Beowulf von Prince, Schweizer Str. 38, AT-6830 Rankweil Oct. 03, 2020

Beowulf von Prince, Schweizer Str. 38, AT-6830 Rankweil
To Mr. President Frank-Walter Steinmeier
Office of the Federal President
Spreeweg 1

D- 10557 Berlin

To the indictment, Case Number: 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 of the indictment of the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office on behalf of the Bamberg General Public Prosecutor's Office, on behalf of the Bavarian State Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection, on behalf of the Bavarian Minister President.
Concerning the File Number of the Office of the Federal President: IIB3 - 4241 E (87) -28 144/2020
Concerning the File number of the Federal Department of Finance (FDF):
432.1 - 372, your reference: nol, Clerk: Lukasz Nosek, reference: DFRGES.18.361; State liability in the matter Beowulf von Prince.
Concerning the contract of koninklijke DSM with the binding parts of the contract, the Code of Business Conduct/DSM Values
Concerning lawsuit in Washington D.C. Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN
Concerning the lawsuit in San Francisco Case No. 3:20-cv-01283-VC

Action for damages and compensation for pain and suffering

Beowulf Adalbert von Prince, Schweizer Str. 38, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria

vs. the Free State of Bavaria,
represented by Mr. Markus Söder, Minister President, Bavarian State Chancellery, Franz-Josef-Strauß-Ring 1, D-80539 Munich, Germany

and in third-party-notice vs.

the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG)
represented by President Frank Walter Steinmeier,
Office of the Federal President, Spreeweg 1, D-10557 Berlin, Germany

and in third-party-notice vs.

the Swiss Confederation,
represented by Mr. Lukasz Nosek, Administrator of the Federal Department of Finance, General Secretariat FDF, Legal Service FDF, General Legal Service, CH-3003 Bern, Switzerland

and in third-party-notice vs.

the koninklijke DSM,
represented by CEO Matchet,
HET Overlon 1, NL-6411 TE Herlen, Netherlands

for
damages and compensation for pain and suffering, caused by violation of the rights and obligations of the administration of the United Economic Territory, inter alia, Articles 14, 25, 16, 79 para. 1 sentence 2, Articles 116, 97, 101, 120 and 133 Basic Law (GG) and the European Convention on Extradition between the Swiss Confederation and the Federal Republic of Germany, Article 14, Principle of Speciality and the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons between Switzerland and the EU.

Concerning the parties
The Plaintiff
The Plaintiff is the legitimate son of Tom Adalbert (the name Adalbert comes from the fact that Prince Adalbert of Prussia was the godfather) von Prince, born on December 27, 1953 in Ebern/Unterfranken/Bavaria/BRD.
On the Plaintiff's nationality:
With the nationality the ordre public is defined, that is the right one is subject to.
This also includes the international treaties of the state. If international treaties give rise to common law between states, each national also acquires a partial nationality of the other state with regard to the international treaties.
As a national of a state, one is also a partial owner of the property of that state.

Not every state recognizes another state.

The father of the Plaintiff. Tom Adalbert von Prince is the legitimate son of Tom von Prince. The grandfather of the Plaintiff is the legitimate son of Henry Prince. The latter was British Police President of Mauritius. During the outbreak of a yellow fever epidemic, he cared for sick people in his police station. As a result, he himself fell ill with yellow fever and died of it. A monument has been erected to him on Mauritius.

The grandfather went for training to relatives in Silesia/German Reich. From there he set out for Africa. As a shipwrecked man he landed on Zanzibar. There he was provided with papers and necessities by the British.
He registered with the German Colonial Administration on the neighboring mainland and became a colonial officer for the German Empire in East Africa. He peacefully united different tribes. Only against Arabs as slave traders and against the Wahehe under Sultan Mkwawa, the black Napoleon, as he was called, he successfully waged war and thus founded the state of Tanganyika, today's Tanzania.

He wanted to settle in Iringa, the capital in Waheheland and had already ordered numerous agricultural implements. But the nationals of the German Empire refused him the right to settle in Iringa. They feared that he might establish his own kingdom. He had taken the head of Sultan Mkwawa to himself - see Art. 246 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles and was thus the leader of the Wahehe in the eyes of the Wahehe.

He was allowed to settle in the Usambara Mountains. He had to sell his agricultural equipment, which was unsuitable for working mountainous terrain.

The European colonial powers had agreed that in the event of war in Europe, the colonies should not be involved.
But after the outbreak of World War I, the British landed in Tanga with 6´000 elite soldiers. After heavy shelling, the 1´000 Askaris (these were African auxiliaries of the German colonial administration) went backward. But then the plaintiff's grandfather arrived with 100 volunteers. The grandfather was the former captain of the Askaris, (by now a farmer), the Bwana Sakarani (the man without fear). Under his leadership, they beat back the British. The grandfather of the Plaintiff was killed.

Now what is the nationality of the Plaintiff's grandfather?
This question is not raised by the Plaintiff, but by the "Germans" with their nationality law.

The oldest brother of the Plaintiff's father, had the British nationality, although he was never in Great Britain.
The Plaintiff's grandmother had moved to the Free State of Danzig after the First World War.
The children should not be involved in a war again.
The Free City of Danzig had been created by the Peace Treaty of Versailles (Art. 100-108). According to Art. 102 of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the Free City of Danzig was placed under the protection of the League of Nations. Therefore, the Danzig nationals were forbidden to be militarily active themselves. Even the acceptance of medals was forbidden. Article 103 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles stipulated that the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig be agreed upon by representatives of the Free City of Danzig with a representative of the League of Nations. According to Art. 49 of the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig, this Constitution may not be changed without the express approval of the League of Nations. This created a cosmopolitan nationality.
The Plaintiff's father returned to his native Tanganyika with a Danzig identity card after his education, not yet eligible to vote at the age of 19. There he was probably the most successful entrepreneur.
The shelling of the territory of the Free City of Danzig marked the beginning of World War II - indictment No. 1 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, violation of the Briand-Kellogg Pact. The nationality of the German Reich was imposed on the Danzig nationals, and thus its law. The Danzigers were pressed into the Wehrmacht and thus enslaved - Charge No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, violation of the 1907 Hague IV. Convention.
After the outbreak of World War II, the British sent the Plaintiff's father to the German Reich in 1940 as part of the Allies. As a Danzig national, he was not entitled to take part in military actions. His resistance was therefore not directed against the German Wehrmacht, but against the rulers of the German Reich, the Nazis, and their law. As a national of the Free City of Danzig, he was bound by the Constitution to uphold it, which was the ordre public, defined in Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution as the German law at the time Jan. 1920.

