

The public Court Trial of the President of European Court for Human Rights

Case: the powerlessness of the Human Rights



Introduction

Earlier are complaints about the perjury and other crimes by Dutch Courts and judges lodged to the European Court for Human Rights (hereafter: ECHR) and these are declared inadmissible (*1) without a motive. This doing makes that national Courts and judges can eternally continue their perjury or other crimes after 1 judgement and without punishment even no punishment for repeating.

Recently a higher appeal –partly again about the crimes by a Court and its judge– and empathically addressed to the Dutch King as the national authority appointed in article 13 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (hereafter: EU's Convention). Not the national authority responds but the Dutch Supreme Court "Raad van State" (in the Netherlands are two Supreme Courts) blocks the access, responds and creates a dispute. Suddenly –out of nowhere– issued this Court a judge-decision out of a secret litigation (*2). Against this treatment, handling, litigation and more committed violations –also against the Human Rights– is a lawful appeal lodged (*3) and empathically addressed to the Dutch King again. Since then is nothing heard: the dispute and its argues are silenced, covered-up or likely deleted. Adding that the ECHR gets to examine and the public gets to scrutinise, Dutch judge-decisions about rubbish in connection to the matter in reality.

No equal executive power

Both above, evidences the cunning way to disguise the denial of justice (*4). A judge uses against its duty (*5), the oversize of power to subordinate article 6-1 to his own sovereign will (*6) to make disliked violations disappear. These violations are earlier confessed, confirmed and determined by the ECHR (*see the references) but these prohibitions have no executive force for a national Court or its judge(s). Equally have Human Rights no obeying force for a Court or its judge(s). A civil citizen has not the equalizing power to level a judge's power and to enforce the citizen's execution of its right to bring any claim before a court or tribunal (*7). Courts and judges only, are able to use the inadmissibility of the ECHR for secretly continuing crimes. This use aims the messenger only and not at all the message.

The facts of violation

(01) The core issue

Although the –civil– public has the equalizing power by the Human Rights, nearly every official body or authority ignores this. This ignoring is mainly due to the ECHR by bad work. The Human Rights have the same –as the civilians who execute these rights– not the force that equalize up to the oversize, of the power of the Courts or its judges. Practice-based evidence is the paragraph "Introduction": the Court and its judge use the power of State-protected independency to silently denial justice and delete the lodged appeal of resistance while the individual citizen has not any power to execute its right to bring any claim before an honest, independent and impartial court and judge or to use its right of an effective remedy before a national authority.

Because Europe is not yours but ours each must share Salomo's wisdom:

A proper measure-strip to gauge the level of justice of an official with peace in his veins is his handling of being accused. This righteous and peace-keeping civil servant makes itself recognized by processing criticisms grateful for the gift to improve quality for the highest level of protection of justice and peace. This apply needs straight forward communication.

(02) First there must be a fair tribunal or judge, which is not present

Analogue considered as for the access to a court (*8) there must be first a fair, impartial and independent staff in a court, tribunal or judge before a claim can justly be declared not-inadmissible and only then access can be given and the rule of law can be active. The guarantees of access and proceedings are of no value when there is no fair court, tribunal or judge.

(03) The freedom of interpreting other's expressions does not exist

Firstly, interpretation is in matters of the law a disordering name: the interpretation remains the interpreting person's expression. The expression of his thought about his/hers own intentions and aims.

The ECHR is fully aware that;

- * a treaty –exactly alike a law– is the expression of the signatory parties (*9);
- * each term or article is the expression that the parties so intended (*10);
- * the ECHR –like any national Court– is able to dig-up these legislator's intentions and aims (*11);

plus that,

- * others' interpretations creates only many –deliberately made or not– divergences and violations or varieties of violations (*12);

Nevertheless continues the ECHR –in awareness and after deliberation– constructing own interpretations (*13). Knowing that each change of person in a tribunal, changes

instantly the tribunal's interpretation or opinion (*14). While each law-article's legislator's intentions and aims never change. So, interpreting never contributes to peace or justice but instead violates the public's right to complete and correct information (*15) of the legislator's intentions and aims.

