on the roots of the interpretation of the law, the fall of the Weimar Republic and the establishment of the Nazi dictatorship by willing lawyers, he does not understand his own statements. It is disgusting how enthusiastic he is about the speed with which the völkisch-national jurists abolished the Weimar democracy and established the Nazi dictatorship. He "sees" the massive spread of judge's law in the Federal Republic of Germany, but he doesn't understand it. Against the legal interpretation methods he praises as a panacea: the use of his own favored method (historical interpretation) for the perversion of the law. But you have to agree with him on one thing: he sees the abolition of democracy and the rule of law in the Federal Republic of Germany with the help of the rampant judiciary as already completed.

In all legal texts of the so-called "legal scholars" massive reference to the old Nazi jurists can be found. This leads to the question of why, 75 years after the end of the Nazi dictatorship, the lawyers, politicians and various other groups of self-proclaimed elites enthusiastically refer to the "legal philosopher" and chief jurist of the Nazi dictatorship Carl Schmitt and unreflectively or even unashamedly proclaim his theses form the important basis for the constitutional law and the governmental practice of the Federal Republic of Germany as well as other modern states. Despite all the enthusiasm, people probably thought it was unnecessary, given all the antis that Schmitt was, to expose him as a fanatical anti-democrat; just as it was considered

superfluous, even after the rapid transition from denazification to renazification, to dispose of the old and new intellectual arsonists in the judiciary and jurisprudence.

In view of Schmitt's theories, the politicians' intentions are obvious: Politicians have to seek and identify the enemy; and in the absence of enemies they have to label fringe groups as such. The "friend-enemy thesis" is the basis of their claim to power; whoever is not with us is against us. According to Schmitt, democracies also have their secret rulers; it is those who call the shots in a state of emergency. So the heart of the politician beats faster. In a democracy, the people of the state rule …… they believe it (let them believe it). For example, everyone is equal before the law, but some are more equal, they are our "elites" of the Party Oligarchy.

Leading jurists believe that they are the drivers of events and on the way to establishing a jurist oligarchy. Wrong, they are handpicked by the politicians. All judges of the Supreme Federal Courts and the judges of the Federal Constitutional Court have been checked for party political usefulness and unconstitutionally placed to the posts. When they bend the law and break the Constitution, that's exactly what the politicians want them to do; they were chosen for this. The allegiance of the lower levels in the specialized jurisdiction is done through unconstitutional (undermining of judicial independence) jurisprudence by pecking order.

75 years after the end of the Nazi dictatorship, the jurists of the Federal Republic of Germany, especially judges and public prosecutors, have still not arrived in democracy. They do not see the Federal Republic as a "democratic constitutional state" but as a judge's state in which they stand above the laws. According to their ideas, RIGHT is exactly what they produce in a high-handed and criminal way.

The judges and public prosecutors do not notice that they are being abused by politicians to maintain and increase their power, just like in the “good old days of German dictatorships”. Politicians want the massive spread of judge's law. The example of the established mafia structures for defrauding 6 million pensioners shows that the judges are being abused by the politicians of the party oligarchy as modern "contract killers"; they don't kill, they silence people. **The elimination of democracy and the rule of law in the Federal Republic of Germany is a work commissioned by the German judges and public prosecutors on behalf of the Party Oligarchy**.

The activities of the Party Oligarchy: Crime of the statutory health insurance companies and the Central Association of Health Insurance Funds ineffective and illegal tinkering with the legal definition of "Pension Payments"

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse“: ***[IG_S11]*** 20200906_Das Treiben der Parteienoligarchie _Kriminalität der gesetzl. KK und des GKV-SVB_wirkungsloses und ungesetzliches Basteln an der Legaldefinition 'Versorgungsbezüge'.pdf
20200906_Das Treiben der Parteienoligarchie.pdf

Since April 1st, 2007, the so-called “Act to Strengthen Competition in Statutory Health Insurance” (GKV Competition Strengthening Act – GKV-WSG) has been in force, which, as expected, does not strengthen competition, but eliminates it once and for all. With it, the statutory health insurance funds are brought together under a so-called "GKV-Spitzenverband Bund" (hereinafter: GKV-SVB). On the website of this GKV-SVB, a lot of gibberish and buzzwords such as "democracy", "participation", "co-determination", "self-administration", "representation of interests of the health insurance companies", "representation of interests of the insured" try to hide what the GKV- SVB in reality is.