(Actual power in the German Reich was not the German Wehrmacht, but the SS. The SS was subordinate to the police. In fact, the SS was the enemy of the German Wehrmacht. The leader of the SS Heinrich Himmler had even issued the order that the SS members, composed of 30 different nationalities, should impregnate the wives of the Wehrmacht members. Only because Hitler feared for the fighting morale of the German Wehrmacht, this order was withdrawn).

After the promulgation of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, where according to Article 133 GG the FRG is the administration of the United Economic Territory, Section 15 of the Courts Constitution Act: "Courts are state courts." was repealed.
In the London Debt Agreement of 1953, Art. 5.2, the Free City of Danzig is listed as a state entitled to reparations.

On Feb. 22, 1955, the Act on the Regulation of Nationality was created. In the written report, it was explicitly stated in bold letters that the nationals of the Free City of Danzig are entitled to reject the Reich nationality. The father of the Plaintiff made use of this right. The Government of Lower Franconia/Bavaria/FRG confirmed the nationality of the Free City of Danzig and that the Plaintiff's father is nevertheless a German within the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law. According to the electoral laws, however, he could no longer become a deputy of the FRG.

In 1956, the Plaintiff's father filed a claim for damages at the United Nations in New York. There, in 1957, his nationality of the Free City of Danzig was confirmed.

Also the Plaintiff could not become a delegate, is nevertheless official with the obligation the GG and the laws - that is the German ordre public at the time Jan. 1920 to protect.

Now, which nationality does the Plaintiff have, which ordre public is the Plaintiff subject to, which treaties under international law, which labor law and which share does the Plaintiff have in which assets, which were also created by his activity as an employee of the United Economic Territory?

In any case, the Plaintiff is a party as an employee of the administration of the United Economic Territory.

Concerning the Free State of Bavaria
The present Free State of Bavaria does not correspond to the borders of the Kingdom of Bavaria. The present Free State of Bavaria was placed under the control of the United States of America as an occupation territory for the purpose of extracting reparations.
Bavaria did not want to join the Basic Law and thus the FRG as early as 1949. Only through pressure from the United States of America did this happen. As a sign of resistance against this, the CSU was founded in Bavaria, as a counterpart to the CDU. The CSU exists only in Bavaria and is not a CDU. Bavaria tries itself as a sovereign state, which wants to appear foreign-politically. It is violated in Bavaria against Article 97 GG.
Prosecutors bound by instructions are appointed disciplinary superiors of judges. And that also still at the same court. Thus Mr. General Public Prosecutor Lückemann of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court was appointed to the President of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court. Now the judges are to decide on the cases for which their superior is responsible. Mr. Lohneis, Leading Senior Public Prosecutor of the Coburg Regional Court, has been appointed President of the Coburg Regional Court.
It may be that on Friday a public prosecutor is working on a case and on Monday he is supposed to decide on it as a judge.
The separation of powers no longer exists.

The roster allocating court business no longer contain a rotation and thus violate Article 101 of the Basic Law and Section 16 of the Courts Constitution Act.
Minutes at court are not kept verbatim anyway.

Bavaria has thus definitely left the legal sphere of the GG, the European Convention on Human Rights and the EU.

Concerning the Federal Republic of Germany
The Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was created by the Basic Law (GG) for the FRG. According to Article 133 GG, the FRG enters into the rights and duties (of the Western Allies) of the administration of the United Economic Area.
The Saarland was initially created as a supposedly sovereign state with its own constitution. After a referendum, the Saarland joined the FRG in 1957 by accession under Article 23 of the Basic Law. Control Council Law No. 35 of 1946 has never been applied there. In contrast, this law continues to exist unchanged in the original Federal Länder of the FRG.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, then Chancellor Helmut Kohl beamingly proclaimed: *"Everything is possible even a peace treaty."* Because of the outstanding reparation payments, they then refrained from a peace treaty and agreed on the 2 + 4 Treaty.
According to Art. 1 of this Treaty, two conditions must be met for it to be effective

a) A constitution must be promulgated to which all "Germans" agree, i.e. also the Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG who made use of the Law on the Rejection of Nationality of the Reich- and Nationality Act of July 22, 1913 and therefore could not become deputies.
b) And that in this future constitution the national territory will be defined, as in Art. 23 GG the area of application of the GG was regulated.

Art. 23 was repealed for this purpose by the American Secretary of State in July 1990.

The conditions of the 2 + 4 Treaty have not been fulfilled to this day.
Officially, it is claimed that the GDR could have joined by a constitution or by joining the FRG, like the Saarland, by supplementing the scope of the GG in Art. 23 GG.
This representation is obviously wrong.
Both a common constitution must be promulgated and the scope of application must be defined.

The GDR acceded by the Unification Treaty.
Article 23 GG was overwritten in 1992 with European Union.

Like the Unification Treaty, the 2 + 4 Treaty is a state treaty and can be terminated at any time by either party.
Mrs. Karin Leffer and the Plaintiff have filed a lawsuit in Washington D. C. and demanded the "Germans" either to implement the 2 + 4 Treaty or to conclude a peace treaty.
Both are rejected by Mr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier as the supreme head of the "Germans".
On the other hand, the "Germans" still hold on to their Reich and Nationality Act of the German Reich from 1913. This law has its scope in the borders of the German Empire at the time of 1913.

For this the explanation:
During World War I, the British imposed a naval blockade on the German Reich. Cut off from supplies, including food, 750´000 Germans starved to death. The American President Wilson

made it a condition for peace negotiations that the German emperor would abdicate. This led to revolution and counter-revolution. Free corps were formed. There was civil war. The British continued to maintain the naval blockade. Another 100´000 Germans starved to death. So the Germans were forced on the one hand to fulfill the American President's demand and on the other hand to end the civil war.
A new government had to be formed. For this a new constitution was needed. For this purpose, the Weimar Constitution was created. However, this did not define the territory of the state. A law that does not specify an area of application has no effect. It is not known in which area it should apply.
On the other hand, the Reich and Nationality Act of July 22, 1913 was adhered to. This was passed by the German Emperor. In this law, a distinction is made between German nationality and Reich nationality. The German nationality is the nationality of the Kingdom of Bavaria, the Kingdom of Saxony etc.. The Reich nationality could be acquired on application by those who had settled in the German colonies.
Thus, the Germans signed the Peace Treaty of Versailles, but did not recognize it.

After the active fighting of the Second World War ended, the German Reich was divided. The northeast of East Prussia was placed under Soviet administration. The rest of East Germany was placed under Polish administration, including the Free City of Danzig, until a peace treaty was concluded. Central Germany became a Soviet occupation zone, and West Germany became an occupation zone of the U.S., Britain, and France for the purpose of extracting reparations. Saarland was declared a sovereign state.

