

Patrick Pasin
C/o Talma Studios
231, rue Saint-Honoré
75001 Paris

Mrs. Laure Beccuau
Public Prosecutor near the Paris
Judicial Court Courtyard of the
Paris Court
75017 Paris

February 22, 2024

COMPLAINT AGAINST JENS STOLTENBERG, SECRETARY GENERAL OF NATO

I, the undersigned, Patrick Pasin, born on 01/13/1963, of French nationality, exercising the profession of publisher, have the honor of exposing to you the events which constrain me, in my own name and as a victim, as the vast majority of French people, to file this complaint. The seriousness of the facts requires referral to a French court, especially since it is a direct attack on the rights and freedoms of French citizens, as well as the fundamental interests of the nation, as repressed. by the Penal Code.

ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF FACTS AND LAW WHICH JUSTIFY THIS COMPLAINT AGAINST JENS STOLTENBERG

This international official lies publicly on the world stage in his role as Secretary General of NATO, knowingly, which contributed to provoking the war in Ukraine, which seriously harms the interests of France and the French.

As international law, in particular the Charter of the United Nations, does not provide for sanctions in this type of situation, it is up to French justice to state the law, so that this is not without consequences and does not happen again, to especially since France is a permanent member of the Security Council (Chapter V – article 23 of the United Nations Charter) and also a member of NATO.

Note that this article 23 of the Charter of the United Nations specifies that the ten non-permanent members of the Security Council are elected by the General Assembly of the United Nations, "which takes special account, in the first place, of the contribution of the Members of the "Organization for the maintenance of international peace and security". The search for peace is therefore the most important criterion, since it is expressly stipulated first.

"Not an inch to the East"

On September 7, 2023, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg spoke at length in English before the European Parliament, specifically the Foreign Affairs Committee (Afet) and the Security and Defense Subcommittee (Sede), the one of the three subcommittees of the European Parliament. Here is an original extract from his statement:

"The background was that President Putin declared in the autumn of 2021, and actually sent a draft treaty that they wanted NATO to sign, to promise no more NATO enlargement. That was what he felt about us. And was a pre-condition for not invading Ukraine. Of course we didn't sign that. » (Source: NATO website)¹

1. NATO website, Opening Remarks, September 7, 2023.

Translation : "The context was that President Putin proposed and actually sent, in the fall of 2021, a draft treaty that he wanted NATO to sign, to promise not to expand it any further. This is what he sent us. And this was a prerequisite for not invading Ukraine. Of course, we didn't sign that. »

In four sentences, it delivers at least two major pieces of information:

1) Russia actually proposed a specific draft treaty to NATO, but NATO rejected it, knowing that the consequence would be war in Ukraine.² Despite the deaths and devastation that would result from it, he displays a guilty cynicism, since he adds "Of course..." ("Of course"), while he recognizes that this negotiation could have prevented the invasion by the Russians.

2) He uses the "We", therefore, he confirms that as Secretary General of NATO, he participates in decisions and is not just a simple official content to execute decisions taken elsewhere by d 'others. Indeed, here is how NATO presents the position of Secretary General on its site³:

"The Secretary General is the most senior international official in the Alliance. He manages the Alliance's consultative and decision-making processes and ensures that the decisions taken are implemented.

- The general secretary fulfills three main functions:
 - he chairs all the major committees and, as such, moderates the debates, facilitates decision-making and ensures that they are implemented;
 - he is the first spokesperson for the Organization;
 - he is the head of the International Secretariat, whose mission is to support him, directly and indirectly.
- He is appointed by the member countries for an initial period of four years, which can be extended by mutual agreement.
- Since 1^{er} October 2014, this position is held by Jens Stoltenberg, former Prime Minister of Norway. »

Still on the NATO website, it is then specified that it fulfills "three main responsibilities":

Chairman of the North Atlantic Council and other major organizations

The Secretary General is above all the chairman of the North Atlantic Council, the cardinal political decision-making body of the Alliance, as well as other high-level decision-making bodies such as the Nuclear Planning Group, the NATO Council Ukraine, the NATO-Russia Council and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. He also chairs the NATO-Georgia Commission.

In addition to his role as president, the secretary general has the power to propose the examination of specific issues and to offer his good offices in the event of a dispute between member countries. A decision facilitator, he leads and guides the search for consensus and decision-making throughout the Alliance. [...]

Concretely, the Secretary General enjoys a certain influence on the decision-making process, without this affecting the fundamental principle according to which only member countries are vested with the power to make decisions.

First spokesperson of the Organization

The Secretary General is the primary spokesperson for the Alliance; he represents this on behalf of the member countries, representing their common position on political questions.

2. "The Russians formally present their demands for security guarantees on December 17, 2021, namely the signing of a "Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Security Guarantees" and a " Agreement on measures to ensure the security of the Russian Federation and member states »with NATO. " Source : *War in Ukraine – The criminal responsibility of the West*, Patrick Pasin, Talma Studios.

3. NATO website / The Secretary General.

He also represents NATO to other international organizations, the media and the general public. To this end, the Secretary General regularly holds press briefings and conferences, public interventions and speeches.

Head of the International Secretariat

The Secretary General is the head of the NATO International Secretariat. In this capacity, he is responsible for appointing staff members and supervising their work.

