

# Drucksache 1

Claudia Latour / Martin Sonneborn

**Assange**

2. Auflage, aktualisiert. Jetzt noch deprimierender. Smiley!

# Preface

Dreamworks und Universal sind an einem konzisen Manuskript zum Leben von Julian Assange gescheitert, genauso wie die New York Times und der Guardian. Wir auch. Nehmen Sie, was jetzt dabei herausgekommen ist, als Plädoyer für Demokratie & Bürgerrechte (am Beispiel eines Publizisten und Plattformgründers), für eine freie Gesellschaft, freie Presse und freie Information. Oder als Sympathieerklärung an das Projekt von WikiLeaks - und Antipathieerklärung an all jene, die es bekämpfen.

Herausgeber:  
Martin Sonneborn  
Fraktionsloses Mitglied des Europäischen Parlaments  
Rue Wiertz 60  
1047 Brüssel  
Belgien

2. Auflage, aktualisiert. Jetzt noch deprimierender. Smiley!

Die zum Ausdruck gebrachten Meinungen liegen in der alleinigen Verantwortung der jeweiligen Verfasser und geben nicht unbedingt den offiziellen Standpunkt des Europäischen Parlaments wieder.

This english version has been typeset using LaTeX and has been fully translated by DeepL.com.  
A BIG THANK YOU TO deepL.com for the FREE service (This is NON-COMMERICAL, EDUCATIONAL USE!).  
Document sources: <https://github.com/schnoddelbotz/free-julian-assange>

# Contents

<b>I</b>	<b>More Being than Appearance</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II</b>	<b>„Yeah, why not?“</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III</b>	<b>Real criminal shit</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>IV</b>	<b>„Reeeevengel!“ (Fatty Pompeo)</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>V</b>	<b>Ping, Pong &amp; Psychology</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VI</b>	<b>In the wood-panelled heart of power</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VII</b>	<b>Who is there - and who is not</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>VIII</b>	<b>Castorf and the living knee</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>IX</b>	<b>Lawyer of the week</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>Yet another Laywer</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>XI</b>	<b>PSYCHO (without Hitchcock)</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>XII</b>	<b>About The Silcence of the Lambs</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>XIII</b>	<b>Lying like a professional</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>XIV</b>	<b>Surveillance and punishment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>XV</b>	<b>30 gentlemen in concrete sandals</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>XVI</b>	<b>Sex, Lies and Audiotape</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>XVII</b>	<b>Augurs and auspices</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>XVIII</b>	<b>2 Presidents of the USA, 1 Europe and Lord Justice Holroyde</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>XIX</b>	<b>The judicial empire strikes back</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>XX</b>	<b>Elf Jahre und zwei Tage</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>XXI</b>	<b>Ein in sich geschlossenes System der Verständigung</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>XXII</b>	<b>An Epiloges statt</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>XXIII</b>	<b>Nachtrag</b>	<b>28</b>
I	17 Stunden und 43 Minuten . . . . .	28
II	Lordrichter (bei) McDonalds . . . . .	29
III	Juristischer Jux aus der Frühen Neuzeit . . . . .	30
IV	Don't mention the war! . . . . .	31

V	V. Gerichtsbehördenbingo 'til the end of time . . . . .	32
VI	Finaler Frontallappenangriff . . . . .	33

„Das Politische kann, wo Menschen leben, nicht verschwinden.“

*J. Habermas*

which (in strange self-referentiality and the most stupid internal symbolism) so stubbornly their OWN OWN LIFE, that they are not able to deal with socially relevant questions, conditions and implications are actually no longer remotely connected.

Translated with [www.DeepL.com/Translator](http://www.DeepL.com/Translator) (free version)

## Chapter I

# More Being than Appearance



It is one of the findings that should not be new to an observer untrained in jurisprudence and jurisdiction. that the REALITY of a legal PROCEDURE sometimes has little to do with the REALITY of the underlying (LAW). REALITY of the (LAW) CASE on which it is based. CASE has to do. Especially not with the THESE in turn underlying ACTUAL CONDUCT. And least least with the socio-political and democratic-practical REALITY, which is concentrated in ALL THAT.

If the REALITY of a JUDGMENTAL NEGOTIATION is divorced from its overriding MEANING, from its triggers, reasons, causes, intentions, goals & consequences - and thus from the basically basically negotiable POLITICAL CORE - completely in order to be able to live in the absurd SHINING REALITY of a pseudo-territory enclosed by legal (in unstoppable madness) in front of oneself, then one is then one finds oneself in the appeal procedure around the extradition of the WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange.

Possibly, those who for centuries have been driven by nothing by nothing but their sheer existence of our JUSTICE SYSTEMS have now in the end been by these (self)destructive offshoots of late modernity. modernity - and that in spite of all their HISTORICITIES, no matter how obtrusively displayed. despite. This is of course all the more true for Great Britain's Magna Carta and its real-wood paneled walls, Victorian velvet curtains, emerald-green banker's lamps (Art Deco) and (well-powdered) judge's wigs.

Against the striking backdrop of such "legal traditions" in the social subsystem of the administration of justice and ARGUMENTATION PATTERNS have long since arisen in the social subsystem of the administration of justice,

## Chapter II

# „Yeah, why not?“



On 27 and 28 October 2021, in London, we will attend a trial in which the REALLY NEGOTIABLE, which has NEVER only affected Julian Assange himself, but always ALL OF US, is not even TALKED ABOUT. The (since 1066) meticulously rehearsed rules of procedure want it that way. That here not the big picture ITSELF, but only its legally permissible WRITS are up for negotiation. With which not the great whole ITSELF, but only the PARTS of a society which are affected by THIS (s)he parts of a "reality" produced by legal means.

And so it actually happens that on a full two days of hearings at the highest British court, the London High Court, the MAIN QUESTION concentrated in the Assange case does not even arise. Which of course is still whether a supposedly democratic constitutional state can misuse a 100-year-old US (anti-)espionage law, in order to - assisted by tradition-saturated judiciary apparatuses of friendly states under the rule of law (in the old European world) in a thousand-year chase of unprecedented Australian publicist so thoroughly that the only thing that could that the example made of him alone - because of the CRIMINAL EFFECT it has had investigative journalism of a Fourth Force, which even Fourth Force that is even remotely worthy of the name will henceforth be permanently prevented.

The British district court in which Australian publicist Julian Assange after a Kafkaesque cascade of prosecutorial (and governmental) cascade of prosecutorial (and governmental) manoeuvres last year, the British District Court had question in January this year with a disturbing "YES,

WHY? NOT?", in what was the biggest democratic SCANDAL in the history of democracy.

The first instance proceedings were (somewhat surprisingly) conducted by a bland District Judge named Vanessa Barrister. (District Judge by the name of Vanessa Baraitser, at the time the most the most undistinguished figure in the British judiciary at the time. had to offer. Neither her professional background, nor her curriculum vitae, nor an overview of the cases she had heard were publicly known. of the cases she tried - not even a blurred photograph. The average owner of a rural of a rural carwash had left more evidence of her actual more evidence of her actual existence than Vanessa Baraitser Vanessa Baraitser, noted British ex-diplomat Craig Murray<sup>1</sup>.

A handful of small claims cases had probably been assigned to her, exciting enough for the traditionally excitable (British) local press, after all: Sexual sexual harassment by and with police officers, provincial politicians with a penchant for surreptitious mobile phone snaps among pre-crossing skirt wearers, that sort of thing. Stuff. In ten years of district court practice, Baraitser had heard a single extradition case:

France's request for the rendition of a businessman (Alexandre Djouhri) implicated in state corruption surrounding ex-president Nicolas Sarkozy. The The matter was clear, Baraitser had approved it.

And now the Assange case.

## Chapter III

# Real criminal shit



Before anyone makes any judgement about Julian Assange, he should remind himself once again who (and what) he is who (and what) they are actually dealing with. they are dealing with.

Diligent statisticians have calculated that in ten years the small group of activists around WikiLeaks have published TEN MILLION secret documents in ten years. in ten years.

More than the entire world press, since the entire world press has even existed. Documents about war crimes, human rights violations, torture, violence, kidnappings, illegal surveillance, espionage, manipulation of opinion and environmental crimes.

Relevant publications include diplomatic and military secret papers (of leading belligerent states) as well as documents to make visible the modus operandi of socio-economic organisations and individual actors. organisations and individual actors - (lying) governments, (power-obsessed) party apparatuses, (corrupt) politicians (corrupt) politicians, (unsympathetic) entrepreneurs, (arsehole) corporations and (notorious) egomaniacs, (Swiss) (Swiss) banks, (offshore) fraudsters, (profit-fixated) nature destroyers and finally political ("Hillary") and religious ("Scientology") sects. WikiLeaks publications were never an end in itself, but a means to achieve a deeply of a profoundly democratic goal, which - borne out of and social ideal<sup>2</sup> - is based on the (incontrovertible) conviction that a FREE that a FREE SOCIETY can only be based on FREE INFORMATION.

In the WikiLeaks project, the fundamental question of modern democracies is condensed, namely that of the LEGITIMACY of state, intelligence and military information monopolies.

WikiLeaks is asking questions that every responsible citizen[3]in the sense of Kant, Voltaire, Daisy Duck & R.D. Precht should ask himself and his democratic and his democratic representatives (and uncles): Does a government have the right to (with the aim of retaining power or enriching itself) override the law? Does an intelligence service have the right to violate the privacy rights of citizens? of citizens it has been appointed to protect? Does a military have the right to violate human rights or principles of international law? And, if so, do these organisations also have the right to conceal violations from the public through secrecy?

Assange, a multi-award-winning journalist and publisher, has been publisher, has been held without legal grounds in the UK's maximum security Belmarsh prison since April 2019 - along with terrorists and serious criminals, serial killers, sex offenders, Islamists, right-wing extremists, IRA fighters, and Christoph Waltz, who was as Ernst Stavro Blofeld, last used his bionic eye from here to execute the (failed) order to kill James Bond. to kill James Bond. Belmarsh is the British Guantanamo, a strictly geometric breeding facility with clinically white interior cells, a place that has been given the (aptly) nicknamed HELLMARSH. Here sits the WikiLeaks founder has been held in solitary confinement for 30 months despite repeated statements by the United Nations (and others) that he is a victim of ar-

<sup>1</sup>Craig Murray on Baraitser: "Someone suggested to me she might be a hologram, but I don't think so. Holograms have more empathy."

<sup>2</sup>Enlightenment!

bitrary, illegal detention and psychological torture. There are, must be made clear time and time again that there is NO LEGAL BASIS for the detention of Julian Assange. There is nothing whatsoever against him.

*Subjective note from Ross Kemp. After watching parts of the documentary "Welcome to HMP Belmarsh", for which actor for which actor Ross Kemp ("EastEnders") was granted filming and access to the high security prison, we are almost a little relieved that Assange is at least housed in a single room. at least in a single room. And we are appalled, really stunned, that he should be deprived of his of his liberty to force him into a place like this to a place like this without any legal basis. Ross Kemp is a man like like a living room cupboard, and he's pretty tough. All over the world he has worked among criminal street gangs, in Afghanistan, Papua New Guinea and who knows what else as an "as an embedded journalist without batting an eyelid. without batting an eyelid. When he enters "The Box", the prison's high-security unit, and the door closes behind him, he is on the edge of his seat. closes behind him, he is in the most oppressive place in the whole world, he says. whole world, he says. There is no bed, no sink, toilet, no window, no access to water or air. to air. "You feel you are completely alone. I don't think I don't think I could spend an hour in here without going insane."*

In the first-instance proceedings concerning his extradition District Judge Baraitser had stubbornly refused to allow any of the refused to even take note of any of the obvious facts. of the obvious facts - from the genuinely JOURNALISTIC nature of WikiLeaks' publications to the recognisably POLITICAL nature of the accusations against its founder, to the obvious (to the blind, really) prospect of an unfair trial in the USA.

Assange would be tried in ALEXANDRIA in the US state of Virginia, where he would have to face a secret trial in a special court with a grand grand jury. In the immediate vicinity of this Washington and Langley, are the Pentagon, the Defense the Pentagon, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, and the headquarters of other military, security and intelligence agencies of the United States. The population structure of Alexandria is is about as far from an average urban population as this ridiculous trial is from the rule of from the rule of law. Between 80 and 90 per cent of Alexandria's residents of legal age, among whom the lay lay judges in the Assange trial would be recruited are representatives of government agencies, intelligence services or the US military, and have a direct, indirect or (at least) economic relationship of dependence on the US government. relationship of dependence on the US government. Grand juries in the relevant judicial district are so reliably one-eyed, one-eared, one-sided, biased and prejudiced that they cannot seriously be expected to render an objective

verdict - the burden of loyalty to the government is crushing. In the long the Eastern District Court of Virginia, there has there has never been a single case in which the grand jury has grand jury acquitted a defendant brought by the national security agencies. Truly never.

*Subjective note from heise.de US legal associations such as the American Association of Jurists (AAJ) and the Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR), together with legal institutions and jurists working internationally, have written a letter to the British Prime Minister. have written a letter to British Prime Minister Boris Johnson and his government to dissuade him from extraditing Julian Assange to the US. Julian Assange from being extradited to the USA. A Such a move would, in their view, be illegal: "Extradition would be unlawful because the protection of Mr. of Mr Assange's fundamental due process rights in the is not guaranteed in the USA. Mr Assange will be tried before the notorious "spy court" of the Eastern District of Virginia (in Alexandria, the author), before which no accused before which no national security defendant has ever succeeded. ever succeeded. Here, he faces a secret trial before a jury selected from a population in which most of the population in which most of the persons eligible for jury eligible for jury selection work for the CIA, NSA, DOD or DOS (The Central Intelligence Agency, The National Security Agency, U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Department of State) work for or are affiliated with.*

## Chapter IV

### „Reeeevenge!“ (Fatty Pompeo)



The United States of America was not aware of Assange's the publication of the materials (meticulously kept under wraps by the materials on the wars in the IRAQ and AFGHANISTAN. IRAQ and AFGHANISTAN, at the latest with the publications on human rights violations in the Guantanamo Bay prison camp. stepped<sup>4</sup>.

Under Barack OBAMA, the USA had still refrained from

<sup>4</sup>(Ouch, ouch.)

not out of philanthropy, but because of a tangible definitional dilemma, known among lawyers as the "New York Times problem". "New York Times problem". It goes something like this: how can Julian Assange be prosecuted for publishing classified material (on the pages of the pages of WikiLeaks) - BUT NOT the editors of the editors-in-chief of the New York Times, on whose pages said EXACTLY THE SAME THING? Or the editors of The Guardian, Le Monde, El Pais, Corriere della Sera, Süddeutsche Zeitung or Der Spiegel?

Lest a false impression be created here (by mistake) Under the Obama administration, the US intelligence and judicial authorities have, of course, also taken action against Assange. In 2011 the FBI carried out a large-scale infiltration operation against WikiLeaks in Iceland, recruited a paedophile as a false witness and - in preparation for an indictment - had already selected the appropriate grand jury. and - in preparation for an indictment - has already convened the appropriate grand jury. The only thing that has been postponed for the time being is the proceedings have been postponed, and this only on the urgent advice of lawyers who (in the White House) had suddenly remembered the contents of the "First Amendment".

The subtle legal philosophers around Donald TRUMP didn't give a damn about the lack of distinction (between publicists and publicists). ass.

In 2017, WikiLeaks had revealed the (disturbing) capabilities of the American of the American secret service to electronic surveillance and cyber warfare. The so-called "Vault 7" leak was the "biggest" and - according to the New York Times - really also the "most the "most embarrassing" data leak that had ever happened to the CIA - or any of its agency heads. For the then CIA chief (and later Secretary of State) Mike Pompeo it may (or may not) have been a (narcissistic) slight. (or not). In any case, it was the trigger for a (private) vendetta against the US that has since been carried out (private) vendetta against WikiLeaks and Julian Assange. Fatty Pompeo wanted ACHIEVEMENT. And officially declared WikiLeaks a "hostile non-state intelligence agency". - a neologism every bit as crude and malicious as its inventor, and one that no serious constitutional lawyer has ever heard of before (or since). <sup>5</sup>.

With Trump and Pompeo behind it, the US Justice Department finally brought its audacious indictment of Julian Assange. The writ covers 18 points (that's more than a western European ladybird has) and and, if he is extradited, it offers him the prospect of 175 years in prison - ten years for each of the 17 counts under the Espionage Act and a further five for the 18th count on which he was convicted. for the 18th, which charges him with attempt-

ing to hack into a government computer, an offence under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

Again, as a reminder, NONE of the US war criminals proven to have been at large in Iraq, Afghanistan or Guantanamo have been innocent, civilians, or children. tortured, tortured and murdered innocent people, civilians, children, was ever held accountable for his crime. ever been held accountable, charged or tried for his crime. tried. They are all at large. Accountable The one who should be held accountable, charged and brought to justice is the one here is the one who made their crimes public.