For this you have to read §§ 29 to 90a SGB IV about the "social insurance carriers", i.e. also the statutory health insurance companies and in particular §§ 217a to 217j SGB V about the GKV-SVB, which was new with the GKV-WSG in 2007 were created. Then, in addition to a lot of actually explanatory information, you will also find the decisive passage under regulations for the statutes of the GKV-SVB: "The contracts concluded by the Central Association of Health Insurance Funds and its other decisions apply to the member funds of the Central Association, the state associations of health insurance companies and the insured." (§217e (2) SGB V)

This has absolutely nothing to do with a statute, but is no more and no less than the elimination of independent health insurance companies and all other member funds including their self-administration and their subordination to the complete control of the GKV-SVB by legislation. Through the GKV-WSG, the statutory health insurance companies and their alleged interest group GKV-SVB were subordinated to the Federal Ministry of Health (BMG). Contracts and decisions of the National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Funds are checked and approved by the supervisory authority BMG and are binding for all statutory health insurance companies. The competition between the different legal Health insurance is reduced to a ridiculous minimum. The GKV-SVB is merely a quasi-authority that has been placed in between the Federal Ministry of Health and the health insurance companies and is controlled by the Federal Ministry of Health in order to be able to continue to announce to the state people the absolute nonsense of the self-administration of the health insurance companies with social elections. And, a very important point: the party oligarchy has usurped the health fund, i.e. the property of those with statutory health and long-term care insurance. This is theft of someone else's property. So the payment of non-insurance benefits from the property of the statutory insured is controlled by the party oligarchy (those in power of the established political parties) via the BMG.

As early as 1966, Karl Jaspers ("Where is the Federal Republic Driving"; ***[IG_O-PP_001]***) stated that the established political parties were establishing a party oligarchy, i.e. their rule over democracy, and in 1982 the then Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker warned that "actual behavior and influence of the parties have established their reputation of seeing the state as their prey". They've made a lot of progress down this path and in 2007 they took over the social systems and the insured's property.

Worse still: With the GKV-WSG, the National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Funds, which is subordinate to the Federal Ministry of Health, was “allowed” to legislate with external effects. This is an open and blatand breach of the Constitution. The GKV Competition Strengthening Act is nothing more than an unconstitutional SELF-EMPOWERING LAW of the Executive while eliminating the Legislature.

The members of the Health Committee of the German Bundestag used the amendment to the law by the GKV-VEG in October 2018 to add an amendment to Section 229 (1) No. 5, unnoticed by the rest of Parliament. They imagined that this would enable the social courts to administer “justice” that is constitutional and in agreement with the Federal Constitutional Court; it has remained their conceit.

Only the Federal Minister of Labor and Social Affairs (BMAS), Hubertus Heil (SPD), and the Federal Minister of Health, Jens Spahn (CDU), obviously saw this as an incentive to surpass this failure with their own private legislation.

As a result of the GKV Company Pension Allowance Act, the GKV-SVB has revised its "paying office reporting procedure" for life insurers with effect from October 1st, 2020. In several places in this document it is claimed that not only lump-sum settlements but also explicitly other one-time payments are to be reported to the health insurance companies of the statutory insured as pension payments. This is illegal in relation to § 229 SGB V, according to which only severance payments ("replaces ...") may be credited as one-off payments. In the "Paying Office Notification Procedure" there is even a self-created legal definition of "company pension" ("The term company pension includes all company pension benefits that are granted on the basis of a previous employment relationship"). This not only disregards the statutory legal definition in § 229 SGB V, it also repeats one of the "criteria" invented in 2002 between party politicians and the health insurance companies, which is in state-organized fraud used for Bending the Law and Constitutional Breaches by the social courts. It is also highly criminal, because here one claims legislative powers while excluding the German Bundestag; it is open and unabashed breach of the constitution.

