

Helga Zepp-LaRouche og professor Francis Boyle taler til den internationale fredskoalition (IPC) den 19. januar 2024

Ikke korrekturlæst

ANASTASIA BATTLE: Velkommen alle sammen! Dette er Den Internationale Fredskoalition. Mit navn er Anastasia Battle, og jeg er ordstyrer i dag sammen med min medvært Dennis Speed. Dette er vores 33. møde, som vi har holdt i løbet af de sidste mange måneder. Vi har haft meget succesfulde initiativer og projekter, som vi alle har gennemført. Folk fra hele verden, der samler fredsorganisationer og fredeligt sindede mennesker for at stoppe atomkrigen på tværs af ideologiske grænser, ja, faktisk på tværs af ideologiske grænser. Vi vil gerne byde velkommen til alle, der er med os i dag. Det har været en meget intens proces i løbet af de sidste par måneder, hvor vi er gået fra det ene brændpunkt til det andet. Men i virkeligheden er det et ovenfra og ned-perspektiv af et generelt pres for atomkrig. Så tak til alle for jeres hårde arbejde. Vi har en række rapporter i dag fra forskellige organisationer og grupper, erfarne arrangører fra hele verden. Vi har også en international menneskerettighedsadvokat, som vil tale i dag, Francis Boyle. Han er en fremragende person; han har udført mange forskellige initiativer, herunder at skrive artikler om anklager mod præsidenter i fortiden for spørgsmål som dette.

Vi åbner med en række personer på dagsordenen, som jeg lægger ud i gruppechatten, så folk kan se, hvem der er med. Vi har et bestemt antal talere i begyndelsen, og så åbner vi op for

generel diskussion, initiativer, ideer. Jeg giver ordet videre til min medvært Dennis Speed.

DENNIS SPEED: Vi bør gå direkte til Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlæggeren af hele dette foretagende, og vi vil høre fra hende, og derefter få en rapport fra Anastasia. Helga, vær venlig at gå i gang.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Hej til jer alle sammen, først og fremmest; velkommen. Jeg tror, at vores indsats bliver mere presserende dag for dag, fordi den geopolitiske konfrontation, som de regionale kriser i Sydvestasien og Ukraine blot er afledningerne af, eskalerer. Det hele skyldes, at de unipolære verdenskræfter mener, at de bør bevare dominansen og modsætte sig fremkomsten af et andet system, idet de helt fejlagtigt karakteriserer det som dødsfjenden, der skal besejres; hvilket er forkert.

Vores politik er, at vi skal nå frem til et nyt paradigme, hvor alle lande på planeten arbejder sammen om fælles mål for hele menneskeheden. Når det er sagt, er det meget tydeligt, at NATO er ude på et skråplan. Det seneste, faktisk ret utrolige eksempel, kommer fra admiral Rob Bauer, som er formand for NATO's militærkomité. Han kom med en udtalelse, hvor han sagde, at vi kæmper for en omdannelse af NATO; at der skal ske en mentalitetsændring fra en tid, hvor folk troede, at alt var klart og kontrollerbart, til en tid, hvor alt kan ske når som helst. Han siger, at der er tektoniske ændringer i magtens plader, og som et resultat står vi over for den farligste verdenssituation i årtier. Og derfor må NATO være i rødt alarmberedskab for en fuldskala krig. Det er utroligt, at denne mand siger dette. Så siger han, at der ikke er nogen vej væk fra krigen i Ukraine, den vil afgøre verdens skæbne.

Jeg vil virkelig spørge, om der er juridiske eksperter til stede ved dette opkald, og de, der lytter, må have en mening. Er det virkelig tilladt at føre krig på den måde? For hvis man hele tiden siger "Rød alarm, I skal forberede jer på en total

krig", så opdanner man til ting, som skaber præcis den mentalitetsændring, som de ønsker. I Sverige, hvor vi havde sådanne udtalelser fra alle mulige mennesker, og i Finland og Tyskland, hvor forsvarsminister Pistorius sagde, at hele landet skal være "krigsparat". I Sverige, hvor sådanne udtalelser blev fremsat, plus advarslen om, at krigen ville bryde ud med Rusland på svensk territorium om to år; i Tyskland skulle det kun være et halvt år nu. I Sverige, efter sådanne udtalelser fra civilforsvarsministeren, skyndte folk sig i panik til stormagasinerne, tømte hylderne og forsøgte at få fat i batterier og alle mulige andre ting. Så denne form for krigsmageri synes jeg virkelig også, vi bør diskutere en modstrategi, for efter min mening, og så vidt jeg ved – og jeg har studeret det en hel del i lang tid – er de russiske militære skridt ikke rettet mod at forårsage en total atomkrig, og det er Kinas heller ikke. Derfor, hvis NATO bliver ved med at sige dette, er det faktisk potentielt en selvopfyldende profeti, og efter min mening er det lovstridigt at gøre det.