The United States essentially relies on the Espionage Act, a law passed in 1917, developed under World War II conditions for World War II secretaries and World War II information of World War II military sensitivity - where did General Custer's division park its howitzers? This "legal basis" alone, dug up in the absence of a plausible, justiciable (or otherwise valid) accusation of an offence, should give every European who has mentally outgrown the PRE-MODERNE (thorough) food for thought. think. The attempt to make an obsolete law of war more than 100 years later against a foreign publicist completely out of context 6]Of course, it was already misused by the US judiciary during the First World War to silence representatives of the political opposition, socialists or pacifists. A practice that the USA was to maintain until the late 1960s (and beyond). The 1971 (failed) trial of military analysts Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo, who had given documents to the New York Times, Washington Post and others proving that the US government had been lying to the public for years about the Vietnam War, caused a stir. years about the Vietnam War ("Pentagon Papers"), corresponds to the cute idea of the madman from the Bosphorus, a contemporary satire by Jan Böhmermann with the Reichs-deutsche Majestätsbeleidigungsgesetz (Imperial German libel law) (anno 1871). Both are already so absurd at first glance that there is no need for a more long-winded commentary. We hold: There is no legal basis to prosecute an Australian journalist under the Australian journalist under the US Espionage Act. under the US Espionage Act.

The US prosecution is not only completely out of time and absolutely absurd, it is also genuinely unconstitutional, because it criminalises core journalistic journalistic core activity and thus abrogates centuries-old legal principles, first and foremost that of freedom of speech

<sup>5</sup>The press conference in which Pompeo declares WikiLeaks to have this ceremonial title of honour is considered by retrospective political scientists to be one of the most cardinal events in the history of the United States. political scientists as one of the cardinal turning points at which the (post-) democratic democratic order of the Western world faced its dialectical tipping point



and, of course, that of the freedom of the press.

## Chapter V

# Ping, Pong & Psychology



Nevertheless, after several weeks of trial, District Judge Baraitser had taken the ludicrous view that Assange's extradition was not prevented by the OPENLY INCREDIBLE nature of an indictment constructed with proto-legal dodges. of a bill of indictment constructed with proto-legal dodges, but only - Tätäräää! - the after seven years of isolation in the Ecuadorian Embassy embassy and another two and a half years of unlawful imprisonment (rather unsurprisingly). the mental condition of the unjustly detained prisoner. unjustly detained prisoner. Supplemented by his suicidal tendencies, which were exacerbated by the world-renowned conditions of imprisonment in the USA and its habitual bestiality.

According to Baraitser's judgement, Assange is in a precarious mental state which, in view of the "harsh conditions" of the inhumane conditions" of the inhumane US prison system, which could "cause him to commit suicide". to commit suicide". Rule, Britannia.

In doing so, Baraitser's judgement leaves out the hair-raising "legal grounds" of the USA, which a REAL FANGIRL of the of the British Rule of Law, which should have been artfully fatally left completely untouched - and by not explicitly rejecting it, implicitly confirms its admissibility. That's really crass. Even more even more crass is the fact that her judgement shifts the negotiating process from the BATTLEFIELD of PRESS FREEDOM, which of course concerns all democrats and citizens and people of the world, to the level of an individual SHOCKSHIP, in which precisely the big picture of an endangered social order no longer plays a role, but only the technical and interpretative details of medico-psychological reports.

This alone was and is (without any doubt) a scandal of the

rule of law. And a multiple one at that. Hugh.

A FURTHER one is now added by the fact that the (downstream) proceedings here are caught in the tightly woven net of the framework of reasons given by the first instance - and the and the judicial discussion is almost entirely based on the inexhaustibly vague the inexhaustibly vague (& furthermore reliably personality-infringing) field of PSYCHOLOGY.

And so it is indeed the case that the lawyer's in the most important legal dispute on the freedom of the press of the present day, is a PING PONG of insinuations without of insinuations without substance, kitchen-sink psychological conjectures and their expert refutation. PRESENTED by James Lewis (in the the role of PING), an accomplished gun dog of the Crown, who here, of course, is not in the service of His Majesty but of highly unsubtle complainants from the USA. And WIDERLEGED by Edward Fitzgerald &. Mark Summers (Team PONG), two human rights lawyers clearly under clearly underchallenged with such nonsense.

Should the Encyclopaedia Britannica ever have an entry on the term "grotesque dysfunctionalities of archaotraditional legal systems", we would have a knot in the a knot in our handkerchief that we will certainly never forget. ever forget. Knot is in the handkerchief, you birds. Knot is in the handkerchief. You birds.

## Chapter VI

# In the wood-panelled heart of power



The Royal Courts of Justice courthouse in the centre of London is an awe-inspiring place full of secular secular sacredness and all-wood courtroom miniatures. Here - after the last reform of 1873 (LISTEN, LISTEN!) - not only the most important common law common law courts, including the Supreme and the Court of Appeal, but also in a tiny dressing room called COURT ROOM FOUR<sup>7</sup> so also

<sup>7</sup>Court Room Four is supposed to be something like the Lord Chief Justice's personal courtroom. Here he finds everything that can be dear to him: a breath of colonial air, his cosiest slippers, and 1 a few moths that have survived both

said prosecuting counsel James Lewis (wig: longhair, goat) as well as Edward Fitzgerald (longhair, steed) and Mark Summers (longhair, fake), the defence lawyers for Julian Assange (longhair, real).

Their raven black gowns reach down to the tips of their respective footwear, which - at least after a few pints - could turn out to be a potentially breakneck tradition. At the latest since the student movement at the latest, it should be common knowledge what under the talars is usually so hidden, here it's all 300 years old. His dirty grey the fine London legal profession owes its dirty grey wigs not even to a self-determined or Boris Johnson, but (on the contrary) to a pirated continental European copy of King Charles II. Charles II, who imported the idea of producing hand-knotted secondary hairstyles in 1660 from France, of all places. (Get Brexit done, folks, all right. Or in the Or in the words of Monty Python: "I don't want to talk to you any more to talk to you any longer, you overgrown English fresh beer drinker! I'll fart on you, you swine priests! If it's up to If it's up to me, you won't get into the European Community!")

Presiding over the lawyers are Lord Justice Sir Timothy Victor Holroyde (robe, short hair, black face mask) face mask) and Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales Wales Lord Ian Duncan Burnett, Baron Burnett of Maldon (robe, short hair, maskless). Whether the coronavirus still exists in Great Britain in October 2021 or not or not in the UK in October 2021 is, on the face of it. somewhat contradictory. The pubs on the island pubs (and all their patrons) have long been in agreement on this which, from the point of view of a continental European, is a surreal, but by no means unpleasant, reminiscence of a time of a time when coronae still meant the circular surface structures the circular surface structures of distant planets.

Either way, the supreme guardians of Her Majesty's legal system take their seats on eccentric red upholstered arm-chairs, everyone else in the plebeian-proletarian wooden class, furnished with the most medieval benches EVER possessed by man since the beheading of Ann Boleyn. She alone, of course, a physical torture as spartan as it is subtle, quite befitting the nastiest colonial plunderers of all time<sup>8</sup>.

On the wooden class benches of the courtroom gallery Assange's father John Shipton, his fiancée Stella Moris, the current WikiLeaks editor-in-chief Kristinn Hrafnsson, and WikiLeaks ambassador Joseph Farrell - along with the handful of journalists and trial and trial observers who made it into the VIP section of this visitors' gallery. Incidentally, via a spiral staircase inside a narrow torture tower. inside a narrow torture tower AND past a taciturn

courtroom court billeteuse.

## Chapter VII

# Who is there - and who is not



For whatever reason, access to the Public Gallery had initially been and drastic quota system, before KAIROS, the god of the opportune moment, gradually took over in the course of two days of negotiations. the god of the opportune moment. Whoever put on the right face the right face at the right place at the right time[9]and had the right slogan with him was let in. "Let me through, I am the EU." Those who don't, don't. There would have been room for 100 people, if the taciturn billeteuse hadn't asked for a good a dozen or so, for whatever reason, the heavy court door the heavy courtroom door creaking shut behind her.

A dozen seats for the interested public. For a trial in which the interested public itself is up for disposition.

All other observers of the trial, mainly representatives of somewhat insignificant-sounding media, must the trial by video transmission from a remote courtroom - via screens on which nothing can be seen, and loudspeakers. screens from which nothing can be seen and loudspeakers from which from which nothing can be heard. A further 80 journalists from around the world show signs of interest this time by tuning in via a video link. by tuning in via a video link.

Most of them have not even travelled to the event because the British judiciary had not been able to grant them access. had not been able to guarantee them access to the courtroom. Members of the press received conflicting messages, and for months the court clerk in charge, an unnamed court clerk had been on holiday for months (for a long time) or ill (seriously), moved, injured or deceased (unexpectedly), and had therefore not even responded to enquiries - certainly not in a binding manner. bindingly. Admission guarantees were categorically refused, press accreditations not issued, access lists not kept.

<sup>8</sup>After the Belgians, actually. But bygoness be bygoness

Anyone who is a representative of the press and nevertheless - at random - comes to this London courthouse is a FREAK. is a FREAK. If he were not, he would hardly have would hardly have appeared under such conditions. The incorruptible and undaunted director, publicist and activist Angela Richter is here, (after all) on behalf of the feuilleton of the WELT, the The clever Daniel Ryser from the Swiss magazine REPUBLIK, Markus Kompa follows the events for TELEPOLIS (via laptop on a dustbin in front of the courthouse) - and that's almost it.

Envoys of more important, higher-circulation German-language & international media houses - or even the big news agencies themselves - are of course not present. We assume: FOR REASONS. And confidently assume that they would ALSO NOT have come if they had been offered luxury suites with a private private gin fountain, diamond-studded giveaways or the crown treasure the crown treasure of some majesty.

Major media houses are not interested in Assange, you know. in Assange, you must know. At least not anymore. When they could still exploit his publications for some idiotic front-page bombshells they were of course NOT interested in him either. in him. Or for WikiLeaks. Or at least for the principle of FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, which, although it justifies their own existence, is nevertheless always ONLY vaguely defended by them at its really DECISIVE POINTS. is always defended ONLY insinuatingly.

If, instead, it has to be defended by someone, and that BOOSTINGLY with his OWN LIFE, without the relevant media people being particularly interested in it interested in it, then we don't really know what to do. If the principles of democracy should be FIREABLE, we hereby consider them to be DESTROYED.

NOT present, of course, are those - according to their self-declaration - democracy-savvy civil rights militants from the convoluted structures of the European Union. Not a single official representative of the EU Parliament, not one of the thirty-two thousand officials of the EU Commission, not one single member of any committee on "civil liberties", which cannot be overestimated for "civil liberties or what", not a single corrupt Croatian commissioner for "democracy and demography", no commissioner for the rubble of (European) human rights. Not a single one of these EU bureaucratic greasepainters who usually can't wait to get can't wait to throw themselves into some dramatic dramatic PR pose as soon as PRESS FREEDOM or HUMAN RIGHTS are mentioned anywhere. is<sup>10</sup>.

As this example again shows, EU representatives are obviously less EU representatives are obviously less concerned

with the defensible principles of press freedom and human rights themselves than with their political instrumentalisation.

After all, the EU Parliament had only just puffed itself up collectively in order to give a not without reason controversial, because ultimately radical right-wing nutcase like Alexei KRAWALNY his stupid Sakharov Prize. prize. Well, yes. In view of the series of its previous recipients, we do not assign this poorly endowed PLASTEPOKAL to the LOBPREIS of IRGENDWAS (human rights, democracy, freedom of the press), but to the (currently much more fashionable) category "hybrid warfare". And while the EU Parliament once a year, the EU Parliament reliably brings into position its most severe (albeit completely irrelevant) media- and morality-political (android) weapon. a decade, it has still not been able to utter a word about the Assange case. No (superficial) moral outrage, no (hollow) political demand, not even a (meaningless or consequence-free) little comment. NOT TO THINK what would be going on in the brains of these European value bearers and democracy fighters if the United States of would be, if not the United States of America, but Iran, Russia or - God forbid - CHINA demanded the extradition of a journalist who had done nothing but truthful information about (war-) crimes committed by these (war) crimes committed by them. Big rhetorical fireworks, Olympic lightning bolts and thunderbolts etc., World War III would be upon us. Good grief!

## Chapter VIII

# Castorf and the living knee



Assange has been denied PERSONAL PARTICIPATION in the appeal proceedings, which will decide the rest of his the rest of his life, without giving any reasons. denied.

<sup>10</sup>Two Irish colleagues from the European Parliament are here: Clare Daly and Mick Wallace. Not on behalf of the Parliament, but (like us) on their own behalf. Some consider them left-wing, some radical, most probably both. both. It doesn't matter, because the most important thing to know as a citizen is that they really have nothing than the welfare of (the majority of) the people (not only) in the EU. If there were only MEPs like these two here, then the (at least) 25,000 (fine) lobbyists in Brussels would have to pay their (at least) 11,000 (fine) lobbyist shops shut down. And for good

A FURTHER CONSTITUTION that makes this court session a farce. A legal system could hardly show more clearly legal system could hardly show more clearly what it thinks of the (humanistic) traditions it always so agonisingly invokes on high holidays.

Assange is being negotiated, disputed and conjectured about as if he were a commodity, a lump of LEGITIMATE MATERIAL that is not even allowed to be sold to the Dadaist retail trade. not even allowed to tell the dadaist retail trade about its own EXPORT CONDITIONS. The accused as an absent object of specialised expert interest, over whom (or which) those present in silly wigs can can dispose of at will. Habeas corpus 2.0.

It seems like an early staging idea of Frank Castorf, when blurred moving images of the ABSTAINER at the beginning of the first day of the trial suddenly appear appear on monitors placed lengthwise. They show Assange in the BLUE ROOM of HMP Belmarsh, Her Majesty's Prison: eight square metres of a padded cell, eighteen kilometres AWAY from the scene of the local legal events here.

The person whose (bare) life is at stake can SAY, can say nothing here. Nor can they laugh, scream, frown in tectonic in tectonic folds of despair, discuss the matter with his with his lawyers, intervene in the course of the trial. can intervene in the course of the trial. IF Assange appears, then he appears as a LACK OF SPEECH HIS own curriculum vitae, at the mercy of specialist lawyers' brilliance & supreme court acts of mercy; captured (of all things) by a surveillance camera with a deactivated microphone.

One briefly wishes there were GODS to smash it all.

This moving image feed, lasting only a few minutes, of a NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVE DAMNED TO TOTAL PASSIVITY is perhaps the clearest metaphor for what this process has become. has become.

It is also the document of the psychological and physical destruction of a human being. On the day before the trial began, Her Majesty's Prison Doctors had changed the type, dosage or cut of medicine given to Assange. medicine, WHATEVER is understood to be medicine in a high-security prison. in a maximum-security prison (and why WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY, WHY of a trial). "High dose of medication," murmurs one judge. What Assange looked like has already been described, we won't even try. try. Gaunt, pale, tired, certainly not well.

When he visibly staggers upon entering the video cell on his way to a table in front of which a camera is installed without a microphone is installed, and when he - seated at the table - table, he begins to tremble faintly and twitch for

fractions of a second, tired, before resting his half-covered face on a hand. half-covered face on one hand as if on a saving island, one can only ask ONE thing: What the hell is all this? the hell is this all about?

After a few minutes, Assange retreats to a back corner of the cell; (it is) the only self-determined decision left to him. He the stare of the camera, leaving behind an empty table an empty table, an empty chair and - now and then from the far right from the far right edge of the picture: a (living) knee. knee.

Consistently, the living knee renounces its right to be on the second day of the trial, the living knee waives its right to a live link to the Castorf play being performed.

## Chapter IX

# Lawyer of the week



When it's their turn, the prosecutor and the defender stand, both Q.C.<sup>11</sup>, stand tall before the judges. Otherwise, no. Behind them armies of lawyers (Longhair) busily hammering something snappy into their keyboards.

The prosecution has guns made of dozens of laptops and 32 massive Litz folders piled up on their desks to OPTICALLY win a battle of materials that they ARGUENTLY ARGUMENTATIVELY and MICRO-AESTHETICALLY, they have long since lost. Anyone who studied in the 1990s know this subtle but telling nuance very well. very well. The one between that small, conceited arsehole with glasses, who with his bacon white and the one who instead prefers to rely on a few red and black binders and his own head.

The cocky ass with glasses is the prosecutor James Lewis. The self-advertisement on his homepage "charming man with a mega-brain", the "Rolls Royce" in the fleet of licensed lawyers and an expert in a confusing multitude of multitude of legal fields. He is a two-time recipient of the awarded by the conservative The Times (and certainly coveted in smaller circles). and certainly coveted

<sup>11</sup>which in this case is unfortunately not the abbreviation for Quality Control (Quality Control), excessive charging speed (Quick Charge) or at least a webcomic (Questionable Content), but for a lawyer of the Crown (Queen's Counsel)

in smaller circles) title of "Lawyer of the Week" - most recently with effect from 13.02.2020. At that time apparently meant as a commendation for the conclusion of an out-of-court settlement that enabled the Airbus Group to settle all claims against payment of 3.6 billion against payment of any justified criminal prosecution for corruption (brought by the USA, France & the UK). This postmodern indulgence was made possible by: James Lewis, your lawyer of the week, who has now stepped up to do the final legal legwork for US law enforcement in the Assange case.