- (04) The peace-keeping system of the "independent judge" is destroyed
The ECHR develops judgments with its interpretations of the EU's Convention (*X). For a legal basis uses the ECHR the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (*X). This doing fundamentally violates article 30 of the UN's Declaration or article 17 of the EU's Convention. Firstly belong the agreeing signatory parties of the Vienna Convention surely to the mentioned State, group or person. On top of this does the article 53 of the EU's Convention in particular aim at laws and other agreements like treaties to not limit the rights and fundamental freedoms, included article 17. To emphasize this do the agreeing signatories of the Vienna Convention not aim at the UN's Declaration and neither at the EU's Convention. So, interpreting otherwise than the EU's Convention's Contracting Parties' intentions and aims, is a fundamental crime that destroys the Convention's goal and purpose.

The internal combat for power

The ECHR demands to be followed by all other Courts –ignoring their State-protected independency– while with (almost) the same object and purpose the ECHR must demand to follow the legislator's intentions and aims. So by ignoring each judge's pseudo-right of independency to ignore, the ECHR and its judgment is worthless. The ECHR creates an illegal judicial organisation with a hierarchy. An ECHR's judgment that violates each civil individual's rights can not be brought to trial at a Court of first instance.

- (05) Intolerable unfairness
One of the few rules of 'fair-play' is that the rules are known beforehand to each who joins the doing together. The law and each article legislator's intentions and aims are known on forehand (*16). The ECHR's, judge's or tribunal's opinion or interpretation is always afterwards thus is never a fair trial settling a 'fair-play'. Adding to this that afterwards people are never to blame of not-knowing how to do right. But Courts and judges do blame people.

- (06) Discrimination of individuals by Courts, judges, official bodies or officers
The ECHR confesses and confirmed that community and –civil– individuals have the same Human Rights (*17). Nevertheless discriminates an ECHR's judgment, the examined case from all other equal cases and the civil litigant from all others civil citizens. The amount of complaints is also no excuse to keep continuing violating (*18) disguised behind inadmissibility. The number is the signal about the quality: the higher the number the more is wrong. So, each decision of inadmissibility is a crime and does not focus on repeating the doing wrong by a Contracting State.

- (07) Paper-world is not the reflexion of the real-world
Recalling the introduction which unveils again a Court document that is rubbish in connection to the matter in reality: it covers-up the argues of the individual citizen. This nonsense is what the ECHR examines by its choice to ignore the civilian's accusations and charges (*1). The people under the latent discrimination line are aware of the injustice and discrimination. It is human that people in the public gets angry.

The introduction confirms that Courts copy each other. The public gets to scrutinise out of a secret process a dictatorial decree of a (European) Court, that contains a malicious accusation and only pretends to found "something" wrong with the

submitted 'complaint' for the purpose of inadmissibility. And national Courts reflect this again, by which doing citizens are pushed deliberately and eternally to drawn in suffering. It is human that people in the public gets angry.

The accountability of the President of the ECHR

The EU's Convention is the Warranty Agreement that founded the ECHR. Each judge (1) is of high moral character and (2) posses the required qualifications for appointment to high judicial office and (3) sits on the Court in its individual capacity (*19). The plenary Court shall elect its President (*20). The single-judge Court shall be assisted by rapporteurs who shall function under the authority of the president of the Court (*21). The President shall represent the Court (Rule of Court, Chapter II, rule 9, paragraph 1).

The legal empowerment of the public to judge

The public is by law empowered to scrutinise and judge each court-decisions or each judge-decisions on a fair trial and the other elements of Human Rights and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (*22).

Both the European Courts brought their deeds, behaviour and actions or themselves out of judgement. So, the public is the only left empowered, independent judge over the Courts.

Legal issues

The ECHR confesses and confirms that the public has the task to scrutinise judge-decisions. To inform widely the members of the public, the results are gathered in the webdossier at the URL "www.de-openbare-zaak.nl" with a Dutch section, an international section in English and a section "Court Trials to the public" (in English). A member of the public has the duty to point every body to this webdossier and its contents for facts and actual practice of violations or offences.

Because the EU's Convention is a normal contract and the ECHR confesses and confirms that one side are "the Contracting States" and the other side are each of the individual civilians. Thereby is this document also a notice of default to the ECHR and its President who represents this Court.