Therefore, Control Council Law No. 35 never came into force in the Saarland. Saarland joined the Federal Republic of Germany, the administration of the United Economic Territory of the three Western occupying powers.

The Potsdam Agreement of 1945 stated:
B. Economic Principles
16. In the imposition and maintenance of economic controls established by the Control Council German administrative machinery shall be created and the German authorities shall be required to the fullest extent practicable to proclaim and assume administration of such controls. Thus it should be brought home to the German people that the responsibility for the administration of such controls and any breakdown in these controls will rest with themselves. Any German controls which may run counter to the objectives of occupation will be prohibited.

Accordingly, the Basic Law for the FRG was created, in which the FRG enters into the rights and obligations of the United Economic Territory.

In memory of the Peace Treaty of Versailles one has therefore in the 2 + 4 Treaty as a condition for the sovereignty of "Germany" the conditions for it in Article 1 of this Treaty.

With a constitution a new state comes into being and must accordingly pass a new nationality law. But one still holds on to the Nationality Act of July 22, 1913.

One has renamed this law now in Nationality Act. However, the Reich and Nationality Act of 1913 is still valid.

The Nationality Act (StAG)
Section 1
A German within the meaning of this Act is a person who possesses German citizenship.

According to this law, who possesses German citizenship?
Section 3
(1) Citizenship is acquired
1 by birth (Section 4),
2 by a declaration pursuant to Section 5,

Section 4
(1) A child shall acquire German citizenship by birth if one parent possesses German citizenship.

Thus the German nationality possesses whose parents, grandparents the nationality of the German Reich after the Reich and Nationality Act from July 22, 1913 possessed.

After 1990, all state institutions were privatized. The Bavarian State Forestry Administration became the Forstbetriebs GmbH. The pension funds were privatized.
The state bonds are issued by the Finanzagentur GmbH.
Finally, the Civil Service Laws were transformed into Civil Service Status Laws.

What is the FRG now?

There are different views on this, each of which has a factual justification.

The Plaintiff takes the view that the FRG was conceived as the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig and has always been and is sovereign.
Bavarian Prime Minister Söder and President Frank-Walter Steinmeier, on the other hand, take the view that the German Reich continues to exist within the borders of 1913. The FRG is thus only a part of the German Reich.

They are probably called Reich Germans in the meantime.

On the other hand, there are also some who claim that the FRG is not a state, but is made up of limited liability companies.

The Plaintiff's view that the FRG is the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig is based on Art. 116, 25, 79 Para. 1 Sentence 2, Art. 133 and 146 GG.
According to Art. 116 GG, the German Reich is recognized in the borders of December 31, 1937, and thus the Free City of Danzig is recognized as a sovereign state.
Art. 116 GG:
(1) Unless otherwise provided by a law, a German within the meaning of this Basic Law is a person who possesses German citizenship or who has been admitted to the territory of the German Reich within the boundaries of 31 December 1937 as a refugee or expellee of German ethnic origin or as the spouse or descendant of such person.

What does the FRG have to do with the German Reich within the borders of 1937?
Is a Sudeten German who has fled or been expelled and settled in Breslau a German within the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law? Hardly. The scope of the GG was limited to the definition in Art. 23 GG.
The question that must be asked is what German in the meaning of Art. 116 is supposed to mean. This can only mean the law that is to be applied. This is regulated in Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution, as the German law at the time of Jan. 1920 and thus the ordre public of the Weimar Republic.

According to Article 25 of the Basic Law, the general rules of international law take precedence over all laws. At the time of 1949, the general rules of international law could only mean the Hague IV. Convention. According to Art. 43 Hague IV. Convention, the occupier must uphold the ordre public. All laws that violate it are null and void. National Socialist law was banned. Thus, the established ordre public is the law at the time of 1920.
According to Art. 79 Para. 1 Sentence 2, the GG cannot be amended insofar as it concerns peace treaties, occupation law and defense law.

But according to Art. 146 GG, all provisions of the GG could be changed from the beginning and can be changed by adopting a constitution. The objection that such a constitution could only be adopted if the citizens of the GDR also voted on it is wrong. If the FRG had adopted a constitution, the citizens of the GDR would have been able to introduce their ideas by amending the constitution even after the fall of the Wall.

The answer as to why a constitution could not yet be adopted can only be that, according to Article 146 of the Basic Law, such a constitution must also be agreed to by those who were not citizens of the German Reich within the borders of 1937, for example the nationals of Danzig.

In 1937, the ordre public of the Weimar Republic no longer applied in the German Reich, but that of the Nazis.

In possession of German law in the meaning of Art. 116 GG are therefore those who are in possession of German law according to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution. Thus, these are citizens of the FRG.

The other inhabitants of the Federal territory of the FRG, as administrators of the United Economic Territory, have assumed the rights and obligations towards the Danzig nationals according to Articles 102 and 103 of the Versailles Peace Treaty.
The resolution of a constitution according to Article 146 of the Basic Law would extinguish the limitations of the Basic Law with respect to peace treaty, occupation law and defense law issues. Whose consent must then be given? That of the Free City of Danzig or that of the German Reich? With a consent of the Danzigers to a constitution, the nationality of the Free City of Danzig expires. This settles the territorial question of Danzig. The Danzigers entitled to reparations would become part of the new state and thus reparations could no longer be demanded. Just as no reparations could be directed to the FRG as long as there were nationals of the Free City of Danzig. The rights and obligations of the Allies towards the Danzigers expire with a constitution to which the Danzigers agree. The Peace Treaty of Versailles is thus observed.

And why does Art. 146 GG still exist?

Against this is the opinion of the Reich Germans, represented by Mr. Steinmeier and, among others, by Mr. Söder.

That they hold the opinion that the German Reich still exists within the borders of 1913 is proven by the fact that they still adhere to the Reich and Nationality Act of 1913. This law has its scope of the German Reich at the time of 1913.
Another proof that these gentlemen still hold to the German Reich in the borders of 1913 is that these gentlemen refuse to implement the 2 + 4 Treaty.
The further proof that Mr. Steinmeier and Mr. Söder are Reich Germans is also provided by the amendment of the Nationality Act Section 40a.
In it, Germans in the meaning of Art. 116, who expressly made use of the Law on the Rejection of German Reich and Nationality of Feb. 22, 1955, are again declared to be nationals of the German Reich at the time of 1913 without their consent.

Section 40a Nationality Act
Any person who, on 1 August 1999, is a German within the meaning of Article 116, paragraph 1 of the Basic Law without possessing German citizenship shall acquire German citizenship on the said date.