While Lewis was counsel to Huawei, representing the United United States in the case of the charming Chinese woman Madam Meng. from extending the reach of US interests to the rest of the (non-US) world. the rest of the (non-US) world, he is now campaigning for the exact OPPOSITE as chief strategist and spokesman against Assange. A DEONTOLOGICAL OPPOSITION that would make any non-lawyer break at the core. For the Rolls Royce in the motor pool (Her Majesty's), the administration of justice, of course, is just business, and as long as the the bill is right (£800/hour), it is right.

Incidentally, three years ago Crown Solicitor Lewis was appointed Honorable Chief Justice of the Falkland Islands. of the Falkland Islands, a rather unspectacular group of islands in the South Pacific whose most exciting characteristic is that it is home to more sheep, penguins and elephant seals than people. than people. Since its seizure by the British Captain John Strong in 1690, the the defenceless archipelago changed its nominal owner several times, until in 1820 the newly founded state of Argentina exercised its (in every respect) obvious sovereignty over the (few) islands. sovereignty over the islands (located a few hundred kilometres off its own coast). Of course without considering that the colonial rulers' plundered possessions on the diversions via the RIGHT OF OWNERSHIP of course is carved in all kinds of stone. And ROBBERY is STOLEN. With the support of the US Navy (sick!) the British took over the islands in 1833, which since then have brought them magnificent profits (from fishing and oil). oil).

In the private house (!) of Her Majesty's Chief Colonial Judge hangs a framed copy of the front page of the front page of the Falkland Island newspaper Penguin News (smiley!) of 14 June 1982, the day when Great Britain's forces recaptured the islands from Argentina in the Falklands War. An event that the ardently national-proud militarist Lewis, as a young lieutenant in the reserves and which, as he explains in his inaugural address, he has since in his inaugural address, HAS BEEN INSPIRED IN HIS HEART. IN HIS HEART.

What to say. The United States of America could not have found a more suitable representative of its impeachment

than he.

## Chapter X

### Yet another Laywer



The guy with the colourful folders, on the other hand, is a certain Edward Fitzgerald, though not the eponymous rebel who (co-)conspired to revolt against British rule in Ireland in 1798. But almost. This Fitzgerald here belongs to the same law firm as human rights lawyer (and actor's wife) Amal Clooney, who was audacious enough back in 2011, to take on the legal representation of Julian Assange.

Fitzgerald is by no means an expert on everything that is legally possible, but is simply a criminal defence lawyer, specialising in in extradition and appeal cases. Activists and lawyers swear on the lives of their mothers, besides Fitzgerald has saved a heap of bare lives, fought more enthusiastically for prisoners' rights than anyone else, and done more human rights work than anyone else 32,000 times over. human rights work than anyone else.

Fitzgerald prefers not to make a fuss about anything he does. about everything he does. "He doesn't blow his own trumpet", as the British supposedly call it. Years ago, when Fitzgerald received an award for his exquisite contribution to criminal justice, his laudator, Lord Justice Sir Konrad Schiemann, was stunned to note: "He could have made a fortune made a fortune if he had chosen to devote his talents to other fields of activity." <sup>12</sup>

Fitzgerald preferred not to do any. Instead, he campaigned for example, British grey hat hacker Gary McKinnon, who was accused of hacking into 97 computers belonging to US armed forces and NASA. High Court and the European Court of Human Rights (WTF?) had already sealed his extradition to the United States where he faced 70 years in prison and a fine of \$1.75 million. 1.75 million dollars awaited him. Incidentally, this was only prevented by the intervention of the then Home Secretary Theresa May, who saw no other way, but to give in to the - through celebrity supporters such as Sting, Pink Floyd, Bob Geldof and the former Floyd, Bob Geldof and the former Labour

<sup>12</sup>e.g. gambling, fishing in the Falklands, very expensive US law firm



Prime Minister Gordon Brown - to give in to the PUBLIC PRESSURE. pressure<sup>13</sup>.

*Subjective hint from us. Public pressure? Most interesting! Who was that again, this PUBLIC? That's not not us, is it? Or is it YOU out there perhaps? wink smiley*

His extradition to the United States Lauri Love, a hacktivist of the Anonymous collective and, by his own admission, a lifelong to "make the world a better place". He was accused of being involved in an operation called "Operation Last Resort", and of stealing "military and stealing "military and personal data" from US Army and NASA computer networks. NASA "compromised national security and offended those who protect the country". Offended? We are too. But rather by such an excellent jurisprudential argument. As appropriate punishment, the Offended States of America, by the way, envisioned 99 years in prison and \$9 million in damages.

They still imagine it today. According to legend Edward Fitzgerald successfully knocked this guy out, too.

## Chapter XI

# PSYCHO (without Hitchcock)



And that's really true, because he's sitting in the visitors' gallery of the London Court of Appeal somewhere right next to us, scratching under his slouch hat, laughing (contemptuously) and fidgeting. he just mumbles and shakes his head. You see and hear immediately: What Lauri Love sees and hears here is not the first time he has seen and heard it. for the first time.

When he stands up at the end of the first day of the trial to proclaim the Hippocratic oath ("I swear by Appollon the physician and Asclepius and Hygieia and Panakeia and all the gods and goddesses, calling them to witness. If I now

fulfil this oath and do not break it, may I be successful in life and art. success in life and in art, and fame among all men for all time; if I transgress it and perjury, the contrary.") - booming loudly in the ears in the ears of all who do not want to hear such a thing now, and never, he has certainly given most of those present the most anarchistic experience of their charmless lives. of their charmless lives. (He was nevertheless not allowed back into the torture tower to the visitors' gallery, although he always put on the right face in the right place at the right time. the right face in the right place at the right time).

In his trial, too, it was WHOLLY AND NOT about any "state of the world", certainly not about a more certainly not about a fairer, freer or "better" one, but about the intricacies of mental health and psychological illness, autism spectrum disorders and their degrees of severity, the Asperger's syndrome, or nature-, world-, and (court-) induced depressive states. In addition about common correctional & detention conditions in the USA as well as their more drastic despotisms, above all those especially those that are feared under the technical term "Special Administrative Measures", as they entail intensified sentences, communication bans and solitary confinement. and solitary confinement. Then there are the deficiencies in medical the US prison system and the average prisoner survival rate - and finally the existence (inevitably) of latent, acute or simulated of a latent, acute or simulated suicide risk.

ALL THAT, of course, must be repeated again in the trial of the most significant case about journalism, press freedom and democracy. The since the since the year 1066, the rules of procedure have it so. With a slight historical deviation, of course. For this time it is not only the repetition is a farce. And not only the first performance a tragedy. Or vice versa.

Crown prosecutor Lewis uses his extended speaking time on the first day of the trial on the first day of the trial for what can best be described as a costly rear-end collision... Caused by the Rolls Royce in the courtroom.

The names of a number of expert witnesses on record are mentioned, usually with the wrong pronunciation or intonation. or intonation, who gives a shit. It's about Asperger's and the very tricky question of why only one of the experts brought in of the experts consulted was able to identify this syndrome at all, namely the neuropsychiatrist Quinton Deeley. namely. Hmmm, let's think about that. Maybe because Deeley was the only EXPERTS consulted in the field of autism spectrum disorders - and for all the other (experts) it would have amounted to an in-

<sup>13</sup>The intervention of the NOW Home Secretary Priti Patel in favour of Assange can be justifiably justifiably DISMISSED. The Thatcherite Patel, hated with all her heart by British leftists is more interested in drastic tightening of immigration laws (life imprisonment for smugglers) and the Police Act, which threatens protesters with long prison sentences if they cause "serious discomfort". should. And for the professional shaping of her eyebrows, of course, which she recently had done for 77,000 pounds from the Home Office budget at taxpayers' expense. (PS: Depressingly, her limp hair flaps actually still looked as unappetising afterwards as they did before. Quo vadis, eyebrow design?!)

admissible overstepping of the boundaries of their field of expertise if they had just casually diagnosed something for which they are not even certified specialists. The hell, Mr Sartre, is are not the others, but US lawyers in attack position. Just in case you should consider rewriting this one-act in rewrite this one-act play in heaven.

Of particular importance to the prosecution seems to be a neuropsychiatrist named Dr Michael Kopelman, a much decorated expert (court) witness in countless trials, professor emeritus at the Institute of Psychiatry, Emeritus Professor Emeritus at the Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience at the renowned King's College, luminary and undisputed doyen of his field, a real of his field, a real authority. In the proceedings at first instance, even the often uninformed Baraitser had found a whole series of good reasons in her found a whole series of good reasons to base her verdict on judgement on Kopelman's expert assessment and the results of the investigations carried out by him (on Assange): The conditions of imprisonment to be expected in the USA could put the psychologically by now Assange, who is now seriously ill, to commit suicide. Extradition request rejected.

For Lewis, who in the past had called on Kopelman himself as an expert witness, the expert witness in the past, the proven expert is now is now suddenly something of an "unreliable" impostor, the expert reports he has produced "flawed", "incomplete" and "misleading", "incomplete" and "misleading" - and that Assange is really really "healthy as a horse".

As befits a standard horror film of the category D, the prosecution now moves on to a crude amateur basement dissection whose subject matter is the personality and psyche of the (absent) accused. In a shattering crescendo, Lewis lays out crescendo, Lewis lays his sharp advocate's knife on every rememberable detail of the delinquent's "mental and spiritual integrity" - which in the end, of course, leads to the which in the end, of course, leads to a (court-proof) determination of his unconditional extraditable status.

Assange is highly depressed, hears music and voices ("You are dust. and voices ("You are dust, you are dead, we are coming, to come for you") and shows "psychotic symptoms" (hallucinations). (hallucinations), for which he is taking antidepressants and the antipsychotic quetiapine. After being observed in Belmarsh, he was observed to do nothing in his cell but in his cell but walk up and down until he collapsed. he collapsed, punching himself in the face and ramming his head and slamming his head into the wall, he was sent to the prison he was transferred to the hospital wing of the prison for months. In an ingenious hiding place under one of his the prison authorities found "half a razor blade". He has already had one attempt in which he slashed his wrists. he slit his wrists. Again and again he repeatedly called for the Samaritans'

(telephonic) suicide Samaritans, as it was noted that he thought of killing himself "a hundred times a day". he thought of killing himself.

Citizens of the world, look at this man.

TOPFIT, the brat. The people killed by Lewis and his living laptops (for money, too) is decidedly brutalist to the point of being tabloid-esque. and goes something like this:

Can someone (Assange) REALLY be depressed (or depressed (or not) if, on a sunny day in May, he has milk and a second helping of oranges for breakfast on a sunny day in May? ? Is anyone (or not) a SIMULANT (Assange), if he claims to be suffering from a syndrome syndrome, which was briefly mentioned in a copy of the "British Medical Journal" (borrowed in June)? was mentioned in a borrowed (June) issue of the British Medical Journal? Isn't any neurological disorder associated with autism already disproved if its bearer (the patient) has disorder associated with autism has not already been disproved if its carrier (Assange) once succeeded in making fleeting eye contact (with a stranger)? Can someone (Assange) credibly claim to have Asperger's syndrome? Asperger's syndrome when he has not even been deprived of custody of his first child? Does a person's mere suicidal intent stand in the way of his extradition if there is no complete proof that, in addition to the INTENT, there is also the intellectual capacity (Assange) to implement this plan? Finally, there would also have to be a concrete POSSIBILITY OF SELF-MURDER, which is not possible under the normal (or (or aggravated), in any case FABULOUS, conditions of detention in the USA. Can you believe it Lewis finally said, is it possible to believe that someone wants to be a "suicide" when he has several "children" of his own? "children" of their own? Counter-question: can you believe that someone wants to be a "Rolls Royce" when he asks several such "questions"?

## Chapter XII

# About The Silcence of the Lambs





The question of the circumstances of imprisonment to be expected in the USA (concretely) comes prominently once again in fact by means of a so-called DIPLOMATIC CERTIFICATE, which the United States had the appeal proceedings and with which they claim to have with which they claim to guarantee the delinquent a humane prison accommodation. That that this assurance is hardly worth the paper (or bit memory) on which is hardly worth the paper (or bit memory) on (or in) which it is written, quickly becomes self-evident. It is a bilaterally made by the USA to the UK, which is not only completely LEGALLY UNBINDING, but which - in the small print but which - in the small print - explicitly authorises the use of the use of EXACTLY THOSE measures which it is it promises NOT to use in its generous headline<sup>14</sup>.

Lewis emphasises that measures such as "administrative segregation" cannot be equated with solitary confinement. can. OF COURSE NOT. Because basically, of course, everything is, as always, worse. The regime of inhumane conditions of detention has taken over the widest of the US prison system down to its very foundations. of the US prison system down to its foundations. At under whatever name they may be called (The Hole, AdSeg, Protective Custody, SMU, SHU), such measures serve the sole purpose of serve the sole purpose of undermining the law. The US human rights organisation National Immigrant Justice Center notes the almost universal existence of unlawful detention combined with bureaucratic neologisms that serve the sole purpose of "evading laws that prohibit indefinite placement in solitary confinement.

The USA is not in the least bit amused with prisoners especially not with WHISTLEBLOWERS, especially if they are also connected to WikiLeaks.

CHELSEA MANNING, a former IT expert in the US armed forces, had told the public & WikiLeaks 2010. hundreds of thousands of documents relating to war crimes in Afghanistan and Iraq, including the video known as "Collateral Murder". It shows attacks by Apache combat helicopters in the streets of Baghdad and the shooting (with audible gusto) by the US helicopter crew of twelve unarmed Iraqi men. unarmed Iraqi civilians, including two journalists from the Reuters news agency and two children. One of many war crimes of which the US military is guilty.

Manning was sentenced to 35 years in prison and served seven years in military custody before being released in 2017. released by order of Obama (last days in office). Since however, she refused to testify in one of those (Democrat-remote) secret trials before a grand jury con-

vened to gather evidence against WikiLeaks and Assange, she was fined \$1,000 DAILY, which ended up being had grown to half a million bucks by the end.

To compel her testimony, she was jailed in March 2019 for one year at the William G. Truesdale Federal Detention Centre in Alexandria, Virginia, where she was "placed" in "adseg", in "administrative segregation". Away from other prison inmates, Manning was locked in a tiny cell with no daylight for 22 hours a day. daylight. Exit to shower (or into the prison yard) was only possible alone and only between one and three o'clock. One and three o'clock AFTER dark, of course, which lifts the individual's spirits and is somehow considered protective measure, you only get sunburn from the moonlight, thank you very much. sunburn only from the moonlight, thank you very much. would have done the trick. The only other person you do you do NOT get to see is the warden, who wordlessly the food through the hatch after he has made sure that you after making sure that you are still alive. This measure, advertised by the Americans as "administrative segregation", is of course nothing more than a little original euphemism. is, of course, nothing more than an unoriginal euphemism for radical solitary confinement, (to which Manning had already been subjected at Quantico and) which is, of course, far beyond the fuzzy line of fuzzy line to psychological torture.

The funeral of Susan Manning (65) did not take place between one and three o'clock, not at night, and not in the in the Truesdale prison yard. After a perfectly formal request, Chelsea Manning's attendance at her mother's Chelsea Manning's attendance at her mother's funeral was denied without formality. Manning was released from prison in March 2020 detention in March 2020 after she attempted to take her own life.

The former programmer at CIA headquarters in JOSHUA SCHULTE is accused of working for the notorious for the infamous "Vault 7" leak, which exposed the entire revealed the CIA's entire "hacking bandwidth", starting with penetrating smartphones and computers in spy operations abroad and ending with with the remote control of internet-enabled electrical devices, through which an automobile ride can be (involuntarily) turned into a harakiri commando and a talking refrigerator (imperceptibly) into a listening cell.

For almost three years, he has been incarcerated in solitary confinement at the Metropolitan Centre, a facility that, according to Schulte, treats its inmates "like caged animals" and which was most recently made worse by the suicide - apparently successful despite the loving care of

<sup>14</sup>Anyhow, US experts consider the issuance of this "diplomatic assurance" an "interesting and creative MOVE" by their government (for instance). creative MOVE" on the part of their government (e.g. New York lawyer Jacques Semmelman, who specialises in extraditions), since otherwise they would run the risk of losing any possibility of bringing Assange to justice. The USA had already given similar assurances in the case of the hacker Gary McKinnon; the court, depressingly, had the court had depressingly recognised them as valid and agreed to extradite him, which was only prevented by Theresa May. which was only prevented by Theresa May



the prison administration & certified suicide prevention measures - of the prostitution ring operator. of the prostitution ring operator, human trafficker and inmate inmate Jeffrey Epstein (Ass) has received headlines. has<sup>16</sup>.

## Lying like a professional

According to the court documents, Schulte inhabits a "filthy cell the size of a car park" (small car, not stupid SUV) that is infested with vermin. "rodents, rodent droppings, cockroaches, mould". There is no heating, air conditioning or functioning sanitary facilities do not exist. The temperatures drop so low that water changes its physical state and the occupant (freezes) to death. the occupant freezes to death, even though he has two blankets, four sets of clothes, five sets of socks (on his feet) and three more (sets of socks). and three more (sets of socks) on his hands. wears. While daylight is blocked by a darkened window, the neon light in his cell burns continuously. in his cell burns continuously. He is not allowed to be outdoors television one hour a week, visits are severely restricted, books and visits are severely restricted, books and legal stuff are are forbidden, as are visits to the doctor.