Legal frames and arised rights

Due to the deliberate lack of legal frames –in particular the ones that state Human and Civil Rights or out of which these rights corollaries– it becomes necessary to pronounce publicly these legal frames and arised rights.

(08) The Warranty Agreement

Rights do solely arise out of a preceding law article. The Human Rights are proclaimed in and by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (hereafter: UN's Declaration) (*23). This declaration is a pledge, so a normal contract. This UN-contract has at the supplying side each Member State of the United Nations and at the receiving side each of the civilians or inhabitants of each Member State.

The UN-contract is in the European Union elaborated into the EU's Convention. This Convention is a Warranty Agreement (*24) on the supply of protection, so a normal contract. This EU-contract has at the supplying side each Member State as the Contracting Party of the European Union and at the receiving side each of the civilians or inhabitants of each Member State.

By ratification became the UN-contract and the EU-contract implemented in the national law. What more is agreed on is in the EU's Convention and guaranteed the supply to everyone. Example: The Dutch Constitution –by article 94– establishes the priority and dominance of the ECPHR over each law-article.

Agreements Rights.

Each country has Agreements Rights in which is elaborated what precise mutual rights, out of a contract arise. Undisputable and crystal clear is, that in the legal frame of the contract on Human Rights first of all must be supplied, a Court with an impeccable staff and the guaranteed tribunal with an average or better quality of sworn judges (*paragraph 02 above). The European and national judiciary, Courts and judges work under the Warranty Agreement and Agreements Rights.

(09) Human Rights are possession

The Human Rights are not at all the rights of the Courts, judges or judiciary and neither of the State or the State's "Executive Power". For example is an independent tribunal not at all a claim that Courts, judges or judiciary can bring before an international organisation: it is their –by law compelled– obligation to be so.

Due to the contractually stated possession of –worldwide– everyone civilian, are the Human Rights impossibly a charity. These rights are impossibly an economic object because these rights are everyone's possession.

Due to the contractually stated possession of –European's– everyone civilian, is the Protection of Human Rights impossibly a charity. Also this Protection is impossibly an economic object because this is also everyone's possession.

So, the economic status of a country is no reason or justification to steal –some of the– Human Rights. Besides a theft, is this also a breach of contract of the State's Protection. The economic status of a country is impossibly a redress or compensation of damages.

Because the Human Rights and their Protection are no economic objects both are easy to supply everywhere, in any situation and in any legal relationship. Each notice of a stolen possession is an undiscussable and undisputable –instant compulsory– restitution, of which a delay causes a huge financial and immaterial damage.

(10) **Only one (1) Court, in fact the Court of first instance**

Confessed and confirmed by the ECHR, contains the Human Rights only one (1) Court, namely the "Court of first instance" (*25). An appeal is only a notice of default and solely the right of a State to repair: nothing more.

Confessed and confirmed by the ECHR (*26), is it prohibited to create levels of justice with levels of Courts like a Court of first instance and a 'higher' Court like Court of appeal or Supreme Court.

Due to the Warranty Agreement or contracts has each individual civilian the right that an appeal is not needed. Each appeal (notice of default) is about an –at the least partly– irremediable damage.

Additional

The introduction evidences that the Court of first instances and even the Supreme Court "Raad van State" are not authorised to judge disliked cases or matters –these are disliked by Courts and judges– and omitted these matters in the judgment. Then all 'higher' Courts examine the judgment on errors and can not approve on the omitted cases or matters. Courts play to each other with judgments.

(11) The supremacy over the judiciary, a Court, a tribunal or a judge

Only the Governments signatory are the High Contracting Parties involved in the EU's Convention, that secured to everyone the Rights and Freedoms defined in the Convention (*24). This excludes the presumed law-base of a "Judicial Power".

Nothing in the EU's Convention may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms or aimed at their limitations to a greater extent than is provided in the Convention (*27). Although the EU is not a State it is for sure a group or a gathering of persons.

The Human Rights are protected by the supremacy of the rule of law and not by a Court's tribunal (*28).