With this "Paying Office Notification Procedure" the insurers of capital life insurance are requested to break §§ 202, 229 of the SGB V and to continue to commit Fraud in Particularly Serious Cases (§ 263 StGB). This Fraud is done with intent, because the insurers know very well that the savings from capital life insurance are private property of the insured, which cannot be contributed.

And that's still not all: If the insured refuse to report the data on their statutory health insurance company to the capital life insurer because this is none of their business and is only used to start the state-organized fraud, then the life insurers in the "Paying Office Notification Procedure " are asked to commit another breach

of the law and to collect the data provided by the German Pension Insurance (DSRV) via an established electronic request; it is tacitly assumed that the DSRV also participates in this state-organized fraud.

Who is responsible for this highly criminal activity (§ 111 Public Call to Criminal Offenses, of the Criminal Code) with a massive call to continue the Fraud in Particularly Serious Cases and the Violation of Private Secrets (§ 203 of the Federal Criminal Code)? They are the Federal Minister of Labor and Social Affairs (BMAS), **Hubertus Heil (SPD)**, and the Federal Minister of Health (BMG), **Jens Spahn (CDU)**, because the revised "paying office reporting procedure" was approved by both ministries (the BMG as the supervisory authority) on February 26th .2020 approved. In the second place, of course, the 3 board members of the GKV-SVB are also legally responsible.

The politicians of the established political parties keep telling us that they can't help it if all the Federal Social Courts dealing with the right to contribute and the Federal Constitutional Court continue to pervert the law and break the Constitution. Here the politicians of the party oligarchy have recently revealed that they are the driving force behind the state-organized fraud, involving the statutory health insurance companies, the social courts, the Federal Constitutional Court, the capital life insurers, etc. with structures like a mafia. They have decided to go ahead with the elimination of the democracy and the Rule of Law unashamedly.

The criminal politicians and their “let off the leash” prosecutors

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse“: ***[IG_S13]*** 20210926_Die kriminellen Politiker und ihre ´von der Leine gelassenen´ Staatsanwälte.pdf
20210926_Die kriminellen Politiker und ihre von der Leine gelassenen Staatsanwälte.pdf

Until 2021 we hesitated with the long overdue criminal proceedings against those responsible for the state and public organizations involved. We knew that the politicians do not only use the judge suffrage to shove candidates who willingly fulfill with their desires into the posts, but also that politicians have the authority to issue instructions to the prosecutors/attorneys general. We see how (remarkably always the same) politicians doggedly defend their prey, no lie is too flat for them, no evidence of their criminal acts impresses them.

As a result of the refusal of the health insurance companies really to face a legal dispute and instead rely on the social courts unimpressed disregard of all relevant laws, we checked the reaction of the health insurance companies to the termination of "contribution payments without legal basis". The health insurance companies react with two forms of violence: a) Coercion (§ 240 StGB) and Blackmail (§ 253 StGB) by blocking the insurance cover without taking into account the contributions paid from the statutory pension b) Commissioning the country-specific main customs office with Theft (§§ 242, 243 StGB) of the contributions from the private account by exploiting the servile spirit of German bank executives

We have filed requests for punishment against 5 groups of offenders based on these criminal offenses: 1) those responsible from a specific Main Customs Office, 2) the boards of directors of a specific private bank 3) the board members and accomplices of AOK Bayern, 4) the judges of the 4th Senate of the Bayer. State Social Court and 5) the board members and accomplices of DAK Hamburg, depending on the crime scenes in the areas of responsibility of the general public prosecutor's offices in Munich and Hamburg. The results of the "processing" by the public prosecutor's offices at district courts almost called for complaints to the general public prosecutor's offices.