*Subjective note from Associated Press When he is taken out of his cell, he is "shackled from head to toe like Hannibal". shackled from head to toe like Hannibal," the filing continues, alluding to the fictional Dr Hannibal Lecter, a cannibalistic serial killer cannibalistic serial killer from the horror film "The Silence of the Lambs" from 1991.*

In his last trial, Schulte asked for a judge to intervene. He himself had exhausted all possibilities to protest to the prison authorities about the conditions of his against the conditions of his imprisonment. The Northeast Regional Office had most recently rejected his complaints because he had failed to because he had failed to use a CUGEL WRITER to make the copies legible, as has been the rule for 40 years. for the last 40 years. The court documents also that Schulte is forbidden to use ballpoint pens. the use of ballpoint pens is prohibited.

## Chapter XIII



The second day of the trial largely belongs to the defence. They are given the extremely agonising task of the absolutely subterranean verdict of the first instance. in this court, my holy and miserable ass. my holy and miserable ass. To crucifixion? Good. Out the door, to the left row, one cross each... one cross, next. Crown attorney Fitzgerald bears it with patience and dignity, hardly looking at, listening to or noticing how agonising it must be (for him) to try and reduce this must be (for him) to bring this multi-stage derailed case back to any logical-argumentative basis. (Or to a human or legal or even humanly or legally comprehensible one).

The previous day, the prosecution's personified dud had tried his hand at expertly conducting a legal-psychological CHAIN SEED MASSAKER to which selected expert witnesses and the and the expert opinions of the lower court, which were to were to fall victim to. Lewis had extensively harped on individual aspects and details which had, of course, been carefully extracted from their respective contexts of understanding, and, to put it conservatively, ZIEMLICH INNOVATIVELY interpreted. We learn from Dustin Hoffmann that such a slippery strategy apparently actually has a chance of success in an appeal, since the judges involved know the original judgement and its reasoning, but not but not the full contents of the case file on which it is based. Especially the witness interviews, of which there are no court transcripts, are only known to them insofar as they are introduced by the lawyers in the current appeal proceedings. in the present appeal proceedings. In short: THESE JUDGES HERE can be told just ANYTHING about the past. Really what you wants:

- The EARTH is a creationist DISCIPLE; (according to witness testimony of Dr. G. Galilei, mathematician and astronomer, v. 22.6.1633. Stop, fun! The heretical adherence to the "Copernican world view" brought the Dottore a trial and there, of course, the death penalty).
- RELATIVITY does not exist outside of its general and specific THEORY (which is, unfortunately, totally useless for social mobilisation as it is not understood by more people worldwide than the details of the case against Assange. It is about TWELVE in

<sup>16</sup>For a very brief moment, the audacious idea appears in our minds that, from the point of view of the British polity might actually be a good deal, or at least not the worst deal, to keep Assange on the island forever and hand over this Prince Andrew to the Americans instead. Forever, too

both cases);

- Have you noticed the SPORTY FIGURE of Helge Braun...?

Really what you want. Because it's all about making a case for your own in front of to create a favourable impression for one's own side in front of for one's own side, irrespective of whether or not this impression is still in a realistic relationship to the actual to the actual (or first-instance) facts of the case.

Augustine, by the way, defines A LIE as the deliberate utterance of the UNTRUTH in deception. Lewis, of course, did not do that. Lewis has lied like a professional, and professionals lie - for centuries - with NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH. Nothing in Lewis' talk was false (in itself). The details, however, all true, like rum cherries from a disgusting cream pie, were nevertheless designed to INTENTIONALLY DECEIVE the appellate judges, for they were designed to create the impression, and to do so by deliberate pre-meditation, that Lewis had been able to destroy, by argument, Kopelman, an expert witness of unsurpassed aplomb. Everyone who was present at the time knows that the opposite is the case, and Lewis is a liar. And knows And knows at the same time: These appeal judges here don't have the slightest clue. They were not there.

Since the day before, the prosecution had already discrediting expert witness Kopelman, Edward Fitzgerald has no choice but to refute him again. has no choice but to refute him once again in substance. - with undiminished passion, rhetorical finesse and the long-suffering of a Siberian bear. Of James Lewis said that Kopelman had misled the district court by concealing the identity of Assange's fiancée and the existence of their two children in his (first) report. children. Judge Baraitser had already sufficiently refuted this accusation in her reasoning. Kopelman had decided to make this omission in the written report in order not to disclose Assange's family background. Assange's family environment. Completely freely and - as will be shown - for more than reasonable reasons. Both the judge and the expert Dr Nigel Blackwood, the expert appointed by the prosecution, had already informed Kopelman in March 2020 - and thus before his report was submitted - about the identity of Stella Moris, the existence of the children and the reasons for his omission. This, in turn, was so prudent and appropriate that it really doesn't stand up as a scandalon available: According to forensic psychiatrist Keith Rix, a recognised authority on the ethical duties of psychiatric experts, Kopelman was not guilty of a breach of duty. of a breach of duty, but had shown "professionalism" by exercising "reasonable and prudent caution". professional conduct".

Want to know why? Then it is fortunate that Fitzgerald cannot avoid explaining the reasons again. to explain the reasons again. The Omission in the Kopelman Report,

he says, was necessary because. - firstly - the SURVEILLANCE of the Ecuadorian Ecuadorian embassy by the US secret service and - secondly - there were concerns that the CIA might be planning an ABORTION or ASSASSINATION in connection with Assange.

Wock. Both of these are not only true, but they are so true.

## Chapter XIV

# Surveillance and punishment



As is well known, from 2012 until his arrest in April 2019, Assange lived by necessity in the London embassy of the embassy of the Republic of ECUADOR, whose then president Rafael Correa had granted him diplomatic asylum. had granted him diplomatic asylum. Through a Spanish "security service provider" with the stupid name UNDERCOVER GLOBAL, which, not in 1984 but surprisingly in 2015. responsibility for Assange's "security", the CIA actually managed to the CIA actually managed to set up a DYSTOPIC round-the-clock surveillance at the embassy. at the embassy. The service provider had installed high-powered cameras in all the rooms occupied by Assange, even in the refrigerator and in the guest toilet ladies' room, bugged the furnishings (even the fire extinguisher). (even the fire extinguisher), used laser microphones, recorded and analysed all of Assange's confidential conversations with lawyers, journalists, friends, doctors and psychologists. and psychologists, he had recorded and analysed all the all the mobile phone, tablet and computer data of all his visitors, saved or (sometimes) deleted them. he had stored and (sometimes) deleted court documents and whole mountains and copied entire mountains of confidential legal correspondence, he had even ordered that a baby's nappy be fished out of the rubbish in order to extract the nappy-wearer's DNA and thus find out whether Assange was his father. Assange was his father.

*Substantial clue from the lab Company CEO David Morales, who came up with this bang idea came from is, by the way, just as dumb as he*

looks. The lab he hired informed him by return of post that the DNA from the faeces of this nappy could not be used for a paternity test. cannot be used for a paternity test. Fucking hell, plan B: steal the baby's pacifier. Steal the baby's dummy. For real. Ironically, the episode with the baby's poo even led to the whole spy thing being blown altogether. For one of three UC Global employees, that was the straw that broke the camel's back. the straw that broke the camel's back. He contacted Assange's fiancée, Stella Moris, to warn her. to warn her, gave notice to the nutcase and called a good lawyer.

This business, which was probably somehow lucrative for both sides in the summer of 2016, when UC Global founder and ex-soldier David "I'm a mercenary and I don't hide it. I make no secret of it" Morales (name and quote genuine) real) took a trip to Las Vegas. Upon his return, he told his employees that the company had "gone over to the dark side", WINKERWONKER, and thanks to new "American friends" was now playing in the "premier league". The contract he had in his pocket was \$200,000 a month. Morales was arrested in Spain in August 2019. bail and is currently awaiting the end of a court case in Madrid, where he is charged with violating of Assange's privacy and the passing of illegally obtained information to US intelligence agencies.

In 2017, when Ecuadorian presidential actor LENIN MORENO slid into office, whom we still to whom we still want to hurl nothing but our demand (hard) that he please finally give back this FORENAME UC Global even started to STREAM the surveillance footage live 24/7: The Assange Show. In emails from David Morales, it says there are three access points for this stream: "one for Ecuador, one for us and one for X". According to research of the Spanish daily El Pais, the word "X" does not mean "M" or "X". "X" does not mean "M" or "Q" or even "Miss Money Penny". but rather - as is clear from his further correspondence - "our American friends". American friends". No further questions, Your Honour.

*Subjective reference from Wikipedia*  
*Lenin Moreno, vice-president under Rafael Correa from 2007 to 2013, obtained in 2018 that Correa was no longer allowed to run for the Presidential election. "There is a widespread view that Moreno is in the process of dismantling the social gains of his predecessor. With this, as well as a neoliberal economic policy and a departure from the foreign policy pursued by his predecessor, he is seeking to close ranks with the rich elite. rich elite."*

In May 2017, only one month after his election, Moreno received Moreno (already) received an important visit. And that was from PAUL MANAFORT, who negotiated with him the conditions for the extradition of Julian Assange, an undertaking which the US had been trying to get Rafael Correa to agree to for years. on Rafael Correa for many years.

Paul Manafort is one of the biggest scumbags that the the US political system has ever produced: Head of the "sleaziest lobbying firm" ("Spy") in the country, (political) advisor to the dictators Ferdinand Marcos (Philippines), Siad Barre (Somalia), Mobutu Sese Seko (Congo) and Ibrahim Babangida (Nigeria), promoter of arms deals with Saudi Arabia and profiteer of the civil war in Angola. civil war in Angola. Donald Trump's campaign manager Trump, convicted tax evader, offshore account operator, bank fraudster, conspirator, Lump & liar, finally pardoned by.... er... Donald Trump.

*Substantial note from Wikipedia*  
*In April 2019, Moreno gave notice to WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange the diplomatic asylum granted to him by his predecessor at the Ecuadorian embassy in London. Assange was subsequently released at the request of the Ecuadorian ambassador on the embassy grounds on the basis of a British arrest warrant for failure to appear in court. for failing to appear for a court hearing by Scotland Yard and brought before a British judge. Moreno's predecessor Correa described the behaviour of the President Correa described the President's behaviour as "one of the most appalling acts ever hatched out of servility, malice and vindictiveness", and called his successor a "traitor".*

To this we have not the PERFECTEST thing to add.

You have noticed at this point: if you ever have to deal with the US intelligence, you will be dealing with REAL PSYCHOS. You're dealing with the craziest, weirdest assholes you've ever dreamed of seeing on a full moon... you've ever dreamed of. Hello, dear Spiegel, and yo, old Süddeutsche. Because the CIA is really like that, as you two (imagine) in your overpriced history books always a place like the Stasi. For real! real!

Fortunately, here in London, there are no law students present. If you were, you'd have to be by this proven and multiple violation of the procedures of procedural law (and of the rights of the accused, which are still vaguely guaranteed in traditional constitutional states), you would have to declare any proceedings brought against Assange immediately be declared unlawful. For the confidentiality of confidentiality of attorney interviews, which the USA has deliberately, systematically and continuously, is enshrined in law. enshrined in law. For real.

## Chapter XV

# 30 gentlemen in concrete sandals



And now for fear number two: concerns about CIA-planned kidnappings and assassinations? Whoo-hoo-hoo, a full load of psychotic paranoia. Absolutely unthinkable! Unthinkable?

A report published at the end of September 2021 by investigative journalists from the news portal Yahoo News, led by Michael Isikoff, has proven that such (crazy-sounding) predatory antics are disturbingly actually have a basis in reality. Over 30 senior and top former government officials testify that the White House (under Trump), together with the CIA (under Pompeo) since 2017 detailed plans to for the ABORTION and ASSASSINATION of Julian Assange. The Yahoo research confirms everything that the defence had presented in the first instance. in the first instance<sup>18</sup>.

The initial plans were to kidnap Assange from the embassy. from the embassy. Employees of the security firm UC Global were given the easily decipherable task of "leaving the entrance door of the embassy open". "to leave the front door of the embassy open" discreetly and overnight discreetly and overnight, so that he could be kidnapped and taken to the to the United States. The United States wanted to wanted to get hold of him at all costs and, in provisional desperation, developed (internally) the distinctive mafia phrase that "more extreme means must now be used". Plans for the poisoning of Assange and and their tricky execution followed, optionally his accidental his accidental assassination BY STROBOSCOPIC BLENDING of a Pakistani taxi driver in the evening light, a street firebombing a street fire based on "Chicago 1930" (and the of "Chicago 1930" (and the diaries of Eliot Ness) or ideas from the estate of Arthur C. Clarke.

The Yahoo search quotes a former national security adviser national security adviser as saying that Pompeo and other top officials were "completely detached from reality" and then detached from reality", and then literally, "They saw blood."

In London, a "wild tussle broke out" over Assange rival spy services" broke out in London over Assange: "American, British and Russian authorities stationed undercover

agents around the Ecuadorian Embassy." The prices of flats, Yps glasses with Yps glasses with rear-view mirrors and fake beards... skyrocketed in the neighbourhood. "It was more than weird," says one high-ranking official. "It went so that every person within a three-block radius worked for one of the worked for one of the intelligence agencies - whether it was a street sweeper, a policeman or a security guard."

At the latest THAT has made this story SO BIZARR that it should immediately be offered to Ian Fleming's descendants as a plot for the next James Bond. Bond: "Time to die - 007 on the hunt for Fatty Pompeo". And all of this would even be really funny if it were not also the pure (and rather depressing) truth.

Pompeo has admitted (with a rather nasty grin, by the way) that "parts" of this report "are true", and hastened to follow up with the claim, that these three dozen whistleblowers - all senior former former government officials - should face HARDEST "prosecution". Cough. We have a Vague Idea of what this could amount to. such a thing could amount to, and recommend that the gentlemen concerned wear a colour-coordinated VEST with the fattest ballistic insertion plates with their classic business suit this autumn. the fattest ballistic insertion plates money can buy. money can buy.

In honks like Pompeo, cultural sociologists encounter a always insightful interpretation of the concept of FREEDOM OF PRESS and INFORMATION. If the spreading of TRUTH through INFORMATION (here) is even more vigorously opposed than the trumpeting of "fakery" (here). than the trumpeting of "fake news", then you are not in Russia but in the model country of Western democracy.

*Substantial advice from Barry J. Pollack, former President of the US National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL). "As an American citizen, I find it absolutely outrageous that our government would consider kidnapping or murdering someone without a kidnap or assassinate someone without trial just for for publishing truthful information."*

Let's let that sink in again for a moment: Highest of the DEMOCRATIC LIBERTURE of the western world - the White House and the CIA - undertook a deliberate ATTACK on the constitutionally protected constitutionally protected fundamental right of freedom of publication and - in violation of the universal principle of of the universal principle of the rule of law - the ILLEGAL abduction and murder of an Australian journalist who was seeking political asylum on the extraterritorial territory of the Ecuadorian Embassy in the capital city of capital of Great Britain.

<sup>18</sup>A witness for the defence, a former employee of the security company UC Global, had told the Madrid Tribunal as early as September the Madrid tribunal hearing the case of David Morales, had already reported in September 2020 that the of the Americans to use "more extreme measures" against Assange: his poisoning or his abduction from the embassy



And secure the same whose criminal assassination they had just meticulously planned, destroying all remembered principles of CIVILISATION HISTORY. now a fair trial, a humane detention and a dignified a humane prison accommodation and a dried-up cream meringue (from yesterday) for breakfast.

Has anyone in this court ever actually heard of the (admittedly increasingly worthless) rhetorical figuration? rhetorical figure of the RULE OF LAW? ? Fortunately, you know, there are no legal scholars there are no legal scholars present. If you were, you would have to by this proven and multiple violation of the most of the most fundamental principles of the rule of law, you would have to immediately blow up (TNT) any proceedings against against Assange should be blown up immediately (TNT).

Assange's second defence lawyer, Mark Summers, has a sense of humour that humour that matches his nationality. In any case this will be the first time, he argues, that the US has sought the assistance of a British court in apprehending a person whose poisoning and/or assassination by a government agency. by a government agency.

This is of course not at all funny, but it is true.

The fact that this entire appeal process was conducted by a (democratically) voted out moron (meaning: TRUMP), a whole TWO DAYS before his departure from a globally (sadly) still overrated overrated presidency, was not (had not been) not (have been) funny. Just as little, by the way, as the fact that this supreme court - represented represented by, of all people, a (British) judge with the (much more Irish) name Jonathan Swift<sup>19</sup>. - took it upon himself to accept this appeal for hearing at all on 7 July 2021. for hearing at all. And that was just ELF DAYS, after the chief witness for the US prosecution... had publicly recanted his testimony and thus (in passing) had also taken away the last sclerotic pillar of the US prosecution.