Then there are those who claim that the FRG is no longer a state entity at all.
These prove it with the fact that § 15 Gerichtsverfassungsgesetz: *"Courts are state courts.",* was omitted and not replaced.
As further proof, they cite the fact that all state institutions have been transformed into limited liability companies. For example, the Bavarian State Forestry Administration became the Bavarian ForstbetriebsGmbH. The FRG's government bonds are marketed through Finanzagentur GmbH. Finally, the civil service laws were transformed into civil service status laws.

Which assertion is now correct?

Mr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier is in any case a citizen of the German Reich.

Concerning the Swiss Confederation
The Swiss Confederation is a sovereign state.
But there, too, police officers have been demoted to employees, with the official justification of cost savings, so that police officers can be dismissed. As a result, police officers, according to their own statements, no longer check the legality of their actions, but carry out orders without criticism.
The debt collection offices (bailiffs) are privatized and act in their own economic interests.
The Swiss Citizens Initiative for judicial reform states that the state organs have been appropriated by the "classe politique" at the expense of the citizens. Judicial offices have been bought, which would already be punishable today.
In the present case, the Swiss Confederation takes sides in a contract with the DSM Group for its own financial benefit and for the financial benefit of the DSM Group and to the financial detriment of the Plaintiff.
In doing so, the Swiss Confederation violates the European Convention on Extradition with the FRG and the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons with the EU.
In any event, the Swiss Confederation is acting as an economic entity in the present case.

Concerning the koninklijke DSM

Koninklijke DSM is a public limited company with its registered office in the Netherlands and branches worldwide.
Due to claims of the Plaintiff against the DSM Group, DSM has caused the Swiss Confederation to prosecute the Plaintiff.

In support of the Plaintiff's claims
From his activities as a forestry official
The Plaintiff has already presented the basis of his claims (unquantified) in the revision to the judgment of the Coburg Regional Court of Oct. 01, 2019.
This revision was also filed at the court in Washington D.C.
Thus, public deeds are available. These have not been objected to and are thus recognized.

The reasoning regarding the Plaintiff's claims from his own damage
The Plaintiff obtained his specialized baccalaureate through the second educational path (in evening classes).
Already at the age of 22 he managed a company with 2 employees. But then the Plaintiff decided to study forestry. Out of 400 applicants for a study place, only 80 were accepted. Of these, only 24 reached the professional goal. As a student, the Plaintiff opened a bookstore and sold books to fellow students and copied documents for them. During the semester breaks, the Plaintiff always worked.

Even besides his studies. On one occasion, the Plaintiff earned over 900,-DM over a weekend (this was half a month's salary in 1978).
When he was hired as a probationary official, the Plaintiff was in charge of the private forest district Steinberg/Forstamt Kronach.
Immediately 4 weeks after the Plaintiff's employment, a snowfall occurred, the largest forest catastrophe known until then. The Plaintiff not only coped with it, he also developed a new silvicultural concept. This provided for hardwoods to be planted between the spruces every 10 meters. The spruce trees had to be planted at a distance of 1 x 3 meters. This met with considerable resistance from the forest owners. Previously, these had always planted only spruce trees at a spacing of 1 x 1 meter and had already obtained Christmas trees at an early stage. Financial resources were made available for the reforestation of the collapsed forests. At a training session, the Plaintiff was advised that pure spruce forests were also being funded again and if the Plaintiff refused to fund pure spruce forests, he could be sued. The Plaintiff responded: he is the clerk on the ground and decides what tax moneys are spent on.
In the end, all forest owners planted mixed forests. The success is visible after the last dry years. In some cases, only the mixed tree species are still standing. The spruces were destroyed by the bark beetle.
The snowfall was followed by years of warm weather. A bark beetle calamity was on the horizon. The Plaintiff drew the attention of the forest owners to this until the night hours. Finally, it was ordered that the forest owners be informed in writing and that a deadline be set for the removal of the bark beetles.
This deadline was not met by all forest owners. Therefore, the Plaintiff carried out the removal of the bark beetles at the expense of the forest owners (replacement measures). Until then, no government lawyer had dared to interfere with private property. The Forestry Office reported the Plaintiff's intention to the Ministry. The ministry replied: *"Probably insane. No way."* The Forest Office replied, *"Too late, all done."*
The Plaintiff was threatened by forest owners that the Plaintiff would pay for the removal. But the Plaintiff had done the measures more cheaply than the Forest Farmers Association could have. On the side, the Plaintiff was the Deputy Managing Director of the Forest Farmers' Association.

The latter received 5% of the turnover as a donation from the suppliers. This 5% income was almost as high as the Plaintiff's salary due to the Plaintiff's activities. The Forest Farmers' Association had to consider how to maintain its status as a non-profit organization. Etc. In only 10 days (including Saturdays and Sundays), the Plaintiff partially worked the monthly target of 160 hours.
The Plaintiff never received any compensation.
In exchange, he received the best of all probationary period evaluations. This was to give the Plaintiff a lightning career in administration. The Plaintiff declined. He did not study forestry only to squat in an office.
In Oct. 1986, the Plaintiff transferred to the Gleisenau State Forest District of the Coburg Forest and Domain Office. 3 months later trees collapsed due to an icy rain. In addition to the 4 workers, the Plaintiff employed another 16 workers to remove the broken trees. The Plaintiff achieved the best comparable operating results in the very first year. The district had some 60-year-old unkempt stands. In order to make up for the lack of maintenance, the Plaintiff employed another 4 workers in addition to his 4.
In 1990 there was a storm. Instead of 4 workers, the Plaintiff employed up to 40 workers at times. The Plaintiff's colleagues, who were not so affected by the storm, applied for compensation for their overtime. They were granted. To compensate the Plaintiff's overtime was refused. There were too many. Someone would have had to be hired. There was no position set aside for that.
The Plaintiff reforested the collapsed coniferous logs with over 20 different species of trees and shrubs. Among them were many exotics. These would be damaged by deer. Plaintiff should have built over 20 kilometers of fence to protect them. Instead, the Plaintiff increased the deer kill to 500% of the previous kill.

In 1994, the Plaintiff suffered a herniated disc in his cervical spine. After the operation, the Plaintiff was told what he must not do. That is, hyperextend his head backward. Doing so will squeeze the disc. If the head is turned, the crushed disc is sheared. If the arm is raised, there is also a counter-pressure and the disc is injured. This is the motion sequence when marking the trees that have to be felled. The Plaintiff had performed this motion sequence about 500´000 times in the last 10 years.
The Plaintiff had to take early retirement. Instead of the agreed 75% pension of the salary, the Plaintiff receives only 58%.

At the same time, the Plaintiff has fulfilled his target benefit for 45 years of work.
Of course, the Plaintiff only completed his services without compensation because he is a civil servant. As a civil servant, one has a special fiduciary relationship with the employer. This is based on reciprocity. The civil servant does not work, he serves. A civil servant is solely responsible for the legality of his actions. In this sense, he is also an entrepreneur.
As a worker, of course, the Plaintiff would have been paid immediately for every hour of overtime.