(12) The compelling obligation of a public hearing

Each judge's task is to judge the case that the individual civilian lodged for the determination of his Human and Civil Rights (*29). To be sure to understand the writing in the documents a judge must order the Court to let a public hearing take place. To verify the points of dispute by whom of the litigants the judge must order the Court to let a public hearing take place. Already these two necessities clears up the legislator's will by a compelling prescription that a public hearing takes place.

Even when an inadmissibility seems to be beyond doubt then still this is the prohibited opinion of the Court. Then the litigant must be notified with a request for points of dispute with the Court and to start a court fee free Court Trial against the Court on the justice of these points.

(13) The judge-decision for everyone executable

Each judge-decision is the determination of the Human and Civil Rights of everyone (*29). So, this decision must emphatic determine to be for everyone and thus by everyone executable at every place in the country.

Also this by law compelling property does require that the decision makes verifiable how the settled case is detected as a case in the category which the legislator intends and aims at.

(14) Each appeal must be reproducible

When the litigation is not reproducible as it took place –like any other scientific research or investigation– then the right of the public to examine or control is impossible to execute and thus destructed. Equally is a just appeal impossible. The judge-decision is indisputable on forehand an offence with irremediable damage.

(15) The effective remedy against Courts and judges

Against criminal Courts and criminal judges who commit perjury must be supplied to everyone an effective remedy (*30). This remedy can impossibly be effective at a Court and tribunal that beforehand does not judge and condemn its colleague-judge. When this Court and tribunal is not made available then the public –or the involved civilian– is the only legal empowered judge.

(16) The equalizing power of Human Rights

The Human Rights are an equalizing power (*31) and nothing less and nothing more. In case the civilian and the public with Human Rights should take-over the oversize of power then the difference in power remains: Nothing improves by turn-over the roles. This wisdom gave birth to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(17) The sole detectability of the presence of Human Rights

Human Rights exist unconditional (*32). So these rights are always present for everyone and are always valid.

Everywhere where an oversize of power is used, undisputable the Human Rights not exist because Human Rights are present or not. In particular the equalizing power of these Rights is impossibly a little present and is impossibly the most powerful.

Note: The use of power is just doing the job right.

So, each misuse of power –like ignore or not use the critics– is a crime, but leave this misuse unpunished is a capital crime.

The call for violence

The absence of Human Rights is a call for violence in whatever way (*33).

(18) The ownership of an expression

The EU-contract contains the Protection of the Fundamental Freedom of speech or expression (*34). To express freely one's will is one's Fundamental Freedom and thus is this expression the speaker's or writer's and signatories' enduring possession.

Stealing this expression and exchange it for some interpretation or some perception of a tribunal or judge, is a crime, but leave the theft or the exchanged expression unpunished is a capital crime. Therefore does also each law-article remain the sole ownership of the legislator who made it.

(19) Only the EU-legislator intentions and aims rule

By the ownership of its expression does also the legislator remain the sole owner of each by this legislator made law-article. This is established by UN-Declaration article 30 and EU's Convention article 17. These articles prohibit each judge or tribunal or public to ignore the legislator's intentions and aims. In Europe also is a Court or judge lawful not empowered or not entitled to decide by its own opinion.

After the establishment of this Court is emphatic agreed by the High Contracting Parties that (quote) "Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as limiting or derogating from any of the human rights and fundamental freedoms which may be ensured under the laws of any High Contracting Party or under any agreement to which it is a party."(*35). So, the interpretation dispute –mentioned in article 32 (*36)– is impossibly something else then the interpretation of one or both litigants.

Conclusion

This document is addressed to the official who presents the ECHR, so nobody else. Many individuals are discriminated and treated unjust by Courts, judges and the judiciary. The ECHR has a significant share in this and this share is the object of this document.

The few of all matters in paragraphs above make sufficiently clear that,

- () the single fact alone that far most of the individual citizens must beg for the obedience of each's –by law given possession of– Human Rights is another practice-based evidence that these Human Rights not exist in the real world;
- () the crimes that judges commit freely while the civilians are punished for; the decisions that aim at the messenger and not at the message; the injustice or the discrimination, these make the people under the latent discrimination line angry;
- () the oversize of power or force to bring oneself out of judgment by a court, tribunal or judge is a –world wide– well-known characteristic of authoritarian dictatorship; Adding that the run into "out of judgment" and silencing or cover-up, evidences the lack of

Salomo's wisdom. This run into cover-up evidences the confession and awareness of guilt thus the lack of high moral character, also because a normal person who mainly does good not misses a serious opportunity to advertise about this in a Court Trial.