## Chapter XVI

<sup>19</sup>The Enlightenment writer, satirist and Irishman of the same name had written his novel (today misunderstood as a children's book) "Gulliver's Travels" (and others) with sharp attacks against the ruling English upper class and the exploitation of the destitute Irish by English landowners

<sup>20</sup>Another five cases were dropped for lack of evidence. After the prosecution dropped the charges one of the victims committed suicide

# Sex, Lies and Audiotape



The Icelandic Sigurdur Ingi Thordarson, suspected hacker hacker, convicted paedophile, pathological liar and sociopath and sociopath, financial fraudster, white-collar criminal and multiple-time proven idiot, admitted to the Icelandic newspaper Stundin on 26 June 2021 to the Icelandic newspaper Stundin on June 2021. statements against Assange, which were eagerly circulated by the US prosecution. by the US prosecution. And that, here comes 1 rant, in order to avoid prosecution for his own paedophile crimes. paedophile crimes.

In fact, Thordarson, the FBI and the US Department of Justice together had entered into a dirty win-win-win deal of the following form: supply of incriminating charges against Assange in exchange for in exchange for immunity from prosecution on paedophilia charges. Fortunately, we are not lawyers, but for us this is a criminal offence of EVIL CONSPIRACY at the expense of a third party, who who cannot help the fact that these other three are simply are really up in arms.

The US authorities had quite willingly allowed Thordarson to Thordarson to pretend that he was a close associate of Assange's and then recruited him specifically to build a legal case, to build a legal case. The fact that they claim not to have known that Thordarson had in fact Thordarson had in fact only been able to get close to Assange briefly under the pretext of raising money for WikiLeaks, but had then rather used the opportunity to embezzle over 50,000 dollars (from WikiLeaks), is of course another matter. For example on page 9856 of Wikipedia or in the Icelandic State Court Courier, because Thordarson was convicted in 2014 for EXACTLY THIS and some other white-collar fraud bullshit.

There you would also have read that the guy is a serial sex offender, convicted several times (2012, 2014, 2015), most recently for molesting nine underage boys, giving them "plane tickets, Land Rovers and up to million dollars" in exchange for sexual favours. A (court-ordered) forensic psychiatric report concluded that, if he was crystal clear concluded that he was of sound mind, but suffered from an antisocial antisocial personality disorder (f.k.a. "sociopath") and was incapable of feeling remorse for his actions<sup>20</sup>.

The extradition proceedings against Assange involved statements by Thordarson were introduced by the prosecution to prove that to prove that Julian Assange had incited OTHERS to commit illegal acts. In her judge Baraitser even quotes part of the US indictment. of the US indictment, which states that Thordarson was asked by Thordarson was ordered by Assange "to hack into computers to hack into computers to obtain information, including audio recordings of telephone conversations between high-ranking high-ranking officials, including members of the Parliament, the government of "NATO Country 1".

*Subjective hint from NATO country 27 That you need a (totally important) secret word for all (important) countries in the world, we still know from the three question marks. We can hardly believe, however, that ICELAND, of all places, in the jargon of US secret under the final impenetrable, absolutely final secret code word "NATO country 1". is used. So they really are just as stupid as we all always always thought.*

*We call a certain confederation of states with hegemonic world power claims, currently (fortunately) in the phase of its (overdue) demise, in in our own HEINY LANGUAGE from now on "Military-industrially highly complex, but otherwise brainache-inducing otherwise brain-ache-inducingly under-complex alliance dissolution reason number one".*

If you dare, you can see the sympathetic chief incriminating witness of the USA since 24 September 2021 in the Iceland's maximum-security Litla-Hraun prison, where he is being held on the basis of a law which which is designed to prevent repeat offenders from committing from re-offending while a court case is pending. during an ongoing court case.

Well, dear judge with the even more barmy financial transaction service provider name SWIFT. When the high court represented by YOU represented the high court, the already of already riddled with multiple JUDICIAL ERRORS, not only Thordarson and the Icelandic Thordarson and the Icelandic Island Post, but literally the whole world, knew that the testimony of this "key witness" was a lie from top to bottom.

And so much then, finally, for the CONSTRUCTION BACKGROUND of this major US indictment of the century, so much for the recitals of higher representatives of the British administration of justice and so much for both ethical principles.

Fortunately, there was never a single trained lawyer present. How insane can a legal process together with its alleged foundations, be allowed to become in this country, my lords and ladies - and, if you will pardon the expression, how UNSERIOUS the legal personnel assigned to it, before they finally rip those silly wigs and ask the only

question that common sense still allows. common sense allows: WHERE DO THE CRIMINALS ACTUALLY SIT (or stand) HERE, MYLORD?

A lie, says Augustine (still), is the deliberate presentation of falsehood with intent to deceive. Let's let all this sink in for a meditative moment.

## Chapter XVII

# Augurs and auspices



Fitzgerald finally turns to Lord Chief Justice Ian Burnett to remind him of the parallels between the Assange and Lauri Love cases. Autism in the fatal combination of autism and depression, plus the conditions of prison conditions in the US, which, according to the axiomatic laws of some legal mathematics an increased risk of suicide and thus a ban on extradition. and thus a ban on extradition under the rubric of "humanitarian reasons". grounds". The Chief Justice, however, interrupts with with the words: "This is a completely different case. case." Oha. In general, this judge interrupts the defence conspicuously often, we just noticed. He drives Fitzgerald into all his oratorical parades, forces him to and answering stuff, while the prosecution had been allowed to recite its really fact-distorting gibberish the day before without any judicial intervention. intervention.

Which of course is either a GOOD sign or a REALLY BAD sign. As it stands in the British betting shops, no one on the ground knows what the probably the share price rises and falls as on any other any other stock exchange, possibly 1 billion to 1 at the moment. But who knows.

The end of the second day of the trial rings in (by local standards of distance) downright disturbing (by local standards of distance) almost disturbingly direct legal ping-pong. more or less. Technical details of procedural law follow psychological details of medical reports, followed in each case by a polemical rebuttal of the other side's the arguments of the opposing side. More or less, anyway.

The lawyers show their mutual disapproval to each other with unsurpassable politeness and a linguistic subtlety

that is otherwise only known from Berliners. When the defence lawyer strikes the final contemptuous blow, for example, by saying something like: "With the greatest respect, some of the incorrect remarks made by my honourable colleague will not be conducive to an articulate resolution of these issues". to an articulate resolution of these issues", you get a tiny inkling of the dignity that this profession may have once carried with it.

We will spare you and us the undignified rest of it. us. In summary, it is about SELF-MURDER and the insane question, knotting itself in all our remaining BRAINWORKS, whether a court would not prefer should not rather take into account those classifications related to present presences, rather than also the validity of psychological "prediction functions". Which translates, I suppose, to mean that the U.S. finds, that any reliable prediction of a predictable future suicidal intent under the conditions of detention it offers nationwide should carry LESS judicial weight than any judicial weight than any suicidal intent that arose independently of them before. (Which, of course, they categorically deny - one way or another.) In any case the USA finds that the expert-fabricated oracle of a CURRENTLY of a CURRENTLY only LATENT suicidal intent, which was only presumably formed AFTER the extradition-related contact with US-American detention conditions presumably into the state of its CURRENT manifestation, of an would in fact in no way prevent an extradition in the PRESENT, since it would itself necessarily be located in the FUTURE. Do you understand? (Neither do we.)

So-called preventive measures of US-American prison facilities become the subject, with "preventive measures" being some bundle of mechanistically conceived devices (to prevent inmate suicides). inmate suicides) that would prevent a prisoner who is so desperate who is so desperate that he wants to take his own life. from taking his own life in a direct combat mode. from translating this INTENT into an ACT. Not for any noble reason, but for a vile reason, because the realisation of a prisoner's intention of a prisoner to commit suicide - at least from the from the point of view of the law enforcement authorities - the scandalous circumstance that a legally convicted prisoner legally convicted person would be able to escape the punishment sentence imposed on him by the cowardly act of committing suicide instead of serving it as prescribed. 21]In addition, measures that prevent someone who wants to take his own life from doing so are unlikely to improve his mood at all.

Jesus, help. Because at this point we really haven't [Anm. des Hackes: Das stand have?!] the slightest idea whether those who have taken such defend or invent a line of thought, have the slightest idea of the ethical or social or

political background against which they are arguing. We spare ourselves and you the even more the even more undignified rest of it, and at the same time we know ONE thing for sure for sure: a judicial system based on a misappropriated 100-year-old espionage law and the lie of an Icelandic paedophile, is seeking the extradition of a citizen and publicist who is completely alien to the state. should really go to hell (along with his vulgar utilitarian doctrine of prognosis for suicide). But very, very quickly.

And then the trial is over. The presiding judge formally declares in his farewell that both sides had both sides have given the court he represents something (or a lot) to think about. the court embodied by him, that the court embodied by him would decision carefully and will have made it at some point, thank you very much, come home in good health and honour us. Thank you very much, come home safe and sound and honour us again soon.

## Chapter XVIII

# 2 Presidents of the USA, 1 Europe and Lord Justice Holroyde



Who to thank for the final act, for now, of this highly artificial legal soap opera is clear. You There are three of them, greetings go out.

FIRST: That boob from the White House. Donald Trump and Joe Biden. The ONE had not only given the green light to the impeachment of Assange, but on his last few feet in office, he shot out all available guns to leave the world in an even worse state than it already was. than it already was. In his last weeks in the Oval office, Trump put on his widest mole grin to quickly carry out a few more executions, or at least to or at least order<sup>22</sup>, pardon a few convicted felon buddies (Manafort et. al.) and finally - exactly TWO DAYS before the arrival of the removalists - to get the appeal against Assange to get underway.

<sup>22</sup>13 in Indiana alone, which was three times more than in the previous 60 years

The OTHER had gone out of his way to quickly satisfy the glorified expectations of European transatlanticists with superficially mannered rhetoric. In In his inaugural speech he had stutteringly explained (to them), that America was finally back, hurray, and quickly the very last thing he could remember about the keywords "justice" and "freedom", and then BRUSHLESSLY continued the political guidelines of the idiot before him. the political guidelines of the idiot before him - including this betrayal of democratic principles, which began with the merciless hunt for Assange from the very beginning.

Of course, if you look even closer, it's all, it's worse, as usual. Needless to say, Biden has not advanced a FEMALE agenda here (and elsewhere), but his OWN. As recently as 2011 vice-president - especially for Assange - he had used the terrorist terrorist designation "high-tech terrorist", which is clearly incompatible with the reflection horizon of all idiots before, after and next to him. and next to him.

Fatty Pompeo's formula of the "hostile non-state intelligence service", as well as Biden's dictum, allow us to look much deeper than we would have liked. look much deeper than transatlanticists are usually able to see. transatlanticists can usually see. Until Joe Biden came along, it was it was self-evident that a publicist is (nothing but) a publicist. (nothing but) a publicist. When he publishes evidence of crimes committed by members of government organisations, then as a politician you have to draw your you have to draw your own simple conclusions. At best, at best, if you are still a Democrat, that crimes committed should be punished and (the) perpetrators charged. The idea of branding the JOURNALIST as a homicidal "TERRORIST" instead and to criminalise the JOURNALIST who uses something as with something as dangerous to the public as a pencil, a printing press or, God forbid, the INTERNET. has never been done in constitutional states, as far as we remember, in constitutional states, as far as we can remember. Until Joe Biden came along.

Hopefully it does not need to be mentioned separately, that the "workflow" of such reality-distorting "frame-setting" is one of the most dimensionally stable and at the same time transparent meshes of "flawless" states of injustice. It simply consists in giving anyone who somehow stands in the way of a smooth exercise of power, (as repulsive as possible) label on the lapel (e.g. "Young Liberals", smiley!) in order to legitimise THE which is what usually follows. If a politician bluntly calls a journalist a "terrorist", he marks him in a straight semantic line. straight semantic line (and visible for all to see) as visible to all) as a RIGHTEOUS person. With a "terrorist one may do with a "terrorist" what is forbidden with "journalists" in "constitutional states": one may monitor him, spy on him, torture them psychologically and physically, even poison

them, kidnap them, murder them and execute them. All things that the US intelligence community and the White White House actually DID and/or planned to do with Assange. PLANNED.

What it might mean for YOU or US if a Joe Biden, whose "progressive" pensioner spirit is hailed is hailed by a world that routinely rumbles at him, still considers the work of a publicist to be "terrorism". still considers the work of a publicist to be "terrorism" (and he must, otherwise he would have withdrawn the appeal), we have no way of knowing for certain. You should know that not only all the conservatives, social democrats, liberals and greens that you you will ever vote for (in the expectation of a more perfect world) will stand at his side in the strongest possible terms. But also, of course, your greatest German ace so far in Brussels, Ms vonderLeyen. No meeting of the members of the European Council, this really most decisive body of the EU, without the servile transatlantic tin-pot drummer (and pioneer of the SMS-based non-transparency, cf. the Pfizer SMS) did not spend several hours with Biden beforehand. with Biden in advance. We are not saying anything more about this now. The GEO-STRATEGIC AUTONOMY that this concrete-faced auntie aunt had promised us, we had imagined differently.

Secondly.

And at this point you already suspect it. SECONDLY, of course, we owe the whole salad (as always) to all these imaginative as always) to all those unimaginative whistles from Europe who (as always) can't see the democratic forest for the transatlantic trees. As long as EU politicians understand nothing else by DEMOCRACY than the nothing but the translation of US-American political phrases into their respective national languages, there will be little chance to change this. And as long as THEY OUT THERE expect nothing from THEIR DEMOCRACY but the serial expect nothing more from YOUR DEMOCRACY than the serial reproduction of empty signifiers on CO2-free glossy paper. either. As long as the demand for PRESS FREEDOM will only be the (obsolete) instrument in an (outdated) ideological toolbox - and European European POLITICS will be a pseudo-prospective field of vision, which in reality has been reduced to the interests (and deployment areas) of an (outdated) military alliance. has melted down.

As long as upright democrats like Julian Assange are denied the political political protection they deserve from the members of the of the EU (individually and collectively), these European civil rights sacks should stick their cheap phraseology in their hats.

Initiated by the French left-wing party La France Insoumise, 39 deputies from nine parliamentary groups in the National Assembly on 27.10.21, calling on the French government to grant Julian Assange immediate political asylum. The motion did majority, but it has once again



reminded the French public of the outrageousness of the prosecution of a journalist. of the prosecution of a journalist.

It is always interesting to see what (left-wing) parties in (left-wing) parties in Europe can sometimes achieve. Apropos. What does the German left actually do for a living?

Thirdly.

And THIRD, we have Lord Justice Holroyde to thank for the design and content of this trial. In the London High Court he sits directly opposite us all the time. And with a look last seen on Darth Vader's face. For two days, this buffoon won't say a word. say anything. (Maybe because he doesn't like it or because can't or - more likely - because he's not allowed to. He is, in fact, subaltern here, to his own surprise, but more on that later).

Holroyde really will remain silent throughout, quite as if he were gagged or not there at all. (Just like Assange.) Except on the morning of trial day two. After a few confused looks that go through the entire Holroyde takes heart, which he probably doesn't have. probably doesn't have, to TUSCHELING (like a (like a sly high school girl) to the Chief Lord Justice (sitting next to him).

Who promptly reports that the High Court, represented by Darth Holroyde, feels disturbed in the most sensitive way. By EVERY one of these people who dared to look not at his judicial sanctity, but occasionally at their their profane mobile phones. The citizenry present may immediately cease to look at anything other than a judge. other than a judge.

We would be happy to say the same to Holroyde, who has so far spent his working hours exclusively without any perceptible pause for breath or emotion at the ahistorical screen set up in front of him. screen set up in front of him. Listen, my lord, the bearers of these inalienable civil rights out there, represented by us, feel very disturbed. And by this Lord Vader here who, for days now, ...not at the democratic sovereign, but at his own private, comical television...

Our guess, by the way, is zombies versus plants. (Or Solitaire.) And we wish him PECH from the bottom of our hearts. May the undead on his screen give him a good beating.

Holroyde is known for his merciless harshness - coupled with a blatant lack of empathy. lack of empathy. It is probably strictly forbidden to say or write or think anything BAD about him at all. At any time Holboyne could pull some dusty colonial-era paragraph out of his frock, which he could so and twist it until, in the end, it simply forbids EVERYTHING. (He looks like it, at least).

If Assange and his father and his fiancée and and his

fiancée and his comrades-in-arms and WikiLeaks and the whole world public are finally tortured with an appeal after eleven years. with an appeal procedure in which it is mainly about the mainly about the private medical details of Assange's private medical details and his mental condition, then we really have no one else to thank - according to the prevailing internal legal logic - than His sourpuss lordship here.

When the preliminary hearing for the present appeal was held on 11 August 2021 Holboyne was (arguably) still speaking, although in retrospect one can Holboyne was still speaking, although in retrospect one wishes he had he would have been better off keeping quiet then too. As recently as August, the case was case had been assigned to a pair of judges under his leadership - he was joined by a junior judge, Justice Dame Judith Justice Dame Judith Farbey, who followed the proceedings silently, as quiet as a mouse.