Det er klart, at situationen i Sydvestasien stadig er den farligste krudttønde. For efter at udenrigsminister Blinken havde rejst rundt i regionen og mødtes med Netanyahu, sagde Blinken angiveligt, at der burde findes en løsning i form af en palæstinensisk stat, hvor de andre arabiske golfstater ville finansiere genopbygningen af Gaza, og Israel ville tillade en palæstinensisk stat. Dette blev fuldstændig afvist af Netanyahu, som afviste en palæstinensisk stat. Det ser ud til at være det, som eksperter længe har kaldt et "brud med en allieret"-scenarie; det vil sige, at to stater, som faktisk har det samme politiske mål, alligevel lader som om, at den ene har kontrollen, og så bryder den allierede med det ved at lade som om, at der er en spænding mellem de to. Der er en grund til at tvivle på, at det rent faktisk er tilfældet, for det ville være meget let for USA at stoppe Israels militære aktioner i Gaza, hvis de simpelthen ville holde op med at sende våben og penge. Så derfor er denne teori om et scenarie

med en løsrevet allieret faktisk meget mere realistisk. Det eneste, Netanyahu tilsyneladende lovede Blinken, var, at Israel ikke ville føre en større krig mod Hizbollah i Libanon. Men hvor meget det er værd, er et stort spørgsmål, for så blev Netanyahu spurgt af en journalist, hvorfor Israel hele tiden kun angriber Irans stedfortrædere – Hamas og Hizbollah og så videre – og ikke Iran selv. Netanyahu svarede: "Hvem siger, at vi ikke allerede bekæmper Iran? Det er præcis, hvad vi gør." Nu er det et åbent spørgsmål, hvad det egentlig betyder, men hvis Iran er involveret i denne krig, kan det føre til en situation, der er helt ude af kontrol, især i lyset af, at der for nylig var ekstremt vigtige diskussioner mellem Iran og Rusland om muligheden for at underskrive en militær traktat mellem dem. Jeg tror, det er situationen lige nu.

Naturligvis er der nu mange internationale organisationer, der forsøger at påvirke situationen, efter at den Sydafrikanske regering har anlagt sag mod Israel ved Den Internationale Domstol i Haag. Fordi Tyskland, af alle lande, følte sig tvunget til at gribe ind som en tredjepart, der tog Israels parti mod Sydafrika. Så der er nu mange internationale organisationer, der protesterer mod det; en af dem er SHAPE-organisationen med Chandra Muzaffar og Richard Falk og mange andre mennesker. Den resolution har allerede mange hundrede underskrifter, og jeg vil bare nævne et par af de tiltag, som de kræver. De kræver som konkrete skridt: en øjeblikkelig våbenhvile; en omfattende økonomisk genopbygning af Gaza og Vestbredden finansieret af Israel og deres vestlige støtter; at give det palæstinensiske folk fuld kontrol over genopbygningen; at stoppe alle former for diplomatiske, militære og politiske aftaler med Israel for at demonstrere, at de virkelig er isolerede; at støtte Sydafrikas sag ved Den Internationale Domstol; at udstede mange skarpt formulerede resolutioner mod Israel for at gøre det klart, at Israel er fuldstændig isoleret i verden.

Så er der også et meget vigtigt åbent brev fra organisationen

“Jews of Conscience” til den tyske regering, hvor der står: “Hvor vover I, ledere af den tyske regering, at benægte det, der bliver livestreamet hver dag i vores stuer, nemlig at Gaza er ved at blive forvandlet til en kirkegård for børn? Den beder Tyskland, men også andre europæiske nationer, om i stedet at slutte sig til Sydafrika og de mange andre lande i det Globale Syd, som allerede har tilsluttet sig den sydafrikanske sag i Haag.