The Attorneys General (po; po = political officials) of the Federal Republic of Germany (these are the Attorneys General (General Public Prosecutors), the Federal Public Prosecutor and the public prosecutors who report to them and work on their behalf) refuse to initiate investigations against criminals from organizations with a legal form under public law and their voluntary supporters the economy (e.g. board members of the fraudulent capital life insurers or board members of banks that support Theft by the Main Customs Offices on behalf of the statutory health insurance companies). In doing so, they proceed according to the extracted "Standard Procedure of German Public Prosecutors to Protect Against State-organized Crime":

1. Denial of requests for punishment
2. Absolute failure to recognize an initial suspicion

3. The criminal offense(s) in the requests for punishment are designated as lawful
4. Any crime(s) visible beyond this will be ignored

Requests for punishment against such suspects are simply renamed criminal complaints by the Attorneys General (po) and these are not processed on the grounds that there is no initial suspicion (sufficient actual evidence). They don't give a damn about the obviousness of their deliberately untrue allegations (lies) (even if documentary evidence is presented, i.e. "sufficient" as well as "urgent suspicion") and the obviousness of their breaking the law. They clearly demonstrate their absolute certainty that nothing can happen to them in this German state. They disregard the Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO) in many ways, in particular the Principle of Legality and the Inquisition Maxim of the actions of the public prosecutor.

They simply describe the criminal offenses to be investigated and to be prosecuted by filing requests for punishment as being in accordance with the law. They ignore other criminal offenses of the accused or other criminals involved visible from the documents of the requests for punishment.

As political officials of the executive, i.e. officials of the federal and state governments, they commit
- at least one Bending the Law (§ 339 StGB) in conjunction with § 12 StGB a CRIME,
- en masse Prevention of Prosecutions in Office (§ 258a StGB) for Official Offenses such as Fraud in the particularly serious case (§ 263 StGB), Theft in a particularly serious case (§§ 242, 243 StGB), Coercion in a particularly serious case (§ 240 StGB), Blackmail (§ 253 StGB), Infidelity (§ 266 StGB),
- and they break the Constitution (Art. 20 (3), 97 (1), 103 (1) Basic Law) and disregard the Rights Equal to Fundamental Rights of the victim of the crime,

to protect such offenders from organizations with a legal form under public law from punishment.
They mutually certify each other's criminal offenses as lawful, with an escalation being refused or passed on downwards to cover up the responsibilities.

They massively, unrestrictedly and without exception use this criminal possibility to protect criminals of organizations with a legal form under public law and their subservient accomplices.
Our 5 requests for punishment alone resulted is 26 Bending the Law and 1,885 Prevention of Prosecutions in Office by 9 public prosecutors or chief public prosecutors. The General Public Prosecutors Reinhard Röttle and Dr. Jörg Fröhlich act as if it were none of their business.

Against this criminal arbitrary justice by refusing constitutional rights (Article 103 (1) Basic Law) victims cannot take legal action at national level. According to § 172 in conjunction with § 389 StPO, the state-organized betrayed cannot bring private charges against the Official Offenses (Fraud, Infidelity, Theft) committed in the course of state-organized fraud combined with Bending the Law and Breaking the Constitution, in order to take action against the Attorneys General (po) who are blocking the legal system. The same applies to Coercion and Blackmail committed in connection with Fraud. The ordinary courts are not only forbidden to convict someone for Official Offenses if the bound by instructions Attorneys General (po) and their authorized Minister of Justice do not want it; the courts are also obliged to inform the Attorneys General (po) on the person who tried it as a plaintiff.

They don't give a damn about the obviousness of their deliberately untrue statements (lies) and the obviousness of their breaking the law, which is always accompanied by at least one crime (Bending the Law); they clearly demonstrate their absolute certainty that nothing can happen to them. They act as commissioned political officials and are subject to the direct instructions of the Federal and State Justice Ministers. The patterns of behavior turn out to be so "synchronized" that their observance in the (general) public prosecutor's offices throughout the Federal Republic of Germany is certain.