- () the Human Rights as a charity of Contracting States or as a charity of the ECHR and its judicial system is refused by the public; This is exposed by persons under the latent discrimination line with detectably enough violent rebellion;
- () the declension of peace in –national or international– community is due to not following the UN-Declaration's signatories' intentions and aims but due to the nowadays from these away drifted opinions and interpretations of mainly the judicial organisation.

Contractual rights

The time arrives for the unveiling whether each civil member of the public can claim its –by law given possession of– Protection by article 30 of the UN's Declaration or article 17 of the EU's Convention, that the President stops the crimes of the ECHR or each civil member of the public again must wait for mercy up to where the President is willing by charity to definitive obey my and everyone's Human Rights and the Protection of these rights.

The signatories of the UN's Declaration and EU's Convention both intend in general to equalize oversized power of a State's "Executive Power", Courts or judges and aim to weaken the cause for rebellion or escalation ending in barbarous acts (*37). On the contrary, up to nowadays the people below the latent discrimination line must combat against the power of judicial tyranny of European or national judiciary, Courts and judges. As this document and the webdossier, is the evidence of.

Determination

Detection of pure guilt

If any official gets angry –even a little bit– by the lodged accusations likely because it's thought of doing honestly and honourable its job and shows this by doing its job not at all –so make the accusations disappear in whatever way– or with an unusual delay, then the public detects clearly the guilt; and the badness by the unveiling.

The ECHR commits crimes against the Human Rights and also makes (by it) disliked accusations disappear by inadmissible decisions.

The ECHR's President's high moral character is yet not detectable on forehand.

Claim or remedy of breach of contract

Each member of the public beneath the latent discrimination line hereby demands that an individual civilian's need for a judge-decision stops definitive at the Court of first instance (*25) by an impeccable craftsmanship and by an inerrable justice with a superb high quality of protection of the and its Human **Rights**.

For this purpose is hereby claimed the restitution of each of all Human **Rights**, among which are;

To refurbish equalizing power

- * each of the Human **Rights** is equipped solidly with a force of justness to equalize any State's, State's body's, tribunal's or judge's executive power, by a Court Executing Order to each State and each State's Government;
- * the instant destruction of the hierarchy or levels in justice in Europe and in it's countries,
 - ** by destroying the levels in Courts, tribunals or judges;
 - ** by destroying the levels in laws;

- * that the European and national law is applied, closely according to each law-article's legislator's intentions and aims which are published in each written judge-decision;
- * that each applied opinion or interpretation of an other one's expression is –also declared by an ECHR's judgment in a reasonable time– always a violation against the freedom of expression of the other one;
- * that each Court of first instance is publicly verifiable for scrutiny on:
 - ** a staff with the most impeccable just craftsmanship and equipped for the most complete in justice,
 - ** mainly protecting the Human Rights of the individual civilian;
 - ** letting business interests never be more then equal to the civil client's interest;
- * each appeal is for the Contracting State the notice of default and a litigation between the Contracting State (in a joint with the appealing party) and the Court of first instance;
- * each repeated "complaint" at the ECHR will be punished by the ECHR and punishes the Contracting State and in particular the violating Court and the violating judge(s);

To equip the right with equalizing power, to bring any claim before a court or tribunal (*10)

- * an inadmissible decision is prohibited by default or if really necessary it then is an unmistakably clear motivated, sovereign decision of the Court's President only;
- * that a court trial without a public hearing is prohibited by default or if really necessary it then is an unmistakably clear motivated, sovereign and preliminary decision of the Court's President only;
- * the evidence is supplied in the written version of the decision for scrutiny on:
 - ** the lying or truth in each chapter of each judge-decision,
 - ** that each consideration is considering the correct point of dispute plus that the considerations are complete and covering the dispute in each judge-decision;