But of course the Plaintiff would not have worked as a laborer or employee in the forest, but as an entrepreneur. With his favorable work, the Plaintiff would certainly have become the largest entrepreneur in the forestry industry.

Damages from unlawful violation of rights, judgment of the Bavarian Administrative Court of Bayreuth 1999.

The Plaintiff had built up an agricultural and forestry business on the side with mushroom and Christmas tree cultivation. After the opening of the border in 1990, the Plaintiff founded two agricultural limited liability companies. To expand the business, the Plaintiff had to build and therefore applied for building permits. These were rejected. The Bavarian Administrative Court of Bayreuth still determined in 1999 that these were wrongly rejected. The Plaintiff also wanted to build a mushroom laboratory with the building permit that had been obtained. Anyone who can produce mushroom spawn not only has a secure income, but can also conduct research with it. The 20 most important medicines are obtained from mushrooms.
However, in the meantime, the neighboring development was rezoned to residential development. Thus, the Plaintiff could not build agricultural again.
The Plaintiff has calculated the loss of earnings for himself and his family and arrives at a claim of 1'200'000,-€.

Claim from political persecution

Instead of agricultural construction, the Plaintiff built a residential building with 4 condominiums after the neighborhood construction was rezoned to residential construction. For this purpose, the Plaintiff established his own construction company and thus purchased the materials at wholesale prices.

From the experiences with the remuneration of the forest workers and its building workers the Plaintiff created a management consultation. Applying the new Hartz-IV Laws on labor market reform, the Plaintiff developed a model for company pension plans, which could also be used to finance company loans. For asset diversification, the Plaintiff contacted his professor for silviculture, Mr. Rittershofer. The latter had founded the forestry industry in Brazil. His student, Mr. Seitz was in the meantime professor for forestry in Curitiba and had begun with the reforestation there. Investments were to be made in new forests there. The Plaintiff had trained

three other academics and produced training material to convey the concept of the company pension plan.

Then the political persecution of the Plaintiff began - see the very brief explanations in the appeal to the judgment of the Coburg District Court of Oct. 01, 2019.

Via the Hinterrhein District Court (Thusis/Switzerland), the Plaintiff notified the claims arising from this to the Coburg Regional Court in the amount of 48'000'000,-€. This public claim was not objected to and is therefore recognized. Pursuant to Section 226 AO, this can be offset directly against tax claims.

Concerning the claims from the inheritance of the Plaintiff's father
The Plaintiff's father had worked in Danzig as a volunteer in all sorts of professions. He could repair everything from wristwatches to cars and radios.

When he arrived in his homeland, the Plaintiff's father had no financial means.
He took over the management of a farm that was completely in debt. First he fired the manager, then he overhauled all the machinery.

By 1939, he owned several hundred acres of specialty crops. In 1956, the father submitted a report to the United Nations that established a loss of earnings of 10'000'000,-Shs. It did not take into account the fact that the Plaintiff's father had worked as a subcontractor for other farmers, had employed up to 3´000 seasonal workers, and had developed new land by building railroad tracks.

The British sent the Plaintiff's father to the German Reich after the outbreak of World War II as part of the Allies against the German Reich. At the risk of his life, the Plaintiff's father evaded conscription into the Wehrmacht and put up civil resistance. He was tortured, lost all his teeth and suffered a duodenal ulcer. Even 10 years later, he was in such poor health that he did not want to return home during a stay in Hamburg, so as not to shock his wife because of his health condition. With private loans, he started a hosiery factory. He was the first to manufacture socks that included an elastic band for support and reinforcements in the heel and toe areas. Of the claims for damages filed with the United Nations, his attorney received three percent. The rest of the claims fall under reparations. The lawyer immediately kept most of it.
The Plaintiff's father had to sell the stocking factory again to pay his loans.
Later, the Armed Forces of the USA took over the manufacturing method of the Plaintiff's father's socks. Even today, high quality socks are still made this way. The quality is no longer achieved.

The Plaintiff's father could do everything, but he had no recognized professional training. For further commercial activity, the Plaintiff's father had to hire someone who had a master craftsman's certificate. This was an unnecessary financial burden.
Finally, the Plaintiff's father conducted a test case against the Gerling Group for over 6 years and won. As a result, all insurance contracts for motor vehicles had to be changed.

As the only participant in the war, the Plaintiff's father did not receive wages and compensation.
The Free City of Danzig was the only state not to receive reparations.

Because the British sent the father to the German Reich, because the government of Lower Franconia, as well as by the United Nations confirmed the nationality of the Plaintiff's father, as that of the Free City, because the nationals of the Free City of Danzig and the Free City of Danzig have not yet received reparations, the Plaintiff is prosecuted, expropriated and put in prison.

The Freiburg Criminal Enforcement Chamber, Case No. 12 StVK 381/16: "*Mr. von Prince remains in custody. He is convinced to be a national of the Free City of Danzig and considers their identity cards legitimate."*

Since 2009, the Plaintiff always had to expect his arrest. He was arrested twice at his home and four times during road traffic checks. In total, the Plaintiff was in jail for 739 days because of his nationality. It would have been more if the Plaintiff had not bought his way out twice.

The first detention was from Dec. 21, 2012, to Oct. 18, 2013, when the Plaintiff was arrested by the Swiss Confederation to be extradited to Germany. The extradition was authorized only for presentation for trial to have an international arrest warrant for alleged illegal possession of weapons lifted. Innocence is already on the preliminary arrest warrant. The weapons were those that the Plaintiff had to acquire on the instructions of the Bavarian State Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in order to practice his profession.

The requirements and conditions of the extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice dated Aug. 20, 2012, Ref.: B 224`163/TMA were fully violated in order to carry out unauthorized law enforcement measures against the Plaintiff. This resulted in the indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11. Allegation: *"Mr. von Prince and Mrs. Karin Leffer are the representatives of the Free City of Danzig."*
By judgment of Sept. 18, 2013, Ref: 2 Ns 118 Js 181/08, the Coburg Regional Court stated: even on bail of 1'344'000,-€/day, Mr. von Prince remains in custody.
In order to cure the violations of the conditions and terms of extradition, Mr. Lohneis, Leading Senior Public Prosecutor, filed an application for extended extradition via the Bavarian State Ministry of Justice. In a decision dated March 10, 2014, the Swiss Federal Office of Justice, which was responsible for the indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11, rejected the entire extradition on the grounds that extradition was not requested for criminal acts, but for political reasons.
Already in German captivity, the Plaintiff had filed a suit for damages at the Bern Superior Court.
If 1'344'000,-€/day was too low for release on bail, then the damages with compensation for pain and suffering cannot be lower.
1'344'000,-€ x 300 days of detention = 403'200'000,-€. This claim has been submitted several times as a public deed to the German Federal President's Office, as well as to courts in Switzerland. A contradiction never took place and was therefore recognized.