The main perpetrators of arbitrary justice with perversion of justice (crimes), Prevention of Prosecutions in Office and breaches of the Constitution are the Justice Ministers of the State Governments and the Federal Government (executive), to whom they are subordinate. So it is the leading party politicians of the Party Oligarchy of the established political parties who ensure and are responsible for the state-organized fraud on the basis of perverting the law and breaking the Constitution via the Attorneys General (po) subordinate to them.

The politicians of the Party Oligarchy have criminalized the various branches of the judiciary in order to unlawfully use the private property of citizens. The prevention of the punishment of Fraud, Coercion, Blackmail, Theft and Infidelity by the "state" criminals and their voluntary helpers for their crimes is an essential building block. The Attorneys General (po) are the Party Oligarchy's “let off the leash watchdogs” to safeguard this state-organized crime.

Those most in charge are all those in power in the Party Oligarchy with their justice ministers in the state governments and in the federal government. They use the state power of the judiciary on the basis of Bending the Law, Prevention of Prosecutions in Office, breaches of the Constitution and committing criminal offenses (Fraud, Coercion, Blackmail, Theft. Infidelity) and they abuse the employees in organizations with a legal form under public law and in organizations of their submissive accomplices in order to steal the private property of citizens.

In view of the planned elimination of democracy and the Rule of Law, the "Pact for the Rule of Law" decided by the Chancellor and the Prime Ministers at the beginning of 2019 is the frank revelation of how stupid our "elites" think the people of the state are. It was decided to squander EUR 200 million (tax money, of course) in order to drum into the dumb people massively and on all channels that they thanks to their tireless "state parties" and "our great [and] functioning judiciary" with the judges hired by the "state parties" ilve in the most glorious of all constitutional states. Our upper ones watch day and night to ensure that the German Michel can go on sleeping peacefully; only every four years should he dutifully choosing the “representatives of the sovereign” pre-selected by the party oligarchs and otherwise be extremely submissive. And so that the subject also believes it, self-proclaimed "educational elitites" let our wise government hire them to inform the people by direct mail that their occasionally "perceived disadvantages" (e.g. in the state-organized fraud) "demanding humility" and that they need to pay more attention to "fairness of burden", "principle of solidarity", "fairness between generations", "general interest", "maintaining stability of the system", etc. [formerly: „das Volksganze“]. But: There can no longer be any talk of the existence of a democracy in the Federal Republic of Germany. "The parties are making the state their prey" was announced by Karl Jaspers as early as 1966, the former Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker repeated it several times in the years 1982 to 1992 and today we are not the only ones who see this as a fact that has already happened

However, based on the experience we have had with state-organized fraud as a result of the GMG, we have to add: “The Rule of Law has also become the prey of the parties.” The politicians of the Party Oligarchy have criminalized the entire judiciary and the Attorneys General (po) secure state-organized crime away.

The eliminating the independence of the judiciary as one of the three pillars of our Democratic Constitutional State (Legislative, Executive, Judiciary),
the systematic disregarding of our Basic Law in the course of the establishment of the state organized Fraud based on Bending the Law and Breaking the Constitution,
the undermining of Parliamentary Democracy through marginalization or even elimination of parliament,
the maintaining this state of affairs through partisan appropriation of the Legislative by the unconstitutional parliamentary group votes,
the "commissioned jurisdiction" regarding the right to contributions by all chambers and senates of the German social courts and the law-bending and unconstitutional "jurisdiction" of the judges of the Federal Constitutional Court,
the protection of this state-organized crime by the political officials of the (general) prosecutors which are subordinate Executive
are nothing more than the abuse of state power by the Party Oligarchy to change the Constitutional Order. This has nothing to do with exercising the “state monopoly on the use of force to maintain state order”; it's the exact opposite.