In addition

- * each litigations starts by default the judgment about what the litigants have done to respect correctly the other's rights and to avoid a Court Trial;
- * that each judge-decision declares emphatically and written in the verdict,
 - ** that the determined rights are for everyone;
 - ** that the handled case is for everyone detectable as belonging to equal cases of the same –equally detectable– category;
 - ** that each national judge-decision is for everyone executable at every place in the country and each ECHR-judgment is compelling right and instantly enforceable against each judge or tribunal at any Court in Europe;

Executability

The president of the ECHR too, is aware that after WW2 each civil rebellion has a legal basis (*33) and is caused by only the judiciary, Courts, tribunals and judges. The peace and justice keeping system of "the independent judge" also lacks an effective self-cleaning force. The webdossier at the URL "www.de-openbare-zaak.nl" is integral part of this document or notice of default.

The president of the ECHR too, is aware that this document is based on and caused by the lack of executive power and force of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, against criminal Courts and its judge(s). It would be insane of the ECHR's President not to order each judge in his Court out of an own righteous conscience (high moral character) to end this discrimination, fulfil the demands and end the divergence in power and force.

It would be insane of the President not to obey and execute the law or Convention out of an own righteous conscience, but delay again –in fact refuse– until a –yet unknown– public's executive power executes this public's judge-decision with force on the ECHR. The

Dutch King too is sufficient informed about the damages and all details for the contractual payment. All necessary information or data can be acquired there.

In last resort is the ECHR's President responsible. Also because the Council of Europe is not and has not an Executive Power.

The payment for damages dismisses impossibly the President or the ECHR from impeccably executing the contract.

A strong advice is to study frequently the above mentioned webdossier and the content of each section.

The public waits for the Court's President's response and the requested ECHR-decision in a reasonable time.

References:

- *1 The webdossier "www.de-openbare-zaak.nl", in the section "Court Trials to the Public", Case European Court for Human Rights versus the Public.
- *2 The webdossier "www.de-openbare-zaak.nl", in the section "Court Trials to the Public", Case Supreme Court "Raad van State" versus the Public.
- *3 Opposition against the judge-decision of the Supreme Court "Raad van State" in the webdossier "www.de-openbare-zaak.nl", in the international section in English, in the Rubric "Exceptional letters" under item 00 "Higher Appeal to the Dutch King", last addition. (After lodging is nothing heard)
- *4 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 35, text part 2
- *5 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 28,
- *6 Case Engel and Others v. the Netherlands, paragraph 81, last but one text part
Case Öztürk v. Germany, paragraph 49, text part 2, last but one sentence
- *7 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 36, text part 2
- *8 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 34, last text part PLUS article 35, last text part
- *9 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 34, text part 2
- *10 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, article 31, paragraph 4 (art. 31-4).
- *11 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 35, first text part, sentence 3: working papers
- *12 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 33, last text part
- *13 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 28, first phrase
- *14 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, pdf-edition page 20, "Separate opinion of judge Verdross" page 22 judge Zekia, page 28 judge Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice.
- *15 UN's Declaration, article 19
- *16 UN's Declaration, article 11
- *17 Case Golder v. the United kingdom, paragraph 38, last but one text part (quote)
- *18 Case De Cubber v. Belgium, paragraph 34.
- *19 EU's Convention, article 21.
- *20 EU's Convention, article 25.
- *21 EU's Convention, article 24.
- *22 Case Campbell and Fell versus the UK, 28-06-1984, paragraph 91.
- *23 UN's Declaration, preamble last consideration
- *24 EU's Convention, preamble and article 1
- *25 Case De Cubber v. Belgium, paragraph 32, fourth sentence, quote: "Article 6 para. 1 (art. 6-1) concerns primarily courts of first instance;"
- *26 Case De Cubber v. Belgium, paragraph 32, second text part
- *27 EU's Convention, article 17.
- *28 EU parliament resolution P6_TA(2006)0260, paragraph Q.
- *29 EU's Convention, article 6.
- *30 EU's Convention, article 13.
- *31 UN's Declaration, article 1
- *32 UN's Declaration, whole preamble
- *33 UN's Declaration, preamble second consideration
- *34 UN's Declaration, article 19
- *35 EU's Convention, article 53.
- *36 EU's Convention, article 32.
- *37 UN's Declaration, preamble paragraph 2 and 3