Although this claim has been presented to all possible courts and authorities, this has not prevented the Plaintiff from being arrested again in his apartment on April 15, 2016 and serving time in jail until April 13, 2017, on the charge of 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11. The fact that the Plaintiff has again provided his assets probably does not need to be emphasized separately. 403'200'000,-€ x 363 days of imprisonment = approx. 160'000'000´000,-€.

Poland submitted an expert opinion in 2017 on the justification of reparations and in 2018 put it at 690'000'000´000,-€. When asked by the Claimant whether this included the Free City of Gdansk, Poland increased the claims to 850'000'000´000,-€.

Mrs. Leffer and the Plaintiff therefore extended the claim in Washington D. C. and demanded compliance with the Versailles Peace Treaty and for the Free City of Danzig 160'000'000´000,-€ in reparations.

Thus these demands are almost identical.

The Swiss Confederation participated in this political persecution on admitted instigation by the DSM concern.
The Federal Office of Justice had indeed refused the extradition because of the proceedings, indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11. As already mentioned, these proceedings could only be carried out by violating the conditions and terms of the Plaintiff's extradition. Therefore, these proceedings are purely Swiss proceedings. However, the Swiss Confederation did nothing to ensure that these proceedings would be discontinued. Therefore, the Plaintiff could not leave Switzerland without being arrested.
Nevertheless, the Plaintiff was extradited. The Plaintiff could not be extradited solely on the basis of Switzerland's Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons with the EU. The reason for the extradition and subsequent prosecution of the Plaintiff by Switzerland was the purchase of receivables against the DSM Group - see lawsuit in San Francisco.
The Plaintiff had arbitration proceedings conducted against the DSM Group under the Swiss Private International Law Act. The DSM Group filed a 77-page complaint with 226 recitals. The main subject of the complaint was not the arbitration award, but the Plaintiff. In addition, the political persecution of the Plaintiff was cited, including an open letter to the Bavarian Minister of Justice Merk. The Plaintiff refuted all 226 recitals point by point. The DSM Group's response was: "*DSM is relying on the Federal Supreme Court to put an end to Mr. von Prince's activities."* The Federal Supreme Court's March 09, 2016 ruling on the appeal against the arbitration award

contains two obvious errors. Therefore, the Plaintiff filed two motions for bias. These motions for bias were accepted as well-founded revisions. As a result, the Cantonal Police broke down the Plaintiff´s front door and extradited him in handcuffs to the informed German police.
The representative of the CEO of the DSM Group, Mr. Nordmann even boasted that the prosecution was at his instigation.

In accordance with the population of the Swiss Confederation and its assets, a participation of the Swiss Confederation of 10% out of the 160'000'000´000,-€ is therefore demanded, i.e. 16'000'000´000,-€. Incidentally, this demand has already been communicated as a public deed and has not been objected to.

The DSM Group generates annual sales of around 900´000´000,-€. A shareholding of 10% therefore seems appropriate. This is 90'000'000,-€.

If these claims are not objected to within 14 days, they are deemed to be accepted, for the FRG 160'000'000´000,- (16'000'000´000,- + 90'000'000,-€) = 143'910'000'000,-€, for the Swiss Confederation 16'000'000´000,- € and for koninklijke DSM 90'000'000,-€.

The grandfather of the Plaintiff has been raised by the German emperor to the hereditary nobility. But the heraldic motto is in English.
The grandfather was killed in action against the British. This could be interpreted as an act for the German Empire. But it could also be seen as a defense for his homeland.

But the Germans honored the grandfather as a German war hero.
According to the interpretation of the Reich and Nationality Act of July 22, 1913, he was therefore not a national of a country of the German Empire, but had the nationality of the Reich.

This is probably also how the opinion of the German Federal Constitutional Court must be interpreted.
Since he was killed in action in 1914, the grandfather could not acquire any other nationality. According to the reading of the German Nationality Act, the Plaintiff's father could not acquire any other nationality either. Thus, according to the German Nationality Act, the Plaintiff has the nationality of the German Reich and not of one of the Länder of the German Reich.

About this once again. The Germans never recognized the Versailles Peace Treaty. The Second World War was only the continuation of the First World War. The attack on the Free City of Danzig and Poland was not a war against foreign countries, but a domestic conflict. That is why the Germans called the Nuremberg war Crimes Trials victors' justice.

Obviously, the Germans also have no intention to accept the results of the Second World War, otherwise they would have implemented the 2 + 4 Treaty.

6'000'000'000´000,-€ of trade surpluses were accumulated to pay reparations. Greece has indeed announced legal action to enforce the claim of 332'000'000´000,- €. But this has not been done to date.

The United States of America and Poland were asked in the proceedings at the court in Washington D. C. that the Peace Treaty of Versailles be implemented again and to distribute reparations for this purpose.
But until today there has been no response.

Thus no one claims the 6'000'000'000´000,-€ of trade surplus. It is de facto ownerless assets. Possibly some states will argue with the argument of the statute of limitations, if these are demanded.

This fortune was not created by the managers of companies, but by wage restraint of the employees of the German Reich also at the expense of the pension fund.

In management without order the Plaintiff demands therefore the 6'000'000'000´000,-€ trade surpluses.
In addition again: The grandfather of the Plaintiff intervened as a volunteer in the fight for Tanga and helped to the victory. (As an aside, the German Schutztruppen were cut off from all supplies and information by the British naval blockade. They continued to fight even after the armistice had taken place in Europe).

The Plaintiff managed private forest as a civil servant for employment in management without order. The legal basis for this is:
Section 677 Duties of the voluntary agent
A person who conducts a transaction for another person without being instructed by him or otherwise entitled towards him must conduct the business in such a way as the interests of the principal require in view of the real or presumed will of the principal.

It is not yet possible to say how these trade surpluses will be reduced.

These trade surpluses are a thorn in the side not only of Mr. President of the USA Donald Trump, but also of the World Bank and others.
They are also illegal.
Mr. Donald Trump responds to the trade surpluses with import tariffs. Mrs. Chancellor argues rather stupidly against that import tariffs lead to expensive goods for Americans and wants to imply that this lowers Americans' standard of living.
But import tariffs flow directly to Americans' wealth.
A foreign trade deficit, on the other hand, means that the U.S. is in debt.
This would not be tragic for the Germans if the foreign trade deficits were paid. But the practice of the last 65 years is that the Germans give away their labor.