As (then still) presiding judge, Holboyne had dared to hear a case brought by Chief Justice Jonathan Swift, we recall, only a month earlier. (With fatal consequences for all our psyches.) Justice Swift had, when accepted the case for hearing in July, only THREE of the total of five grounds for APPEAL put forward by the US: purely legal and formalistic, relating (at most) to the district court's interpretation of individual legal provisions by the district court. All the agonising questions of (low-level) kitchen psychology, on the other hand, all the clinical pictures, depressions, suicidal intentions, all the expert opinions and their questioning had been quite explicitly excluded by Swift. (One notices immediately: a man of honour).

For this appeal here could have been so beautifully, dryly, technical and deadly dull as any other standard as any other standard court hearing. In any case, it's very different from the failed re-enactment of this early Hitchcock classic here.

What we had to see, hear and NOT HEAR for two days was entirely due to Holboyne. Holboyne. Guilty. For it was he who allowed the two previously the two previously excluded grounds of appeal and and allowed the United States to extend the appeal process to the medical-psychological grounds. grounds, of which you have just had a taste. you have just had a taste of.

## Chapter XIX

# The judicial empire strikes back



One week before the start of the main hearing in October 2021, suddenly and for reasons that are not reasons are unknown, the quiet as a mouse in the Assange case assessor was WITHDRAWN. And replaced by Lord Chief Justice Burnett, whose sovereign conduct of the trial Holroyde has had to endure silently ever since.

And THAT might indeed be a GOOD thing for once.

Lord Ian Duncan Burnett is a knight in shining armour, if one may the (somewhat awkward) title of nobility "Baron Burnett of Maldon, of Maldon in the County of Essex" has been conferred upon him "for life, so long as he lives, so long as he does not die". he lives, so long as he has not yet died". As Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales, Burnett occupies the highest highest appointable judgeship in the land, one of the most respected judges in Britain.

The series of cases with which he has come into contact over the years is as impressive as it is historic: from the Kings Cross fire (1987) to the Southall (1997) and Ladbroke Grove (1999) train accidents to the inquests following the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, and Dodi Al-Fayed. Really great cinema. Burnett was also involved in the overturning of the wrongful convictions of the Guildford Four and the Maguire Seven, Burnett had been involved. In two serious miscarriages of justice, eleven innocent (Northern Irish and English) citizens were FALSE. and English) citizens were falsely accused of being terrorists and sentenced to up to 35 years imprisonment, one of Britain's biggest judicial scandals. in Britain.

From the Supreme Court, Burnett was promoted to the Court of Appeal as "Lord Justice of Appeal at the Court of Appeal". where he was in charge of extradition cases. and where - here comes 1 rant - he corrected Lauri Love's first instance extradition order to the US by immediately REVOKING it: Key words: Asperger's, depression and suicidal tendencies. - normal humanitarian reasons.

In the circle of WikiLeaks sympathisers, the (which can be dramatised from a purely narrative point of view) of Justice Burnett, who, after all, had entered into these as the deus ex machina in a tragedy of antiquity. ancient tragedy, is seen as a good omen. And we too of course WANT to believe that this is something good. the resol-

ution of a soul-crushing conflict through the courageous by the courageous intervention of BLIND goddesses of justice of justice, who finally give the long-awaited final the longed-for final turn of events. HOPE as a principle and OPTIMISM as a strategy, even though both, says Heiner Müller, are only due to a lack of information.

The Swiss international law expert Prof. Dr. Nils Melzer, on the other hand, formulates a depressing thesis. When a judge wants to base his judgement on a precedent decision then he can simply do so. In order to repeat the principle of a decision that has already been made, one does not need the judge who originally made it. THIS judge, according to Melzer, is needed in a case only to REVERSE the principle of a precedent decision. The only one to be overruled by from the legal standard set in the Lauri Love case without being challenged is the one who originally made it: Lord Chief Justice Burnett himself.

## Chapter XX

### Elf Jahre und zwei Tage

Wenn die US-Seite im Berufungsverfahren Recht bekommt, wird der Fall an das Bezirksgericht zurückverwiesen, wo er erneut verhandelt werden müsste. Bekanntlich wird es Monate, wenn nicht (wieder) Jahre in Anspruch nehmen, ein zweites Gerichtsverfahren durchzuführen. Monate und Jahre, die Assange nach über 4000 Tagen unausgesetzten Freiheitsentzugs weiterhin festgehalten würde, um sie mit ungewissem Ausgang hinter den Gittern eines britischen Hochsicherheitsgefängnisses zu verbringen. Ein Alptraum <sup>23</sup>.

Wird die Berufung abgewiesen, wäre Assange (theoretisch) nach geschlagenen 11 Jahren wieder der freie Mann, der er (theoretisch) schon die letzten 11 Jahre über hätte sein müssen.

Es sei denn, die USA entschlossen sich, den Fall Assange noch einmal ganz frisch aufgerollt VON NEUEM zur Ank-

<sup>23</sup>Assange hat sieben Jahre in einem einzigen Raum verbracht (Botschaft), danach zweieinhalb Jahre in Einzelhaft (Belmarsh). Jeder, der während der Covid-Ausgangssperren einen vergleichsweise lächerlichen Eindruck von erzwungener Isolation bekommen hat, möge sich das mal für eine Sekunde vorstellen.

lage zu bringen, wie es von James Lewis zum Ende der Verhandlung hin tatsächlich angedroht wird.

Es sei denn, die USA entschlossen sich zur Anrufung des allerallerhöchsten, allerletztinstanzlichen und allerexklusivsten britischen SUPREME COURTS. Dieser ist selbstverständlich so eigenständig, dass er die Übernahme des Falles einfach ablehnen könnte, womit die Sache dann endgültig erledigt wäre. Passieren wird das natürlich nicht, weil es als offener Affront und (politische) Kriegserklärung gewertet würde, weswegen es für den (unpolitischen) Supreme Court in Wirklichkeit auch nicht infrage kommt, den Vereinigten Staaten eine (höchst)persönlich erbetene Urteilsprüfung abzuschlagen.

Auch in diesem Fall würde Assange weitere Monate, wenn nicht Jahre seines Lebens hinter den Gittern von Hellmarsh verbringen.

SO oder SO oder SO bleibt die niederschmetterndste Erkenntnis die, dass - selbst wenn in diesem absurden Schauspiel die Auslieferung Assanges (doch noch) abgewendet wird - die ZENTRALEN FRAGEN, die mit diesem für die Verfasstheit unserer Öffentlichkeit paradigmatischen Fall verbunden sind, am Ende unverhandelt bleiben. Unverhandelt vor dem Berufungsgericht Ihrer Majestät - und unverhandelt von der betroffenen Öffentlichkeit.

SO oder SO oder SO ist und bleibt es nämlich ein Rätsel, dass unsere Gesellschaft diesen so offenkundigen Angriff auf die Grundpfeiler ihres Gemeinwesens, auf die Prinzipien der Demokratie, der freien Presse, der Transparenz und Rechenschaftspflicht - und nicht zuletzt auch auf die internationale Ordnung - so regungslos über sich hat ergehen lassen wie ein gewöhnliches Opossum<sup>24</sup>.

Für einen alten Hasen wie Bertolt Brecht könnte ALL DAS natürlich die fabelhafte Vorlage für das lehrreichste Lehrstück aller Zeiten sein - über SIE und UNS und die Notwendigkeit des HANDELNS angesichts einer öffentlichen ORDNUNG, deren monströse Dysfunktionalitäten ja nur durch unser stillschweigendes Einverständnis möglich geworden sind.

## Chapter XXI

<sup>24</sup>Das Opossum imitiert die physiologischen Merkmale des Todes, indem es Körpertemperatur, Herzschlag und Atmungsfrequenz herabsenkt und nicht mehr auf die Umwelt reagiert.

# Ein in sich geschlossenes System der Verständigung

„Praktisch nichts an diesem Fall ist übriggeblieben, das noch legal sein könnte.“

Prof. Dr. Nils Melzer

Der um den Gründer von WikiLeaks in elf zermürbenden Jahren teils künstlich erzeugte, teils organisch gewachsene Rechtsfall weist - neben all den in ihm selbst verdichteten logisch-argumentativen Ungeheuerlichkeiten - eine solche Dichte an rechtsstaatlichen Ungeheuerlichkeiten auf, dass man sich unwillkürlich nach irgendetwas SCHRECKLICHEM sehnen möchte, z.B. nach Mahnwachen mit Teelichten und qualvollem Gesang oder irgendwelchen Bürgerrechtlern, die einen melancholischen Halbkreis um eine Notrufsäule bilden.

Ein Blick in die Berichte des UN-Sonderbeauftragten für Folter Nils Melzer, der als Schweizer Völkerrechtler in Fragen einer fachkundigen Beurteilung juristischer Verfahrensabläufe alles andere als ein Laie ist, genügt, um das Ausmaß der Ungeheuerlichkeiten zu erahnen, mit denen Rechtsstaaten wie Schweden, Großbritannien und die USA gegen Assange vorgegangen sind. Obwohl alle angestregten Verfahren jeweils fachmännisch mit juristischen Argumentationsangeboten grundiert waren, sind Mittel und Prozeduren zum Einsatz gekommen, mit denen alle bisher bekannten Prinzipien der Rechtsstaatlichkeit auf das Äußerste strapaziert, wenn nicht gar außer Kraft gesetzt worden sind.

Auf die durch tätliche Mithilfe schwedischer Behörden entstandenen Verdächtigungen, die Assange über ein Jahrzehnt fälschlicherweise das Stigma eines „Vergewaltigers“ eingebracht haben, können wir nicht näher eingehen, sie sind ein Kapitel (bzw. Buch) für sich und lassen sich bei Nils Melzer, der diesen (gesonderten) Fall lange und ausgiebig studiert hat, detailliert nachlesen: „Der Fall Julian Assange. Geschichte einer Verfolgung“.

*Sachdienlicher Hinweis der schwedischen Behörden  
Hier also nur die Kurzfassung des unbeschreiblichen Irrsinns, dem ein normaler Mensch im kafkaesken Labyrinth unserer Justizsysteme begegnen kann, wenn er erst einmal hineingeraten ist. Während er sich anlässlich eines Seminars in Stockholm aufhielt, hatte Assange im August 2010*

*Geschlechtsverkehr mit zwei Frauen. Er war eindeutig einvernehmlich, das stand nie und steht nicht infrage. Die Frauen kannten sich, tauschten SMS-Nachrichten aus und begannen sich Sorgen einer möglichen HIV-Infektion wegen zu machen. Wir schreiben das Jahr 2010, und beider einvernehmlicher Geschlechtsverkehr mit Assange war ungeschützt verlaufen. Sie verlangen von Assange einen HIV-Test, den er verweigert, und fragen sich, ob man ihn nicht behördlich zu einem Test verpflichten könne. Sie gehen zur Polizei. Nein, erfahren sie da, ditt hamwa nich. Hier jibs nur „Vergewaltigung“, wollense das? Die Frauen wollen das dezidiert nicht - trotzdem geht die Sache weiter irgendeinen obskuren behördlichen Gang. Später werden noch viel dümmere Polizeibeamte in dieser hanebüchenen Geschichte auftauchen und eine (komische) schwedische Staatsanwältin, die gemeinsam für den Ärger sorgen werden, der Assange schließlich in die Ecuadorianische Botschaft zwingt. Eine Anklage wegen Vergewaltigung wurde gegen Assange nie erhoben. Es wäre bestimmt auch schwierig gewesen, sie zu begründen, denn eine Vergewaltigung gab es nie. Und wenn selbst die, die in einer Akte als Opfer eines Tatvorwurfs geführt werden, bestreiten, dass es diese Tat je gegeben hat, dann wird es wirklich schwierig. (Auch für die fieseste Staatsanwältin in ganz Schweden.)*

Von den beteiligten Rechtsstaaten wurde damit eindrucksvoll vorgeführt, wie die Legitimation eines konkreten Begehrens, einer als rechtswirksam angesehenen Klage, von der Ebene juristischer Eineindeutigkeit in einen undurchsichtigen Bereich rechtlicher Rezeptionsästhetik verschoben werden kann, ohne dass dies Straßenumzüge aufgebracht Demokraten auslöste.

Jenseits des konkreten Falles von Assange bestünde daher möglicherweise die metajuristische Notwendigkeit, über die (strukturelle) Instrumentalisierbarkeit der Rechtssysteme von Rechtsstaaten nachzudenken. Oder über die verschiedenen Darreichungsformen ihrer zeitgenössischen Zweckentfremdbarkeit.

Oder über die beunruhigende Erkenntnis, dass nicht nur die Vereinigten Staaten, sondern längst auch Großbritannien und Schweden an der Abschirmung ihrer Regierungen vor der Öffentlichkeit arbeiten, indem sie einen ausschließlich ihrer eigenen Definitionshoheit unterstehenden „Geheimnisverrat“ als Straftatbestand in ihren Gesetzbüchern verankern. Und Regierungshandeln damit vor der einzigen Instanz immunisieren, die ihm überhaupt Legitimation verleiht, nämlich vor uns, vor Ihnen, vor der sie in Macht setzenden Bürgerschaft.

Wenn derlei obrigkeitsstaatliche Irrationalismen nun unsere Gesetzestexte (oder ihre Lesarten) zu durchdringen beginnen, dann wird das basale Legitimationsmuster moderner Demokratien selbst auf den Kopf gestellt, denn es hielten damit (durch und durch kontingente) Rechtfertigungsgründe (ganz und gar) zufälliger Regenten Einzug in ein Rechtssystem, das ja eigens konstruiert wurde, um

jeder obrigkeitlichen Willkür endlich Einhalt zu gebieten.

Wenn unsere oder Ihre Kinder in einer künftigen Gesellschaft leben, in der überführte Straftäter straffrei bleiben, es stattdessen aber zur Straftat geworden ist, die Wahrheit über Straftäter zu sagen, dann sagen Sie bitte nicht, Sie hätten nichts davon gewusst.

Und wenn durch unser Rechtssystem kraft seiner eigentümlichen Eigengesetzlichkeiten nicht mehr Recht, sondern sein genaues Gegenteil entstünde, dann wären die für unsere Gesellschaftsordnung konstitutiven Grundprinzipien am Ende doch auf einen recht lächerlichen Treppwitz der Demokratiegeschichte zusammengeschrumpt.

Jeder Mensch, der sich länger als 3 Minuten mit Julian Assange und WikiLeaks beschäftigt hat, weiß, worum es in diesem Verfahren IN WIRKLICHKEIT geht. Jeder der angereisten Beobachter weiß es, jeder zugeschaltete Journalist, jede wortkarge Gerichtslampe, Stenotypistin und Eichentür. Julian Assange selbst weiß es natürlich sowieso, ebenso die Mitarbeiter von WikiLeaks, die Menschenrechtsorganisationen und Journalistenverbände. Die Ankläger wissen es genauso gut wie die Verteidiger. Die Richter, Gerichtsschreiber und Aktenlehrlinge wissen es auch. In dieser und jener und jeder nur denkbaren gerichtlichen Instanz. Alle Anwesenden wissen sehr genau, welche Fragen hier eigentlich zur Verhandlung stehen - und dass sie mit psychologischen Gutachten ebenso wenig zu tun haben wie mit Haftbedingungen, diplomatischen Zusagen oder Suizidgefahr.

Wenn sie alle nun Stunde und Stunde in diesem hochartifizialen Schaumraum der britischen Rechtspflege zubringen und mit kleinteiliger Vortragsführung (und der haarspalterischen Zerlegung aktenkundiger Details) unterkühlte Rhetorikschlachten schlagen, REDE UM GE-GENREDE, ohne dabei diese EINE ZENTRALE FRAGE anzuschneiden, von der doch ALLE wissen, dass es um sie geht, - dann hat das ganze Verfahren (endgültig) die Züge eines WITTGENSTEINSCHEN SPRACHSPIELS angenommen.

Eines Sprachspiels, in dem Julian Assange, WikiLeaks, Pressefreiheit, Demokratie und wir, alle anderen, um die und deren Gesellschafts- und Rechtsordnung es dabei im Grunde geht, nur mehr als BEOBACHTER vorkommen. Beobachter, die (perückentragende) Beobachter bei der Ausführung ihres eigenen Sprachspiels beobachten, das in seiner Hauptsache eben NICHTS ist und, so beschreibt es wenigstens Wittgenstein, nichts anderes jemals zu sein intendiert als ein „in sich geschlossenes System der Verständigung“.

### An Epiloges statt

„Ich sage Ihnen: Wer die Wahrheit nicht weiß, der ist bloß ein Dummkopf. Aber wer sie weiß und sie eine Lüge nennt, der ist ein Verbrecher!“

*Bertolt Brecht, Leben des Galilei*

Als am frühen Sonntagmorgen des 2. September 1666 der königliche Bäcker Thomas Farynor die Glut im Backofen übersah, während er die Tür zur Bäckerstube in der Pudding Lane abschloss, ahnte er nicht, dass er damit einen viertägigen Großbrand auslöste, der vier Fünftel der City of London zerstören würde. Der große Brand von London gehört zu den größten Katastrophen, an die Bewohner der Stadt (und Stadthistoriker) sich (noch) erinnern können. An einem gewöhnlichen Sonntag - nur Monate nach der letzten Großen Pest - fiel die Polis einem einzigen durch Achtlosigkeit übersehenen Funken zum Opfer.