Jeg ønsker ikke at uddybe mere end det. Jeg synes, at disse to situationer gør det meget klart, at vi absolut er på vej mod en global krig, hvis vi ikke ændrer dette. Vi ved, hvad der skal bringes i spil; vi har absolut brug for en omfattende fredsplan for Mellempøsten med en tostatsløsning, våbenhvile, en oaseplan for økonomisk genopbygning af hele regionen. Det diskuterede vi på sidste møde. Jeg synes, at ideen om at have et økonomisk udviklingsprogram, der indgyder håb for alle i regionen, er ekstremt vigtig. Det samme gælder naturligvis for Ukraine; Ukraine har ikke brug for at blive gjort til en af verdens våbenfabrikker, hvilket er, hvad det militær-finansielle-industrielle kompleks på en eller anden måde planlægger. Ukraine har brug for økonomisk omstrukturering for at genopbygge deres økonomi, hvilket kun kan ske, hvis vi får de europæiske lande til at arbejde med Bælte & Vej Initiativet og naturligvis invitere USA til at være en del af det. Den nye sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur, som vi absolut skal nå frem til, skal tage hensyn til hvert enkelt lands interesser og ikke efterlade nogen udenfor, for ellers kan det ikke fungere.

Jeg synes, det er de emner, vi skal diskutere i dag, og jeg giver dig ordet.

SPEED: Tak, Helga. [Vi har en særlig gæst i dag. Jeg tror, at nogle mennesker kender ham godt, andre gør ikke, så jeg vil lige sørge for, at han bliver præsenteret ordentligt. Han er advokat Francis Anthony Boyle, en amerikansk menneskerettighedsadvokat, professor i international ret ved

Illinois University's College of Law. Han har været advokat for Bosnien-Hercegovina, og han har i meget lang tid støttet palæstinenserne og den oprindelige befolknings rettigheder. Nogle af os har haft lejlighed til at arbejde sammen med ham i forskellige sager. Vigtigst af alt har han faktisk ført sager for Den Internationale Domstol; han har arbejdet med og været i stand til at identificere tilfælde af folkedrab i fortiden. Han er her for at tale med os om det i dag. Han har begrænset tid, og derfor vil vi straks give ordet til professor Francis Boyle.

Resten på engelsk:

[On Jan. 19, Prof. Francis Boyle gave the following lecture to a meeting of the International Peace Coalition regarding his history of having fought and won a case of genocide at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague, otherwise known as the World Court. Boyle is an American human rights lawyer and professor of international law at the Illinois University's College of Law. He served as counsel for Bosnia and Herzegovina during their case at the ICJ in 1993.]

EIR is publishing Prof. Boyle's remarks in order that his expert legal opinion regarding the current case by South Africa against Israel at the ICJ becomes a larger topic of discussion internationally. We hope that this knowledge, and the circulation of it among all proponents of a just peace, will greatly reduce the ability by outside political forces to pressure the ICJ judges to ignore the principles of law that govern the "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide" which was approved by the UN General Assembly on December 9, 1948.]

PROF. FRANCIS BOYLE: Thank you very much, Dennis for having me here today. I want to express my gratitude to Helga Zepp-LaRouche for having me speak at this conference at this critical time in the history of the human race.

I believe that the Republic of South Africa will win an order of provisional measures of protection against Israel on behalf of the Palestinians. I'm speaking here as a straight-out legal matter. Obviously, as we speak here today, Israel and the United States are putting massive political pressure on the judges of the World Court to rule against the Republic of South Africa and the Palestinians.

I'm just going to deal with this as a technical, legal matter. As Dennis correctly pointed out, I was the first lawyer ever to win anything from the International Court of Justice on the basis of the Genocide Convention. I won a massive, overwhelming order for the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina against the rump Yugoslavia to cease and desist from committing all acts of genocide against the Bosnians. That was in April 1993. Then, I won a second massive overwhelming order for the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina against Yugoslavia to cease and desist from committing all acts of genocide against the Bosnians on September 13, 1993. This was the first time ever in the history of the World Court that any lawyer had won two such orders in one case since the World Court was founded in 1921. Then, I won a third order—what's known as an Article 74, Paragraph 4 order to the same effect from the President of the Court which was binding on the parties. So, three orders in under six months.

In addition, on behalf of my clients at the time, the mothers of Srebrenica and Prijedor who survived the massacre at Srebrenica. I convinced the prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia to indict my adversary, Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic for almost every crime in the ICTY statute, including two counts of genocide. One for genocide against Bosnia in general, and the second for genocide at Srebrenica in particular. He was put on trial in The Hague. After the close of the prosecution's case, he filed a motion to dismiss all the charges. That was denied by the tribunal ruling that there was enough evidence produced

by the prosecution to convict him on all charges beyond a reasonable doubt, including the two counts of genocide; and that he should then proceed to open his defense, which was going to implicate all the international officials working in cahoots with him behind the scenes. Whereupon, he mysteriously died; dead men tell no tales.