Instead of the USA imposing import duties, the Germans could introduce an export tax. This export tax would immediately benefit the Germans. Exports are collapsing. What's the problem? German industry needs to sell more goods domestically. To do that, Germans need to earn more money so they can buy more. German goods become more expensive abroad, but the German standard of living rises.
6'000'000'000´000,-€ is a fortune of 75'000,-€ for each German. A 4 person household has an accumulated wealth of 300'000,-€.

In 2018, trade surpluses were generated in the amount of 2'500'000'000,-€. About this each German gave up 3'000,-€. A 4 person household on 12'000,-€. One can already buy a new car from it.

To accumulate further trade surpluses and not to reduce the old ones is certainly not a proper business management for the Germans.

The parties of the FRG must already let themselves the question accept, whose interests these represent.

International legal relationships are involved.
It is a matter of property disputes.
According to Art. 2 sZPO, the ZPO may not be applied in international legal relationships.

Art. 2 International matters
The provisions of international treaties and of the Federal Act of 18 December 1987 on International Private Law (IPLA) are reserved.

Instead, disputes shall be resolved compulsorily in accordance with the 12th Chapter of the Swiss Private International Law Act IPRG - Arbitration.

The 12th Chapter of the IPRG follows the legal logic that contractual autonomy/freedom of contract includes the choice of judge in case of dispute.

In the case of national legal relations, the legal provisions on the appointment of the judge are, in fact, part of the general business provisions. Every national has an equal share in it. No national may express a general suspicion that the judge will rule in favor of his own national.

Arbitration must be expressly agreed.

In international legal relations, the situation is exactly reversed. One contracting party has no part in the appointment of judges. In the case of changes in the law, one contracting party has no share in it. In the case of changes in the law, a state judge may no longer be able to judge according to the law that was in force at the time the legal relationship came into existence.

One contracting party may raise the general suspicion of bias that the state judge will rule in favor of its own national.

Arbitration is therefore mandatory/obligatory.

Citation Prof. Dr. iur. Dr. rer. pol. h.c. Carl Baudenbacher, Presiding Judge of the EFTA Court in Luxembourg:
Contribution to the Swiss Private International Law Act (IPRG):
"International arbitration is governed by the 12th Chapter of the Federal Act on Private International Law of Dec. 18, 1987 (Art. 176 to 194 IPRG). The provisions of this chapter are applicable if the arbitral tribunal has its seat in Switzerland and one of the parties did not have its domicile or habitual residence in Switzerland when the arbitration agreement was concluded. An additional condition for the application of Chapter 12 of the IPRG is that the parties ***have not explicitly excluded its applicability."***

According to Art. 177 IPRG, even states or state-owned enterprises cannot avoid arbitration.

Art. 177 IPRG
Any dispute of financial interest may be the subject of an arbitration. A state, or an enterprise held by, or an organization controlled by a state, which is party to an arbitration agreement, cannot invoke its own law in order to contest its capacity to arbitrate or the arbitrability of a dispute covered by the arbitration agreement.

An arbitration agreement shall be deemed to have been concluded upon the establishment of a legal relationship under property law.

The establishment of a legal relationship is an agreement. A legal relationship concerning property is arbitrable and therefore an arbitration agreement within the meaning of Chapter 12 of the IPRG.

No jurisdiction, judge, law or form need be agreed.

Art. 179
1 The arbitrators shall be appointed, removed or replaced in accordance with the agreement of the parties. 2 In the absence of such agreement,…..

Art. 182
2 If the parties have not determined the procedure, the arbitral tribunal shall determine it to the extent necessary, either directly or by reference to a statute or to rules of arbitration.

Art. 183
1 Unless the parties have otherwise agreed, the arbitral tribunal may, on motion of one party, order provisional or conservatory measures.

Art. 187
1 The arbitral tribunal shall decide the case according to the rules of law chosen by the parties or, in the absence thereof, according …..

According to the Code of Business Conduct of the DSM Group, the agreed law is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the Charter of the United Nations. Court decisions that violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights generally constitute Violence of Law and may not be respected by DSM.

The simple written notification that a dispute is to be resolved by arbitration is deemed to be the initiation of arbitration proceedings, confirmation of an arbitration agreement.

Art. 181 IPRG
1 The arbitral proceedings shall be pending from the time when one of the parties seizes with a claim either the arbitrator or arbitrators designated in the arbitration agreement or, in the absence of such designation in the arbitration agreement, from the time when one of the parties initiates the procedure for the appointment of the arbitral tribunal.

Simple written notification shall suffice as proof.

Art. 178
1 The arbitration agreement must be made in writing, by telegram, telex, telecopier or any other means of communication which permits it to be evidenced by a text.

The arbitral tribunal shall decide on its own jurisdiction.

Upon notification that arbitration proceedings are being conducted, proceedings already pending before a state court shall also come to a halt.

Art. 186
The arbitral tribunal shall itself decide on its jurisdiction. 1bis It shall decide on its jurisdiction notwithstanding an action on the same matter between the same parties already pending before a state court or another arbitral tribunal, unless there are serious reasons to stay the proceedings. 2 A plea of lack of jurisdiction must be raised prior to any defence on the merits.

Arbitration proceedings have already been conducted in accordance with the provisions of the IPRG.

It is apparent that claims of bias against Swiss judges are not being processed.

In the matter of the arbitral award of Oct. 14, 2015, three motions for partiality were filed and have not been processed to date.

Regarding the Plaaintiff's right of residence in Switzerland, two motions for bias were filed and have not been processed to date. With regard to the right of residence, three claims have been filed with the Swiss Federal Administrative Court and have not been processed.

No decision has yet been made on the motions for partiality against Mr. Gasser, President of the Rheinfelden District Court, as well as on the partiality of the mandatory attorney appointed by Mr. Gasser and on the general motion for partiality concerning the amendment of the Administrative Law.

Complaints to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg are rejected on the grounds that legal recourse has not yet been exhausted.

Thus, a legal standstill prevails.

Although no decisions are made on motions of bias against judges, the lower courts disregard them.

Thus, there is arbitrariness of law.

This is also confirmed by the Swiss Citizens Initiative for judicial reform.

https://www.justiz-initiative.ch/nachricht/news/stand-der-initiative-am-1-mai-2020.html?fbclid=IwAR2nNpDhtenZtv3pTuoIoxcOXYHujMaEoG2odxOTAYVuR7-7EcBooJtJatU

A clear and unmistakable separation of the judiciary from the executive, the legislature, the political parties as well as the entire "classe politique" in which the judiciary is incorporated, to the detriment of those seeking justice.

That parties cannot claim a mandate tax from federal judges. The sale and purchase of judgeships by parties and judges is an unlawful act and, according to the initiators, would already be punishable today.