Als der Staatssekretär im Marineamt und Abgeordnete des Unterhauses Samuel Pepys auf die Dächer stieg, um das (unaufhaltsame) Wüten der Flammen und die Zerstörung einer Stadt zu beobachten, deren Aufbau immerhin sechzehnhundert Jahre gebraucht hatte, oder als Samuel Pepys sich niedersetzte, um dieses Desaster (danach) zu beschreiben, ahnte er nicht, dass 450 Jahre später eine Handvoll Prozessbeobachter im Berufungsgericht der wiederaufgebauten City of London dasselbe tun würden wie er.

Zur Kreuzigung? Äääh, nein. Freispruch. Sie haben mich freigesprochen. Sie haben gesagt, ich hätte nichts getan, also könnte ich frei ausgehen und irgendwo auf 'ner Insel leben. Oh, das ist aber nett für dich, dann nichts wie ab. Nein, nein, ich hab' Sie verulkt. In Wirklichkeit ist es Kreuzigung.

In Wirklichkeit ist es Kreuzigung.

## Chapter XXIII

### I 17 Stunden und 43 Minuten

Niemand weiß etwas. Bis Donnerstagnachmittag, 16 Uhr 32, als das Hohe Gericht die bevorstehende BEKANTGABE seines Berufungsurteils BEKANNTGIBT: Freitagmorgen, 10 Uhr 15.<sup>25</sup>

Wenn ein Gericht - entgegen all seiner bisherigen Gepflogenheiten - verkündet, irgendetwas werde nicht in zwei, vier oder verflucht nochmal neuneinhalb Wochen geschehen, sondern in exakt 17 Stunden und 43 Minuten, dann kann man davon AUSGEHEN, dass das Gericht davon AUSGEHT, dass es niemandem auf der Welt gelingen wird, rechtzeitig vor Ort zu sein.

Für sein exquisites kleines SPRACHSPIEL, das das britische Justizsystem hier ohnehin nur zum Zweck der (eigenen) SELBSTVERSTÄNDIGUNG aufführt, hat es für Zuschauer PER SE keine Verwendung. Auch jetzt nicht, wenn es nach 42 Tagen (und Nächten) exzessiver Selbstbesinnung, pararealistischer Rechtsexerziten und leidenschaftsentleerten GERECHTIGKEITSSTUDIUMS noch einmal auf die Bühne kommt, um zum Gedenktag der Allgemeinen Erklärung der Menschenrechte<sup>26</sup> diese eine letzte ZUGABE zu spielen. (Applaus.)

Julian Assange (selbst) wäre alles andere als ein gewöhnlicher Zuschauer gewesen, und die 18 km von Hellmarsh zum Londoner High Court hätte er in der avisierten, verdammt SPORTLICHEN Zeitspanne sogar auf einem Bobby-Car geschafft, wenn man ihm eines untergeschoben hätte. Wessen RECHTSSTAATSVERSTÄNDNIS es eigentlich noch entsprechen soll, dass ein Angeklagter weder an der Verhandlung noch an der finalen Urteilsverkündung auch nur TEILNEHMEN darf, fällt uns (beruhigenderweise) gerade nicht mehr ein.<sup>27</sup> Auf (ausdrückliche) Weisung des Gerichts wurden auch Assanges ANWÄLTE expressis verbis AUSGELADEN, Rechtsbehelfe (kategorisch) ausgeschlossen, Eingaben und Nachfragen (schon im Voraus) abgelehnt. Soso, Ihr Pappnasen. (Dann mal einen donnernden Applaus.)

Keine Öffentlichkeit, kein Angeklagter, keine Anwälte.

<sup>25</sup>Greenwich Mean Time, was sonst.

<sup>26</sup>10. Dezember 2021

<sup>27</sup>Kim Jong-un, Oberster Führer der Demokratischen Volksrepublik Korea



Noch nicht einmal ein Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales. Nur der Schatten von Ludwig Wittgenstein ist gekommen (Kellertür) - und natürlich Lord Vader, jener Justice Holroyde, der während zweier Verhandlungstage durchgehend geschwiegen hatte. Sein unausgereiftes Schweigegelübde war vielleicht nie etwas Handfestes wert gewesen, 42 Tage später ist es jedenfalls Geschichte: ER SPRICHT. Im Namen des höchsten, tiefsten, ersten, letzten, ältesten und jüngsten Gerichts. Und auch das spricht PER SE nur zu sich selbst.

## II Lordrichter (bei) McDonalds

Wir haben es gerade noch geschafft, uns über eine instabile Online-Verbindung zuzuschalten. Der Videolink zeigt erfreulicherweise nichts als ein tiefschwarzes TEST-BILD und erspart uns damit den (nochmaligen) Anblick dieses blasierten Perückenträgers, der uns ohnedies in viel zu plastischer Erinnerung geblieben war<sup>28</sup>.

Die TONSPUR hingegen bleibt uns nicht erspart. Das richterliche Rezitativ erinnert in seinem zurechtweisenden Ton am ehesten an eine dieser (ästhetisch/literarisch/ethisch, bitte ankreuzen) etwas prekären Mitarbeiteransprachen des SCHICHTLEITERS in einem US-amerikanischen Schnellrestaurant. Holroyde nimmt sich (immerhin) ganze NEUN MINUTEN Zeit, um ein zweieinhalbjähriges Verfahren, das an innerer, rechtsphilosophischer, gesellschaftspolitischer Verwinkeltheit durch kaum ein anderes zu überbieten wäre, zu seinem rabiatestmöglichen Abschluss zu bringen: Die Auslieferung von Julian Assange sei rechtmäßig, sagt der Kerl, (und damit) basta.

Die beiden US-Beschwerdegründe, die Holroyde HÖCHSTPERSÖNLICH noch zur Verhandlung zugelassen und das Berufungsverfahren damit in einen HIRNZERFETZENDEN PSYCHOTRIP verwandelt hatte, werden vollumfänglich verworfen. Das Hohe Gericht erkennt damit alles an, was zum Zustand von Julian Assange und dessen verheerenderweise zunehmend verheerenden Verheerungen festgestellt worden war. Na sowas. Im Namen aller empathiefähig gebliebenen Menschen möchten wir uns noch einmal für dieses übelriechende Schlachtfest aus sinnloserweise dargebotenen Persönlichkeitsverletzungen bedanken, für das Seine Lordschaft die ihm zugefallene Rechtsautorität verwendet hat.

Holroyde findet, so eine Sache wie dieses „Assooonj“ sei durchaus für den juristischen Export geeignet, warum auch nicht. In der Handelsgesetzgebung Ihrer Majestät habe man keine dem entgegenstehende Rechtsvorschrift entdecken können, erst recht nicht in den dazugehörigen Verträgen des geborenen Idioten Boris John-

son. Das Gefahrgut könne infolgedessen auf Überlandverschickung gehen, vielleicht werde das ja sogar ganz LUSTIG, worauf wenigstens die protokollfähigen Aussagen zeitgenössischer Zeichentrickhelden zweifelsfrei hindeuteten. Sorgfältig polstern, verpacken und einwickeln (wir empfehlen: die letzte Druckausgabe der Universal Declaration of Human Rights), reichlich Knallfolie zur Hohlraumfüllung, noch'n Aufkleber drauf („zerbrechlich/zerbrochen“): FERTIG!

Ordentlich verpackt könne der Mann bedenkenlos ausgeliefert werden, postwendend. Nicht etwa, weil er (für sich genommen) in einer auslieferungsfähigen Verfassung wäre (s.o.), sondern weil die überaus vertrauenswürdige (lt. SCHUFA?) Regierung der USA ihn und die dazugehörige juristisch-logistische Dienstleistung nun mal bestellt hat<sup>29</sup>. Aus den knappen, um diese draufgängerische (und nur von politischen Analphabeten als „apolitisch“ interpretierbare) Kerneinschätzung gewickelten Schmuckfloskeln wird schnell klar, dass Holroyde wild entschlossen ist, nicht nur DIESER, sondern grundsätzlich JEDER überhaupt ERINNER- oder VORSTELLBAREN US-Regierung den vollen Vertrauensvorschuss seines Erstklässlerherzens in den Schoß zu legen. Nicht etwa, weil das jeweilige US-Regierungspersonal tatsächlich irgendwie vertrauenswürdig wäre (s.u.), sondern weil es nun mal das Personal der (Regierung der) Vereinigten Staaten ist.

Sie sehen hier ein ziemlich amüsantes Vorurteil bei der Arbeit, Juristen (oder Spielverderber) nennen sowas ein PRÄJUDIZ. Es ist nicht nur hart wie British Steel, sondern entfaltet auch noch eine (hammermäßig) durchschlagende Nebenwirkung (Schädelweh) auf jede nur von ihm berührte Rechtsprechung, indem es etwa einem RANDOM Bewohner des Weißen Hauses unbesehen denselben (selbstgepflückten) Lorbeerstrauß überreicht wie jeder anderen Regierungsbackpfeife vor, nach und neben ihm: dem (überführten) Kriegstreiber- und Vollpostengespann George Bush (I. & II.), dem (überführten) Lügner Colin Powell, den (überführten) Kriegsverbrechern Richard Nixon und Henry Kissinger, dem (überführten) Waffenhändler Ronald Reagan, dem (überführten) Masterhonk Donald Trump sowie dessen (übergewichtigem) Folterknecht Fatty THE NUT Pompeo ebenso wie einem (angeblichen) Demokraten mit dem Vornamen „Joe“.

Im Hinblick auf die drei verbliebenen Beschwerdegründe wird der US-Seite nämlich RECHT gegeben - mit einer Begründung, die - DAS WISSEN DIE GÖTTER nicht viel mehr (juristische) Reflexionszeit in Anspruch genommen haben kann als die Zubereitung eines Hamburger Royal TS. In ihrer extra zum Berufungsverfahren noch rasch gefertigten „diplomatischen Zusicherung“<sup>30</sup> hatten die

<sup>28</sup> Danke, gerichtstechnisches Technikteam, wie immer: great work.

<sup>29</sup> Her Majesty's Judicial Parcel Service, stets zu Ihren Diensten.

<sup>30</sup> Copy & Paste

USA Großbritannien ja (angeblich) fest versprochen, den Inhalt der zu erwartenden Warensendung nach ihrer (Aus)lieferung in einem art- und rechtsgerechten Aufbewahrungsverhältnis unterzubringen.

Diese Zusicherung ist auch 42 Tage später noch nicht weniger BESCHEUERT (geworden) als sie es immer gewesen war. Noch immer ist sie nicht nur absolut rechtsunverbindlich und von einer (aussagenlogisch) geradezu bestialischen Selbstwidersprüchlichkeit, sondern sie steht v.a. erwiesenermaßen - noch immer - in einer endlosen Reihe ähnlicher „Zusicherungen“, die die USA gegenüber Drittstaaten (nachweislich) immer wieder abgegeben, aber (ebenso nachweislich) immer wieder gebrochen haben.

Amnesty International zufolge sind jene „US-Zusicherungen“ in einem so beunruhigenden Maße UNGLAUBWÜRDIG, dass man (allein aus Gründen des Verbraucherschutzes) ihre Umverpackung mit irgendeinem grob apodiktischen Warnhinweis versehen müsste<sup>31</sup>, in den asozialen Medien würde sowas (als Verbreitung von FAKE NEWS) geächtet, verboten und schon nach Minuten gelöscht. Denn Assange, so Amnesty, wäre in den USA natürlich absehbar psychischer Folter ausgesetzt, ein Ende jeder Strafverfolgung und seine sofortige Freilassung seien dringender geboten denn je. Wir gehen mal unverbindlich davon aus, dass eine Organisation wie diese so ungefähr ahnen könnte, wovon sie spricht, wenn sie zu einem so uneindeutigen und alarmierenden Schluss kommt wie hier.

*Sachdienlicher Hinweis aus dem Sinn des Lebens, Teil VII (1983) Shut up, you American! You always talk, you Americans, you talk and you talk and you say 'Let me tell you something' and 'I just wanna say this.' Well, you're dead now, so shut up.*

### III Juristischer Jux aus der Frühen Neuzeit

Das Gericht dagegen führt aus, dass jede diplomatische Zusicherung der USA selbstverständlich vorbehaltlos zu akzeptieren sei. Nicht etwa, weil es dafür irgendeine faktische oder historische EVIDENZ gäbe (die es ja auch gar nicht gibt), sondern aus einem romantischen Bedürfnis nach TRANSZENDENZ heraus. Eine gegebene Zusicherung, so Holroyde, begründe nämlich - wir zitieren - ein „heiliges Unternehmen“ zwischen EINEM „ehrwürdigen Staat“ und der unbezweifelbaren Ehrwürdigkeit IRGENDEINES „anderen“<sup>32</sup>.

Hut ab, Holroyde. (Pardon: Perücke.) DAS nennen wir mal einen WIRKLICH WITZIGEN JUX aus der Frühen

Neuzeit, und mit ALTEN WITZEN kennen wir uns wirklich aus. Mit demselben Text würde dieser zeitmaschinenangereichte Richter hier wohl auch die Auslieferung von Jamal Khashoggi an Saudi-Arabien, Can Dündar an die Türkei und die des ersten selbstverdienten Talers an Gündel Gaukeley angeordnet haben: Rechtsapparate ehrwürdiger Ehrenstaaten (unter sich). Farblich passt diese sinnstrenge Begründung noch immer vorzüglich zu den Vollholzvertäfelungen, Samtbehängen und diesem ekligen Amalgam aus selbsthaftender Staubschicht und spätkolonialen Deckenrosetten - aber das natürlich nur am Rande.

An einem ganz anderen Rande (Theke) haben wir mal kurz über den würdevollen Begriff der „Würde“ in seiner ideologisch abgründigen Kombination mit einer so ehrenhaften Denkfigur wie der der „Ehre“ nachgedacht und sind (schon beim ersten Bier) zu dem an WÜRDENEHRE nicht zu überbietenden Schluss gelangt, dass diese Sache namens „Assooonj“ (Holroyde) dieser Sache namens „Vereinigte Staaten“ in beiden Disziplinen eindeutig überlegen ist. (Aber auch das natürlich nur am Rande.)

Ein (angeblich) unabhängiges und (durch und durch) unpolitisches Höchstgericht erklärt die (faktisch) vielfach falsifizierte Behauptung eines (staatlichen) Prozessteilnehmers hier mit debilem Grinsen zum Newtonschen Naturgesetz. Natürlich nicht, ohne es um sein eigenes logisch-philosophisch GANZ SCHÖN AUSGEFUCHSTES Traktat zu ergänzen. Demzufolge müsse eine Aussage WAHR oder (auch nur) WAHRSCHEINLICH sein, nicht weil sie für sich genommen wahr (oder wahrscheinlich) WÄRE, sondern allein, weil es eine pathologisch präpotente Nervensäge gibt, die die Wahrheit dieser Aussage nun mal nachdrücklich behauptet. Die Nervensäge ist hier die unverlässlichste Regierung aller vereinigten Staaten der Welt, deren EINGEHALTENE „Zusicherungen“ (in Auslieferungsverfahren) jeder Einarmige problemlos an seiner fehlenden Hand abzählen kann.

Holroyde geht sogar noch einen Schritt weiter. Er faltet Bezirksrichter Baraitser ordentlich und regelgerecht zusammen (einmal längs, zweimal quer, diagonal hat er vergessen), weil sie es versäumt hat, in gebührender Weise mit der ehrenwerten Anklage zu kooperieren, wie es doch ihre richterliche Pflicht gewesen wäre. Seiner Ansicht nach hätte Baraitser nämlich noch VOR Urteilsverkündung die US-Seite davon in Kenntnis setzen müssen, dass sie das Auslieferungsverfahren womöglich VERLIEREN könnte. Und zwar, um den USA damit die Möglichkeit zu geben, das Verfahren doch noch zu GEWINNEN.

Leck mich am Arsch. Entweder waren wir in Staatsbür-

<sup>31</sup> „Obacht: Inhalt enthält 1 (gezielte) Irreführung“

<sup>32</sup> „Assurances constitute the solemn undertaking by one solemn state to another and therefore have to be accepted.“

gerkunde (BRD) wirklich pausenlos besoffen oder DAS ist wirklich die revolutionärste Plattenverschiebung aller tradierten Verfahrensgrundsätze der (westlichen) Welt - jedenfalls seit Malcolm McLaren, Grandmaster Flash und der Erfindung der TEKTONIK.

Seit wann, mit Verlaub, hat ein Gericht denn EINE SEITE darauf hinzuweisen, dass es nach Lage der Dinge irgendwie schlecht für sie steht? Und seit wann muss es (auch noch) imperativ dafür Sorge tragen, dass dieselbe Seite nach Ablieferung einer rechtlich völlig unbedeutenden diplomatischen Verdichtung des prozessuale Regeldrama im 5. Akt (letztgültig) zu seinen Gunsten wenden kann?