I don't have time here to go through the entire application by the Republic of South Africa, the request for provisional measures of protection, and six hours of oral arguments before the World Court by two teams of lawyer on both sides. By the way, if you were following those hearings, I did all those arguments myself for Bosnia-Herzegovina. What I want to point out here, however, is from my perspective, the most critical factor you will note if you listen to the hearings. That was argumentation back and forth over my original order for the Bosnians. The British lawyer representing Israel, [Christopher] Staker, lied through his teeth about the meaning of my first order. He lied. Let me read to you from my first order that I won. He lied about this; he said it didn't mean what it said it said:

“Unanimously, the Government of Yugoslavia should immediately in pursuance of its undertaking in the Convention of Genocide, take all measures within its power to prevent commission of the crime of genocide.”

He lied about that, and I have been saying all along in my interviews, at a minimum, the Republic of South Africa will win a provisional measure like that on behalf of the Palestinians as precedent.

Second, the British lawyer Staker tried to explain away and minimize another—and by the way, that measure was then reaffirmed in the second order I won before the World Court, which Staker didn't point out, by 13 votes to 2. Reaffirms the provisional measure indicated in Paragraph 52A1 of the order made by the court in April 1993, which should be immediately

and effectively implemented. Only the Russian judge and the Serb judge ad hoc ruled against me. And of course, Russia and Serbia were working in cahoots with each other.

Now, Staker did not lie about this provision here, but he tried to explain away and discount its significance. Let me repeat it: "Unanimously, the Government of Yugoslavia and the Government of Bosnia-Herzegovina should not take any action, and should insure that no action is taken which may aggravate or expand the existing dispute over the prevention or punishment of the crime of genocide or render it more difficult of solution." I believe I got that measure because I figured that we would obey the order, and Yugoslavia under Milosevic was going to grossly disobey it. And I wanted to entrap Yugoslavia in massive breaches of all areas of international law, not just the Genocide Convention. This measure was reaffirmed in the second order I won "By 14 votes to 1 reaffirms the provisional measure indicated in Paragraph 52b of the order made by the court on 8 April 1993, which should be immediately and effectively implemented." Notice, 14 to 1; even the Russian judge agreed with that, only the Serb judge ad hoc voted against me.

Now, as for the third measure of provisional protection I won for the Bosnians, the Republic of South Africa asked for a modified version of this measure. It's been modified for the circumstances of the Palestinians' case. "By 13 votes to 1, the Government of Yugoslavia should in particular insure ... do not commit any acts of genocide, of conspiracy to commit genocide, of direct and public incitement to commit genocide, or of complicity in genocide whether directed against the Muslim population of Bosnia-Herzegovina, or against any other national, ethnic, racial, or religious group." At the time, Bosnia had—and still has—about 10 different racial, ethnic, national groups. I got them all protected. Primarily Muslims, but not exclusively, Croats, Jews, Turks, Roma, and others; I got them all protected.

In this case, of course, it's just the Palestinians, so that's why that measure has been modified by the Republic of South Africa. And again, in my second order, 13 votes to 2; only the Russian judge and the Serb ad hoc judge voting against me. "Reaffirms the provisional measure indicated in Paragraph 50A2 of the order, which should be immediately and effectively implemented."

So, that is why, just as a straight-out legal matter, I believe that the Republic of South Africa should win those three provisional measures of protection. But again, as a political matter, massive pressure is being applied. I'm sure those judges of the World Court today are being blackmailed, threatened, bullied, and intimidated by the United States and Israel and their supporters to rule against the Republic of South Africa.

Finally, let me get into the complicity of the Biden administration and the British for sure. This is a complicity to commit genocide in violation of Article 3, Paragraph E of the Genocide Convention that criminalizes complicity in genocide. I was in a similar situation for Bosnia-Herzegovina. Pursuant to my advice, Bosnian President Alija Izetbegović authorized me, on November 15, 1993, to sue Britain at the International Court of Justice for aiding and abetting genocide against the Bosnians; which I set out to do and was fully prepared to do when the British threatened to starve the Bosnians if I actually filed the lawsuit. Though at that time, I was in negotiations with the court for the hearing in my complaint against Britain.