Thus, the provisions of the IPRG regarding the function of the Swiss state courts are not applicable.

The general terms of business of the DSM Group.

https://www.dsm.com/content/dam/dsm/corporate/en_US/documents/dsm-nutritional-products-terms-and-conditions/purchase/nam/dsm-nutritional-products-usa-terms-conditions-purchase-english.pdf

18. Miscellaneous
18.1If any provision(s) of these General Purchase Conditions should be or become ineffective or invalid the other provisions will not be affected thereby. Parties agree to replace the ineffective or invalid provision(s) by a provision of similar import, which reflects as closely as possible the intent of the original clause.

Therefore, further arbitration may be conducted if the claims are disputed.

With the utmost respect

Exhibit 4 to the Evaluation Guidelines of March 26, 1982
Assessing department
Forestry office Kronach

Appraisal of the probationary period
according to § 49 LbV

temporary Chief Forest Inspector Beowulf v. Prince, born 27.12.1953
Official title, first name and surname

Expiry of the probationary period 17.8.1984 (extended until - -)

Field of activity and tasks during the probationary period

Duration from	to	Office	Type of activity Description of the field of activity
18.2.1982	17.8.1984	FoDSt. Steinberg	Representation of the forest ranger; all consulting activities in a coniferous forest, as well as forestry road construction, management of a snow breakage catastrophe, disproportionate proliferation of bark beetles, versatile support measures.

Evaluation: (Overall evaluation - suitability (also health suitability), qualification, performance)

FOJ. tempor. v. Prince has a good, versatile theoretical knowledge. He is generally very proactive; he also likes to take on a lot of responsibility.

v. Prince seeks contact with the forest owners and is able to convince them. In particular, he has achieved very good consulting successes in the implementation of silvicultural measures in the form of the planting of mixed hardwood cultures in the afforestation of snow breakage areas.

For his superiors he is a critical but positive employee.

v. Prince is resilient beyond the normal level. So far he is completely healthy.

He has good assertiveness.
He shows particular interest in environmental issues, but without overreacting.

In the course of his further professional development, especially the addition of practical experience, it is to be expected that v. P. will also become more balanced and will be able to remedy here and there still existing small deficiencies.

Versorgungsysteme im vereinfachten Überblick 01.01.2002

	betrieblich										privat	
	AUB Kombisystem	**Direkt-zusage**	**U-Kasse**	**Direkt versicherung**	**Direkt versicherung**	**Pensions-fond**	**Pensions-fond**	**Pensions-kasse**	**Pensions-kasse**	**Pensions-kasse**	**Private Vorsorge**	**Private Vorsorge**
	Optimale Kombination der Möglichkeiten	Rückgedeckte Direktzusage § 6a EstG	Rückgedeckte Unterstützungs-kasse § 4d EstG	Direkt-Versicherung § 40b EstG	Direkt-Versicherung § 10a EstG	Pensionsfond § 10a EstG	Pensionsfond § 3 Nr.63 EstG	Pensionskasse § 40b EstG	Pensionskasse § 3 Nr.63 EstG	Pensionskasse § 10a EstG	Private LV / RV	Private Riester-Förderung 10a EstG
Ansparphase: Steuern	steuerfrei	steuerfrei	steuerfrei	steuer-begünstigt (Pausch.Steuer von 20 %)	Sonderausga-benabzug + Zulagen-förderung	Sonderausga-benabzug + Zulagen-förderung	steuerfrei	steuer-begünstigt (Pausch.Steuer von 20 %)	steuerfrei	Sonderausga-benabzug + Zulagen-förderung	steuerpflichtig	Sonderausga-benabzug + Zulagen-förderung
Ansparphase: Sozialver-sicherung + Lohnnebenko-stenersparnis für AN+AG	sozial-versicherungs-frei	(grds. nicht relevant, da Zielgruppe i.d.R. > BBG; ansonsten analog zur U-Kasse)	sozialver-sicherungsfrei bis 2008 (bis 4% BBG) Lohnnebenko-stenersparnis für AG + AN	sozialver-sicherungsfrei bis 2008 (bis 4% BBG) Lohnnebenko-stenersparnis für AG + AN	sozial versicherungs-pflichtig	sozial versicherungs-pflichtig	sozialver-sicherungsfrei bis 2008 (bis 4% BBG) Lohnnebenko-stenersparnis für AG + AN	sozialver-sicherungsfrei bis 2008 (bis 4% BBG) Lohnnebenko-stenersparnis für AG + AN	sozialver-sicherungsfrei bis 2008 (bis 4% BBG) Lohnnebenko-stenersparnis für AG + AN	sozial versicherungs-pflichtig	sozial versicherungs-pflichtig	sozial versicherungs-pflichtig
Ansparphase: Höchstbeträge	Angemessen-heitsregelung	Angemessen-heitsregelung	grds. Keine (Kapital max. i.d.R. 215.765 €)	1.752 € pro Jahr	525.- € 2002	525.- € 2002	4 % BBG	1.752 € pro Jahr	4 % BBG	525.- € 2002	keine	525.- € 2002
Vorzeitige Verfügbarkeit	ja	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	Verfügung •vor 60. LJ •Baufinan-zierung	nein
Finanzierungs-effekte für das Unternehmen	ja	ja	ja	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	-	-
Einfluss auf Kapitalanlage seitens des Unternehmens	ja	ja	ja	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein	nein
Freie Wahl der Anlageform beim Kapitalaufbau	ja	nein	Ja, aber Garantie-verzicht	ja	ja, eingeschränkt	ja, eingeschränkt	ja, eingeschränkt	nein	nein	nein	ja, eingeschränkt	A
Auszahlphase: Kapital oder Rente	Wahlrecht Kapital oder Rente	Wahlrecht Kapital oder Rente (i.d.R. Rente)	Wahlrecht Kapital oder Rente	Wahlrecht Kapital oder Rente	Zwangsrente	Zwangsrente	Zwangsrente	Wahlrecht Kapital oder Rente	Zwangsrente	Zwangsrente	Wahlrecht Kapital oder Rente	Zwangsrente
Hinweise / Empfehlung	beste Lösung für AG + AN	Topverdiener (i.d.R. GGF-Versorgung)	gute Lösung als Ergänzung zur Direktver-sicherung	gute Lösung (ggf. + Ergänzung zur U-Kasse)	§ 10a EstG privat nutzen	§ 10a EstG privat nutzen	einge-schränkte Zielgruppe	§ 40b EstG als Direktver-sicherung nutzen	einge-schränkte Zielgruppe	§ 10a EstG privat nutzen	Abhängig von indiv. Kundensit.	Abhängig von indiv. Kundensit.