> ***§ 81 High Treason Against the Federation StGB***
> *(1) Whoever undertakes it, by force or by threat of force*
> 1. *to impair the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany or*
> 2. ***to change the Constitutional Order based on the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany**,*
>
> *shall be punished **with life imprisonment** or with **imprisonment for not less than ten years**.*
> *(2) In less serious cases, the penalty is imprisonment from one to ten years.*

The party politicians have abolished the Rule of Law and thus the constitutional order with abuse of state power, they commit ***High Treason Against the Federation (§ 81 StGB)*** and according to constitutional principles all belong behind bars for life; their political parties are forbidden.

The loud and stately announced birthdays of the Basic Law, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Federal Constitutional Court 70+X years after the end of the Nazi dictatorship are only shameful in view of the fact that, analogous to the Weimar Republic, German party politicians have again eliminated a German democracy and its Constitutional State with uninhibited support by state lawyers who disobey all laws.

And now we are at the starting point of our consideration, namely the right of every citizen of the Federal Republic of Germany, which is equivalent to a fundamental right:

> ***Article 20 Paragraph 4 Basic Law: „All Germans have the right to resist anyone who undertakes to abolish this order if no other remedy is possible."***

We repeat the question that was explicitly asked to and not answered by the Federal Constitutional Court:
How do we do that without getting shot by the GSG 9?

EUROPE and its undemocratic institutions
EU Commission and European Court of Human Rights

Detailing with proof references below „Schlüsse": ***[IG_S14]*** 20220411_Europa und seine undemokratischen Institutionen - EU-Kommission_EGMR.pdf
20220411_EUROPA und seine undemokratischen Instuitutionen – EU Kommission_EGMR.pdf

According to the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the European Union is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law resulting from a common constitutional tradition in its member states. The EU Commission has been preparing an annual status report since 2020 in order to monitor and improve the rule of law in all of the now 46 member states and to generate warning signals for measures to be taken in individual member states if there is a systemic threat to it (Rule of Law Mechanism).

In the sense of this responsibility, the EU Commission decided in 2020 to investigate the role of the German financial service supervisory authorities (BaFin, BMF) in the WireCard fraud scandal, independently of German authorities. On July 7th, 2020, the EU Commission (President von der Leyen, Commissioners Dombrovskis, Jourová and Šuica) was asked to expand this investigation to include their role in reviewing/approving the 3-party agreements on capital life insurances between insurers, employers and employees regarding their legal quality and the possibility of manipulation to the detriment of the economically weakest party of employees. Of course, background information on the request - the state-organized crime on the basis of perverting the law and breaking the constitution and the fraud on the 6.3 million pensioners with a fraud volume of around EUR 26 billion at the end of 2018 - and the involvement of the financial service supervisory authorities and the capital life insurers were also sent to classify the topic.

This request to the EU Commission was answered after 6 months with, among other things: *„The facts […] relate to the design and application of the social protection systems […]. According to the EU treaties, the corresponding provisions are essentially the responsibility of the member states. It is up to the Member States to decide on the conditions and structure of the levying of contributions to finance the social protection systems. There are no indications that the facts you complained about could violate provisions of European Union law."*

On December 28, 2020, the EU Commission (von der Leyen, McGuiness, Dombrovskis) received tutoring: The EU's reply letter is off topic, the alleged complaint does not exist, compliance with the rule of law in the member states is very much a task for the EU Commission, although its review was not requested in the specific case. If there is still no correction to this day, the EU Commission will be certified to be

„extended arm of national Party Oligarchies" and „a nail in the coffin for the European idea".

This is how theory and reality diverge at the EU Commission.

The European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg (ECtHR) is to ensure that the (47; now after Russia's expulsion) 46 member states of the Council of Europe comply with the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and its Additional Protocols (ECHR). The rules according to which the 46 judges of the Member States and the registry belonging to and providing support to the ECtHR work are also laid down in the ECHR. Every citizen of the 46 member states can complain to the ECtHR against the violation of the human and fundamental rights laid down in the ECHR by their member state if the conditions laid down in Art. 35 ECHR are met. After the admissibility has been clarified, this individual complaint is assigned to a 3-judge committee, a 7-judge chamber or the Grand Chamber (17 judges), depending on the "severity" of the case. The essential information about the complainant and his previous completion of the national legal process must be documented in the prescribed complaint form; supplemented by evidence documents for the legal process and other details.