I believe that's the end of my 10 minutes. I've given you my assessment of the current situation. That's where we stand, and I'm very happy to be here today. I hope I've given you something to think about. Thank you, Dennis.

SPEED: Helga, I want to give you a chance to respond, see if there's anything you wish to ask, or any other remarks you

have.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: First of all, thank you, Professor Boyle. I remember our cooperation at the time of the Bosnia-Herzegovina and Srebrenica situation. I'm very happy to see you doing well.

I only have one question. What is it that the international peace movement could do to try to make sure that the legal expertise which you presented, which is obviously a factor in the situation, that that becomes more a topic of discussion so that the ability to influence the outcome of the these judges and the ruling of these judges is being minimized?

BOYLE: Well, Helga, I've been giving all the interviews I possibly can. But because of Zionist control and domination of Western news media sources, I've been blackballed and black-listed out of all mainstream Western news media sources. So, I guess you can just get the message out. For example, the lecture I just gave today. You could get it out around the world as best you can; you have my permission to use this lecture, certainly.

SPEED: Professor Boyle, we have one question that did come in from one of our main people, Jason Ross, who asks you this: "Craig Murray, reporting from the public gallery at the International Court of Justice, wrote that the judges 'looked visibly relieved' when attorney Malcolm Shaw raised the issue of the existence of a formal dispute between South Africa and Israel. 'This gave them a way out,' writes Murray. The case could be technically invalid, and then they would neither have to upset the major Western powers, nor make fools of themselves, by pretending that a genocide the whole world has seen was not happening.'

"Professor Boyle, was this raised as an issue in your own case against Yugoslavia? Do you think Shaw's argument holds any weight before the International Court of Justice?"

BOYLE: Look, you say that Craig—I wasn't there, but this could provide the judges of the court a way not to rule; a technical argument out. As I said, it's been reported that Israel is bringing massive pressure upon these judges. I would say blackmail, threats, intimidation to rule against South Africa, just like they did to Goldstone on the Goldstone Report. Now as for Shaw's technical argument legally, look here, President Izetbegović appointed me Bosnia's ambassador to the World Court on a Friday afternoon at about 4pm. I went back to the hotel, cleared out, got on the 8pm plane from JFK to The Hague, and then sued them. The Yugos had no notice from us that I was going to sue them. There were no negotiations over genocide, there was nothing. I just sued the SOB's. The Yugos were first informed on Monday of my lawsuit. The World Court had no problem with that.

As for the British lawsuit, I appeared with the Bosnian ambassador at UN headquarters in New York at a press conference at the end of July 1993, where I publicly threatened to sue all five permanent members of the Security Council. So, at least the British were on notice, but the Yugos had no notice. What can I say?

I did want to point out one other thing. The world news media is dismissing an order which I believe South Africa will win, saying it will have no significance. Excuse me. After I won my first World Court order for the Bosnians, I walked out of the grand courtroom to hold a press conference right there in the foyer with the entire world news media in front of me. I held up my order and I said, "Look here. The World Court has just ruled that genocide is going on in Bosnia. Under Article I of the Genocide Convention, every state party to the Genocide Convention has an obligation to prevent the genocide by Yugoslavia against the Bosnians. Therefore, I am calling for direct military intervention by the United States and the NATO states to save the Bosnians from extermination by Yugoslavia." A few hours later, Washington, D.C. and NATO headquarters

announced that they were instituting a no-fly zone over Bosnia with their own jet fighters, and they would shoot down any Yugoslav jets, airplanes, or helicopters that intruded on Bosnian air space. The Yugos could no longer murder Bosnians from the sky.

So, if and when South Africa wins this order, it could have very significant consequences for Israel. We'll just have to see what happens. Again, yes, Murray is right; like Goldstone, the judges might succumb to pressure and rely on Shaw's argument. But as I said, Shaw's argument created no problems for me when I successfully sued the Yugos and won those three orders.

SPEED: We have one more question for you: "I also have a question. In case the ICJ decides provisional measures, can this be a sufficient legal basis to pursue then in different countries those who minimize and support genocide?"