Den substantiellen (Mehr-)Wert eines solchermaßen gestrickten Berufungsurteils für die universalen Prinzipien des universalen Demokratie- und Rechtswesens würde ein seriöser Staatsrechtler noch nicht einmal volltrunken einzustufen wagen. Wir schätzen ihn auf den Menüpreis von 1 Dollar 99. Zuzüglich der Kosten für eine Maxidröhnung Cola light.

Tragischerweise hat selbst dieser eine seidene Faden, an den die Hoffnung aller unverbesserlichen Rechtsoptimisten geknüpft war, sich nun MIT GROSSEM PENG in den Urzustand des mitleidlosen Nichts zurückatomisiert. Die hoffnungsverzerrte Idee nämlich, das jähe Auftauchen des Lord Chief Justice Ian Burnett könne (oder solle) diesem vermurksten Fall am Ende doch noch so etwas einhauchen wie die unbefleckte Empfangnis (objektiver) Rechtsgrundsätze und (rechtsunwissenschaftlicher) Gerechtigkeit.

Wir könnten uns vorstellen, dass der höchste Richter Großbritanniens ziemlich genau weiß, was es mit diesem gewagten Urteil (in Wahrheit) auf sich hat - und dass es deutlich über den LIMES<sup>33</sup> hinausgeht, diese 550 km lange Grenze nämlich, die die zivilisierte Welt mitsamt ihrer höheren Rechtswesen vom lausigen Leben im BARBARICUM trennt. (Vernünftigerweise ist Burnett noch nicht einmal gekommen, um sich das Elend seiner eiligen Verlesung anzuhören.)

Das Verfahren gegen Assange war von Anfang an total behämmert, denn es war ausweislich seiner vorgeblichen Rechtsgründe erkennbar nicht juristisch, sondern politisch humoristisch motiviert gewesen. Wer sich das noch einmal LEBHAFT (Cinemascope, Technicolor, Dolby Surround) in Erinnerung ruft, der wird zu seiner heimlichen Bestürzung (und seinem offenen Entsetzen) feststellen, dass das Urteil des Berufungsgerichts erschreckenderweise erbärmlich gut zum intrinsischen Charakter dieses gesamten Verfahrens passt. RechtsstaatsSmiley.

Sollte IRGENDJEMAND in Grobbritannien es wagen,

noch einmal gegen das Rechtssystem von Polen zu pöbeln, dann bekommt er aufs Maul. Dieser ungünstige Oxford-Zögling mit der Kopferücke aus ausrangierten Wischmops zum Beispiel.

Lord Vader jedenfalls ist noch immer hochzufrieden. Er verliert das Urteil (hier) hörbar zu seinem eigenen Genuss und mit einer gestelzten Überheblichkeit, die er UM KEINEN PREIS verbergen würde. Immerhin war er es ja gewesen, der für die grenzdebilste Degeneration dieses Verfahrens gesorgt hatte. Das psychotische JURISTENPINGPONG war in jeder Hinsicht SINNLICH gewesen, denn es hatte zur Aufhebung des erstinstanzlichen Urteils nicht im Geringsten beigetragen. Sollte sein Zweck allerdings darin bestanden haben, subtilen Einfluss auf den Inhalt der öffentlichen Berichterstattung zu nehmen, dann hat sich das Manöver längst (mehrfach) bezahlt gemacht. Alle knappen Nachrichtenmeldungen<sup>34</sup> waren nahezu ausschließlich um (psychologische) Gutachten, (simulierte) Krankheitsbilder und (privatpersönliche) Details gekreist. GANZ UND GAR NICHT gekreist waren sie hingegen um die Gesamtheit der - journalistisch und juristisch um Welten ergiebigeren - RECHTSPROBLEME, die durch die Aussicht auf ein unfaires, unzulässiges oder gar politisches Verfahren, die stupende Omnipräsenz menschenrechtsverletzender Haftbedingungen, die Spielarten der psychischen Folter und schließlich die traditionsreiche Unglaubwürdigkeit diplomatischer Zusicherungen der USA aufgeworfen worden waren. Game, set and match, Mylord.

Wenn jetzt jedenfalls schon unsere als unabhängig konzipierten Höchstgerichte damit beginnen, sich „ehrwürdigen Staaten“ gegenüber stärker verpflichtet zu fühlen als der Verteidigung der ihnen überantworteten Rechtsprinzipien, Verfahrensgrundsätze oder dieser letztlich doch gar nicht so schwer erfassbaren (platonischen) Idee der GERECHTIGKEIT, dann können wir einpacken.

Denn so war diese Sache mit der Gewaltenteilung wirklich nie gedacht gewesen.

## IV Don't mention the war!

Wie erst nach Urteilsverkündung bekannt wurde, hat Assange zu Beginn des ersten Verhandlungstages einen (offenbar stressbedingten) Gehirnschlag erlitten, während er gezwungen war, der kultivierten, kleinen Hobbykeller-Sezierung seines eigenen Geisteszustands aus einer acht Quadratmeter großen Gummizelle beizuwohnen, ohne auch nur die geringste Möglichkeit zur Intervention in das ihm vorgeführte (Rechts)geschehen zu haben. Selbst nachdem ein neurologischer Blitz in seinen Kopf gefahren war, hielt man ihn - angesichts dieser Sternstunde der mo-

<sup>33</sup>Für Insulaner: Hadrianswall

<sup>34</sup>S. 17, ganz unten, neben dem Kreuzworträtsel



deren Küchenpsychologie (800 Pfund/ Std.) - noch immer in (der ihm dauerhaft verordneten) DULDUNGSS-TARRE.

Irgendein anonymen Justizanarchist sollte bei Gelegenheit mal einen Zusammenschnitt dieser irrsinnigen Gerichtsfarce ins Netz stellen, vielleicht unter dem Titel „Collateral Murder - Reloaded“<sup>35</sup>.

Einer ärztlichen Untersuchung unter der Ägide von Nils Melzer, noch immer Sonderberichterstatter der Vereinten Nationen, ist im Ergebnis zu entnehmen, dass Assange fortgesetzt WEISSER FOLTER ausgesetzt war (und ist). Diese schwer nachweisbare und (auch deshalb) wohl perfideste aller Folterformen zielt auf die blitzsaubere Zerlegung der Psyche einer Zielperson - und ist daher bestens geeignet für Staaten (und Hausfrauen), die wissen, wie schwer es ist, diese fiesen kleinen Blutspritzer JEMALS wieder aus einer weißen (Sommer-)Weste zu bekommen. Dass psychische Folter über kurz oder lang zu körperlichen Ausfallerscheinungen und diese wiederum zum Tode führen können, ist dabei fest einkalkuliert. Wenn Nils Melzer konstatiert, das Vereinigte Königreich foltere Assange buchstäblich zu Tode, dann ist das noch nicht einmal halb so übertrieben wie es (für Sie und uns hier draußen) klingen mag.

Wir hätten mittlerweile jedenfalls Lust, uns im Gegenzug für all den britischen Bullshit hier mal probeweise ein paar ihrer Perückenträger ausliefern zu lassen. Für den Fall, dass Assange in den Händen englisch- oder amerikanischsprachiger Strafvollzugsbehörden auch nur das Geringste zustoßen sollte, hätten wir eine weit weniger absurde Klage im Köcher als diese Anfänger aus den USA. Wie wäre es mit BEIHILFE ZUM MORD, Mylords. Holroyde und Burnett würden wir nach einem 1789-tägigen Schauprozess, den sie (abwechselnd) aus der Passkontroll- und der Gepäckschlange am BER mitverfolgen müssten, eingehend mit unserem eigenen KALIBER altertümlicher Vollstreckungspraxen vertraut machen: Im Stechschritt vor, Robenböden strammziehen & paar Dutzend rechtsedukative Rohrstockhiebe, voilà. Nach allen Regeln der Kolonialpädagogik und der (deutschen) Kunst.

Und wehe, sie erwähnen den Krieg.

## V V. Gerichtsbehördenbingo 'til the end of time

„Ist dort oben noch jemand anders, mit dem wir reden können? Nein! Und jetzt verschwindet endlich, sonst rufe ich ,God shave the Queen!‘“

Allmählich wird es schwierig, im labyrinthischen Verkehrsnetz der fallweise noch zulässigen Rechtswege, -pisten, -umleitungen, -(ausfall)schritte und all ihrer behördlichen Umstellwerke nicht den Überblick zu verlieren. Wir rekapitulieren mal wie folgt: Das Berufungsgericht verweist den Fall durch seine Entscheidung formal zum Bezirksgericht zurück. Die richterliche Novizin Baraitser wird angewiesen, zur Strafe für ihren eklatanten Fehlschluss („Auslieferung abgelehnt“) ihr eigenhändiges Urteil (aus dem Januar) noch einmal eigenhändig zu korrigieren - und die Sache dann umgehend dem britischen Innenministerium zur weiteren Wirklichkeitswerdung (Paketmarke) zu übergeben. Dass Home Secretary Priti Patel ein richtig harter thatcheristischer Hund ist, Verzeihung: eine Hündin, hatten wir wohl schon erwähnt. Daneben ist sie noch die weibliche Inselausgabe von Andi B. Scheuert: eine personifizierte Selbstüberschätzung und notorische Dummschwätzerin; nichts, was die Kuh je berührt hat, ist jemals auch nur so einigermaßen ausgegangen.

Einspruch gegen dieses Berufungsurteil<sup>36</sup> kann die Verteidigung jetzt nur noch beim Supreme Court einlegen, dem Obersten Gerichtshof des Vereinigten Königreichs, der natürlich den Teufel tun wird, sich eine derart toxische Zeitbombe freiwillig ans Bein zu binden. Falls die Fraktion der Masochisten unter den Obersten Richtern wider Erwarten die Oberhand gewinnen und der Fall zur Verhandlung angenommen werden sollte, kommt eine (dieser Tage) recht einfache, wenn auch latent unrechtsstaatlich wirkende Arithmetik zur Geltung: Bereits vier der zwölf Richter am Supreme Court verdanken ihren Posten Boris Johnson, zwei weitere werden im Januar 2022 folgen. Wie der Fall Assange unter derartigen Voraussetzungen entschieden würde, kann man sich unbesehen ausrechnen. Was wiederum auf einen wirklich verstörenden Sachverhalt weiterverweist, der Europarechtler und Politikwissenschaftler mit Bezug auf das britische Rechtssystem und seiner - von Johnson vehement vorangetriebenen - Erosion LÄNGST NICHT MEHR nur von einer Vorstufe POLNISCHER VERHÄLTNISSE sprechen lässt. Ohne jeden Witz.

Mit oder ohne Ehrenrunde über den Supreme Court wird DER FALL danach erneut durch die etablierte Kette verfügbarer juristischer Umschlagsplätze gereicht.

<sup>35</sup>Niiiiicht! Ist hochverboten! Wer das macht, kommt nach Belmarsh. Wirklich, kein Spaß!

<sup>36</sup>Stichtag ist der 23. Dezember 2021

Zuerst zurück zum Bezirksgericht, wo die Verteidigung rechtzeitig vor Weiterleitung an die (überkauften) Augenbrauen Priti Patels nun ihrerseits in Berufung gegen die ursprünglich ergangene Bezirksgerichtsentscheidung gehen kann, in die sogenannte Gegenberufung („counterappeal“), die sich inhaltlich und argumentativ dann nicht an einem traditionell substanzbefreiten Drehbuch aus den USA, sondern an den eigenen Berufungsgründen (der Verteidigung) auszurichten hätte.

Bis alle, die dann noch leben, sich eines verregneten Vormittags im Court Room Four des Berufungsgerichts wiedersehen, werden Wochen, Monate oder Jahrzehnte vergangen sein. Wochen, Monate und Jahrzehnte, die Julian Assange - weiterhin völlig rechtsgrundlos - im Einzelzimmer eines britischen Hochsicherheitsgefängnisses festgehalten (werden) wird. Man kann sich das nicht oft genug klar machen: Während in den verstaubten Rechtsstuben da draußen mit gravitäischem Gestus ein immer abstruseres GERICHTSBEHÖRDENBINGO abgehalten wird, gibt es für die Inhaftierung von Julian Assange noch immer nicht die geringste Rechtsgrundlage. In dem Rechtsstaat, der ihn hier gefangenhält, liegt nämlich (noch immer) nicht das Geringste gegen ihn vor. Nichts, nothing, niente, nada, niets, rien. Wirklich nicht das Geringste.

Derweil soll ein (gesichts- und rüchgratloser) US-Diplomat hinter vorgehaltenem Handschuh verraten haben, dass die Vereinigten Staaten gar nicht ernsthaft damit rechnen, Assange jemals auf jenen GRUND und BODEN zu bekommen, den sie nach 500 Jahren nun frecherweise ihren eigenen nennen. Das sei auch gar nicht das Ziel, betont der GEHEIMNISVERRÄTER angeblich, denn die nach frühneuzeitlichem Maßstab gebotene Satisfaktion könne man sich auch deutlich unauffälliger, viel lautloser und weit beiläufiger verschaffen: „We'll keep him in the courts 'til the end of time.“

Wie es aussieht, könnte das wirklich klappen.

## VI Finaler Frontallappenangriff

Als hätte es noch einer (letzten) Pointe zur Auslieferung von Julian Assange bedurft, hier ist sie.

Das (völlig unpolitische) Höchste Gericht des (lupenreinen) Rechtsstaates Polen, äh, Pardon: Grobbritannien besiegelt die Auslieferung eines australischen (!) Journalisten (!) auf Grundlage eines us-amerikanischen (?) Spionagegesetzes (?) von 1917 (?) und der Lüge (!) eines isländischen (?) Pädophilen (!).

Währenddessen hat die EU-Kommissionspräsidentin verständlicherweise keine Zeit, diesen finalen Frontallap-

penangriff auf die Grundwerte unserer Gesellschaftsordnung zu kommentieren.

Sie sitzt nämlich mit dem transatlantischen Retropräsidenten Joe Biden auf einem zynischerweise zeitgleich zur Urteilsverkündung einberufenen Ball namens „Gipfel für Demokratie“, um sich von Biden, der diese an Assange exemplarisch demonstrierte Kriminalisierung eines Publizisten und die damit verbundene Pervertierung von Recht & Demokratie sofort stoppen könnte, (wenn er es wollte,) dieselben hohlen Phrasen anzuhören wie immer.

Zum Beispiel die: „Als globale Gemeinschaft für Demokratie müssen wir für die Werte eintreten, die uns vereinen.“ Oder die: „Wir müssen für Gerechtigkeit und Rechtsstaatlichkeit eintreten, für Redefreiheit, Versammlungsfreiheit, Pressefreiheit, für alle angeborenen Menschenrechte jedes Einzelnen.“

Dass Biden, während er solche Sätze vorliest, an der kriminellen Idee festhält, einen Publizisten zu 175 Jahren Haft zu verknacken, der nichts getan hat, als die Wahrheit über US-amerikanische Kriegsverbrechen zu veröffentlichen, ist ein Widerspruch, der vielleicht Ihnen da draußen auffällt, nicht aber der Chefin Ihrer EU-Kommission.

Mit dieser ihr scheinbar angeborenen Debütantinnen-attitüde, die von (echten) Schauspielern als „Overacting“ verachtet und daher gewohnheitsmäßig gemieden wird, könnte vonderähmLeyen jederzeit artig ihre eigenen hohlen Phrasen aus dem Präsidentinnenhandbuch ziehen.

Zum Beispiel die: „Demokratie ohne freie und unabhängige Medien kann nicht funktionieren. Wir müssen Journalisten um jeden Preis schützen.“ Oder die: „Information ist ein öffentliches Gut. Wir müssen diejenigen schützen, die Transparenz erzeugen - die Journalisten.“

An spätestens DIESER Stelle jenes FIEBERTRAUMS antiker Dramenhelden wüssten WIRKLICH ALLE, die über SO ETWAS<sup>37</sup> noch nie ausführlich nachgedacht haben - wir, Sie, Wittgenstein, Vader, sogar Biden und vonderLeyen selbst -, dass hier in Wahrheit NICHTS auch nur ANNÄHERND so gemeint ist, wie es für Sie da draußen (und uns) geklungen hat.

Eine politische Logik, die das Ziel, unter dessen Namen sie auftritt, von innen heraus zerstört, verweist nicht mehr auf einen erstrebenswerten Gesellschaftszustand, sondern auf den Ausgangspunkt (ausweglos) einer sophokleischen Tragödie (ausweglos).

Und als hätte es noch eines SPRACHSPIELS zum Zerfall unseres Gemeinwesens bedurft, nun ja. Das könnte es sein.

<sup>37</sup>Anwendungsprobleme der Diskursethik in Politik, Recht und (zweitklassiger) öffentlicher Rhetorik



Herausgeber:  
Martin Sonneborn  
Fraktionsloses Mitglied des Europäischen Parlaments  
Rue Wiertz 60  
1047 Brüssel  
Belgien

2. Auflage, aktualisiert. Jetzt noch deprimierender. Smiley!

Die zum Ausdruck gebrachten Meinungen liegen in der alleinigen Verantwortung der jeweiligen Verfasser und geben nicht unbedingt den offiziellen Standpunkt des Europäischen Parlaments wieder.