The member states are not forced to do anything by successful individual complaints, but there is still pressure on those member states that constantly disregard the human and fundamental rights of their citizens. The German “subversive activities lawyer”, A. Müller-Elschner, who has been working in the registry of the Court since 2000, and “his German judge” R. Jaeger (in 2004 – 2010), who has already shown during her time as a Federal Constitutional Judge that she considers the Federal German Constitution and the Federal Constitutional Court Law to be only conditionally applicable, tell us that countries like [Russia], Turkey, Romania, Ukraine, Slovenia, Georgia, Moldova and Bosnia-Herzegovina have some catching up to do in respecting human rights and have led to an enormous backlog of complaints.

However, the available figures make it clear in connection with the rules for dealing with complaints that the pressure to act to introduce the single-judge decision derived from them is a politically willed lie. The assertion that the processing of the complaint data in the law firm for a well-founded admissibility decision requires legal knowledge or even legal experts in the jurisdiction of the complainant's country is also a flat lie. Article 35 of the ECHR results in exactly 8 questions to be answered, all of which can be answered by a competent secretary using the data on the completed complaint form. Another lie is the assertion that knowledge of the used language is a mandatory requirement for this preparatory work for the admissibility decision. If the complainant via the ECHR is allowed to lodge a complaint in his native language to an international court for 46 member states, then the inability to translate the text content required for a decision on admissibility of 3 to max. 7 (on average approx. 5) pages into one of the two official languages of the ECtHR is a reason for the immediate dismissal of the Chancellor and his controlling President of the ECtHR; otherwise this can only be understood as unwillingness.

With the single-judge decision, the Council of Ministers abolished the minimum 6-eyes principle (committee) and thus opened the floodgates to the possibility of manipulation. Carrying this out on grounds that are all flimsy lies goes against the Council of Europe's noble intentions to promote the rule of law.

Although the single-judge decision was linked to the fact that this may not be made by the respective judge of the complained state alone, this does not prevent a decision not to accept the case being prepared on the basis of lies by an interloper of the complained state in the registry. In the press release of the Council of Ministers from May 15, 2010 on the introduction of the single-judge decision it says: „In order to enable the registry and the judges to process“ *[correct here would be: getting rid of]* „cases more quickly, decisions on the admissibility and merits of individual complaints are made jointly. This has already become common practice at the Court of Justice.“ In 2010, the Council of Ministers therefore saw no problem in unlawfully shifting the judicial decision on admissibility to an opaque registry, in violation of the ECHR, and in making a contribution to the ECtHR breaking the ECHR.

The massive efforts to introduce single-judge decisions, particularly by the Federal Republic of Germany and the Swiss Confederation, began before 2004. The excuses advanced are flimsy lies, but both states have solid motives. From 2002 Germany prepared the state-organized fraud on over 6 million pensioners and established it from 2004. Even taking into account the intentional and encouraged inertia of the German judicial system, a massive wave of lawsuits was to be expected after a few years, which could also spread to the ECtHR. As a consequence, Germany would have to be thrown out of the Council of Europe by the other member states for criminalizing the judiciary and undermining the German Constitution. In Switzerland,

citizens pushed through the constitutional ban on the construction of minarets in 2009, so the Swiss Federal Constitution has since broken the ECHR; as a consequence, Switzerland would have to be thrown out of the Council of Europe by the other member states.
It is said that the "German-speaking" Republic of Austria is also involved in the use of the possibility of manipulation, but we have not investigated this further.