BOYLE: Yes. Under the Rome statute for the International Criminal Court, genocide is a crime. And the Rome statute states are required to have domestic implementing legislation for the Rome statute, including genocide. Now, I cannot say precisely what all those Rome statutes say—there are 120 or something—what that domestic implementing statute says. It depends on the law of the state; it does not have to be consistent. But, to give you an example, I filed a complaint with the International Criminal Court against Bush-Cheney, Rumsfeld, Ashcroft, Tenet, Rice, and the rest of them, for a policy of extraordinary rendition, which is a euphemism for the enforced disappearance of human beings and torture of them. Now, Bush, Jr. after he retired, announced he was going to Geneva to give a speech. So, Geneva NGOs contacted a Swiss parliamentarian, and the Swiss parliamentarian publicly demanded that on the basis of my complaint, the Swiss federal prosecutor indict Bush, Jr. when he showed up in Geneva for violating the Swiss domestic implementing legislation for the Rome Statute on torture. That was headlines in the Geneva

Tribune. That got back to Bush, and he never showed up in Switzerland. So, yes, this can be done, but again, it all depends on—there is this principle of universal jurisdiction, but it all depends on the law and the procedure of every state in the world. I was involved in an attempt to prosecute Sharon, Yaron, Elie Hobeika, and Rafael Etan in Belgium under their universal jurisdiction statute for the massacres of Sabra and Shatila. We were doing quite well, and then Rumsfeld publicly threatened Belgium that if they didn't change that statute, he would move NATO headquarters from Brussels. Whereupon, the Belgians caved in, and changed the statute, and our lawsuit was out.

So, there's no hard and fast rule. I would have to work with attorneys—I was there working with Belgian attorneys who asked me to get involved, because I had sued General Yaron here in the United States for the massacre of Sabra and Shatila for a group of women who were next of kin. That was the first lawsuit, to the best of my knowledge, ever filed against an Israeli official for a massacre against anyone. So, it all depends on each state; what their laws say, what their procedures are, etc. To do that, I would have to work with experts on international law, constitutional law, criminal law in those countries to see if we can do it.

SPEED: I want to thank you for being with us, and what you've been saying and your consistency and your fight on these matters. That's what our International Peace Coalition is trying to bring to the fore. We'll certainly welcome you back whenever you'd like to more involved, or as involved as you can be. We want to thank you for being with us today.

BOYLE: I did want to sincerely thank Helga and her associates for providing enormous assistance to the Bosnians in the genocide against them. I remember distinctly going over to Brussels to speak at the European Parliament in a conference organized by Helga and her associates with the Bosnians. I just wanted to acknowledge that before you move on to your

next speaker.

SPEED: Thank you very much for that. We're certainly going to be consulting with you again.

Closing Remarks

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this was a very productive session. I think a lot of marching orders should come out of that. I would really urge people, and I'm happy to look at what Alex Jones is saying, because the one point I mentioned in my initial remarks, unfortunately nobody commented upon. But I think it's actually the most important to look at, and that is the statement by NATO that we are on a red alert for the preparation of a total, all-out war. I find it quite amazing that a top NATO leader is saying something like that. I would urge you all who know any kind of competent military experts in any country of the world, get them involved to comment on that. This is obviously a matter which should concern everybody. If there is total war, then all of us will be quite dead. So, that's one thing.

Then naturally, I would urge people to take the remarks of Professor Boyle and indeed make them known. Do outreach to other jurists, legal professionals, because I think this is also a wake-up call for all the law professionals to take the question of putting the world back into a legal shape, a legal order.

I'm very happy to say that I watched a little bit of the demonstrations in Berlin today, where the truckers were having a demonstration. Some of the farmers, as was mentioned, were there saying that they will from now on join together. They had a poster with a tractor and a truck, titled "Together We Are Strong!" Naturally, everybody is already saying if every pensioner would have a tractor, the world would look different, because they could go with their tractors on the street and protest as well in force, because their pensions

are being cut as well, or at least trampled upon.

So, I think there is a lot in motion. I'm also happy to give greetings to Maurizio; I glimpsed at the meeting of the new party in Italy yesterday, where Jeffrey Sachs gave a very passionate greetings from Bangkok. And Michele Geraci naturally is the person who was the initiator of the memorandum of understanding between Italy and China for Italy to join the Belt and Road Initiative. Then we heard the report from the people in Romania. I think all of these different aspects show how important it is that we connect more and more, because who would know about anything going on in Romania, but if the people speak on platforms like this one so that the other people can find out about it. So, I think therefore the situation is both good and bad; extremely dangerous, but also very hopeful. The more people wake up and start to take accountability positions, then we have chance to put the world back in order.

My only wish other than what I just said would be that you really have to build this process for next week. Make it double; make it triple; ten times as big. Then we can really impact the situation by becoming stronger and stronger. That's it for me for this week.