A detailed examination of the articles of the ECHR reveals that they do not provide an answer as to how a single-judge decision on the inadmissibility of a complaint should proceed. In particular, it remains completely open who decides that a complaint is inadmissible and who determines to which national judge the decision to sign the non-acceptance is forwarded. All judges of the ECtHR have also issued Rules of Procedure (RoP) of the Court. Of course, one would expect that this RoP would be in line with the ECHR and that it would not only contain text variations of the international regulations of the ECtHR that would encourage perversion of the law, but also actual additions for the work of the ECtHR. But none, even from the RoP it is not clear how a single-judge decision should / may take place. To confuse matters even more, "reporter" and "judicial reporter" are happily interspersed and neatly mixed up. It must be concluded that this ambiguity of the ECHR and the supplementary RoP regarding the process of single-judge decisions on the non-acceptance of complaints is intentional in order to ensure freedom of design for the breaches of the ECHR by interlopers in the registry and the judges.

Of course, Switzerland also smuggled interlopers (subversive activities lawyers) into the registry. So the German-Swiss cooperation between the "rogue states" is running perfectly. The Swiss interlopers prepare the non-admission of the Swiss individual complaint and have it signed by the German judge, insofar as they still consider his signature to be necessary in their megalomania. In return, the German interloper Müller-Elschner prepares the non-admission of the German individual complaints and the Swiss judge signs it. The justification for the decision, which has been necessary since the introduction of the single-judge decision, is "worked out" by the interlopers, is very simple and always the same: a bunch of lies in a few sentences with the core lie; „*domestic remedies have not been exhausted as required by Art. 35(1) of the Convention*“.

The Swiss human rights lawyer O. Lücke has reported on a number of handling of complaints before the ECtHR. His experiences about the state of corruption and the open breach of the ECHR by the ECtHR coincide with ours. But we have to disagree with him on 3 points: 1) In fact, he was taken in by the brazen lies of the Swiss state lawyers, who claim that in order to complete the national legal process, the violation of the respective right from the ECHR, which was later to be denounced, must have already been reprimanded nationally. 2) He believes in the lies of necessary experience with the national legal system and language skills to decide on admissibility. 3) He apparently believes that the judges of the ECtHR are being manipulated and misled by the interlopers in the registry.

On point 3): The decisions of the ECtHR are exclusively the responsibility of the judges of the ECtHR. If they allow themselves to be manipulated in the process, then it would also be their responsibility. The fact that e.g. Germany has with A. Seibert-Fohr a judge in the ECtHR “in running” since 2020, whose planned manipulability is obvious; she dreams of being able to continue to scientifically penetrate International Law during her 9 years of service in Strasbourg and she has absolutely no idea what the task of a judge is.

Furthermore, we have proved that the judges of the ECtHR are aware of the "national use" of individual / many / all by their member states to manipulate complaints. After the complaint "Rüter vs. Germany, complaint no. 52128/21" prepared by the German subversive activities lawyer Müller-Elschner was rejected by the Swiss judge and member of the "Swiss Social Democratic Party" Andreas Zünd with the usual core lie, all 47 judges of the ECHR (including their elected presidents) were repeatedly asked in personal letters, with a deadline, to put an end to this criminal activity at the ECtHR with the legally available means of the ECHR and the RoP. The answer … continued icy silence from all 47 judges from all member states.

It scratches the varnish of the European community of states and the imaginary self-image as a stronghold of the rule of law and democracy in the world, when the decisions of the ECtHR reveal that this self-image is just a badly peeling facade and that disregard for democracy and the rule of law is a fairly widespread evil in the member states. So are the 46 member states of the Council of Europe trying to silence the bearers of the bad news (the complainants)? The question arises: Did the other member states also establish such criminal methods after Germany and Switzerland enforced the single-judge decision? But probably not all. According

to the complaint statistics, there are black sheeps (e.g. Ukraine), maybe the good ones can be found among them. How did the German and Swiss "clean men_women" and "model democrats" manage to enforce this abolition of European law? … As always? … with money or with political blackmail?

If the member states of the Council of Europe cannot bring themselves to put an end to this criminalization of the ECtHR by continually breaking the ECHR, then they should at least manage to end the intolerable abuse in the naming of the ECtHR and the misleading of the citizens of Europe and rename this European institution to what it actually is, at least since 2010:

„EUROPEAN POLITICAL SHODDY THEATRE“