The Secretary General therefore has very important responsibilities, particularly with regard to peace, and when he speaks, it is on behalf of the entire North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Note that Jens Stoltenberg, appointed Secretary General of NATO on 1^{er} October 2014, a few months after the February 2014 coup d'état known as the "Maidan revolution" in Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea by Russia in March. Former journalist, Prime Minister of Norway (almost ten years in office), member of the board of directors from 2002 to 2005 of the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (Gavi) in connection with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, appointed special envoy of the UN for climate change, before being at the head of NATO, he is an experienced politician, "a high-ranking European political figure", as the NATO website presents him. We cannot imagine that he does not know the files he must deal with in the context of his functions, in particular relations with Ukraine and Russia, after so many years in office, even though he chairs the NATO-Russia Council.

However, here is what he said in an interview⁴ to the major German magazine *Der Spiegel* published on January 19, 2022, exactly one month after Russia sent its draft peace treaty and one month before the attack on Ukraine:

Spiegel: Aber hat die Nato in den Neunzigerjahren gegenüber Russland nicht ausgeschlossen, in Richtung Osten zu expandieren?

Stoltenberg: Das stimmt einfach nicht, ein solches Versprechen wurde nie gemacht, es gab nie einen solchen Hinterzimmer-Deal. Das ist schlichtweg falsch. What else is there?

Translation

Spiegel: But didn't NATO rule out expanding eastwards towards Russia in the 1990s?

Stoltenberg: This is simply false, such a promise was never made, there was never such an agreement behind the scenes. This is simply false. How could this be possible?

The lie is established

The proof is made of his lie and his responsibility, as attested by several documents and publications prior to his interview, of which here are examples:

1) Svetlana Savranskaya and Tom Blanton, two researchers from George Washington University, published their study in December 2017 as part of the National Security Archive,⁵ which begins like this:

Declassified documents show security assurances against NATO expansion to Soviet leaders from Baker, Bush, Genscher, Kohl, Gates, Mitterrand, Thatcher, Hurd, Major, and Woerner.

Translation : Declassified documents show security guarantees against

4. »*Russland is the Aggressor*«, An Interview with Britta Sandberg and Maximilian Popp, *Spiegel*, 19.01.2022.

5. "The National Security Archive is an American non-profit association founded in 1985 and based at George Washington University. It publishes on the Internet declassified CIA documents obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, an act of Congress signed on July 4, 1966, by President Lyndon B. Johnson. » Source Wikipedia.

NATO expansion to Soviet leaders from Baker, Bush, Genscher, Kohl, Gates, Mitterrand, Thatcher, Hurd, Major and Wörner.⁶

Not only do all the heads of state and leaders cited assure the Russians that NATO will not move "an inch eastward", but, moreover, they reiterate this commitment on several occasions;

2) The discovery by the American political scientist Joshua Shiffrin of a document initially classified "secret", which specifies this: "As the document proves, the British, Americans, Germans and French, however, agreed that Eastern European membership in NATO was "unacceptable". " *THE Spiegel* publishes an article on this subject on February 18, 2022 entitled: *We cannot propose to Poland and others to join NATO" - Discovery of new file from 1991 supports Russian accusations.* We are now six days away from Russia's attack on Ukraine. It is impossible that the teams surrounding the Secretary General, including Germany's representation to NATO, were not aware of this fundamental information - it could have prevented the war - published by the *Spiegel*, nor even that of the National Security Archive from 2017.

3) In reality, an aggravating circumstance, it is on NATO's own website that this information expressly appears dated May 17, 1990: "This affirmation and the assurance that NATO troops will not exceed the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany offer the Soviet Union solid security guarantees. » (see image below). This is Manfred Wörner (1934-1994), **former NATO Secretary General**, which delivers "this affirmation and assurance".⁸

How can the current Secretary General, Jens Stoltenberg, say the opposite of the institution that employs him and lie with impunity to the world? This is so incredible and unacceptable that we are adding the image of the passage from this declaration to the NATO website:



The very NATO website establishes Jens Stoltenberg's lie

6. *NATO Expansion: What Gorbachev Heard*, Svetlana Savranskaya and Tom Blanton, National Security Archive at George Washington University, December 12, 2017.

7. »Wir können Polen und den anderen keine Nato-Mitgliedschaft anbieten« – Neuer Aktenfund von 1991 stützt russischen Vorwurf, Klaus Wiegrefe, *Der Spiegel*, 02/18/2022.

8. Source: NATO website, The Atlantic Alliance and European Security in the 1990s, Speech by Secretary General Manfred Wörner delivered to the Bremer Tabaks Collegium.

– Another aggravating circumstance: participants in these negotiations and commitments not to extend NATO to the east are still alive, including the former English Prime Minister John Major, James Baker III, Secretary of State to George H. Bush from 1989 to 1992, but also Roland Dumas, at the time Minister of Foreign Affairs of France (1984-86 and 1988-93), who, moreover, confirms in a video interview on the site Les Crises, put back on the YouTube platform on February 13, 2022, i.e. 11 days before the Russian intervention that, indeed, Russia was guaranteed that NATO would not expand towards the east.¹⁰

The Secretary General of NATO and his services should then, at least in such circumstances, have contacted one of them, especially since they knew that the consequence would be war in Ukraine, as well as he confirmed this during his speech before the European Parliament. He therefore did not seek peace by all means, but rather worked for war knowingly. In doing so, he not only violated the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty (NATO), but also the Charter of the United Nations, as we will point out.

On the violation of the North Atlantic Treaty (NATO) by Jens Stoltenberg

By lying on this crucial question of the extension of NATO towards the east, Jens Stoltenberg violates, among other things, the Preamble and Article 1 of the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty, therefore the very principles of his employer :

The States Parties to this Treaty, reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments.

Determined to safeguard the freedom of their peoples, their common heritage and their civilization, based on the principles of democracy, individual freedoms and the rule of law.

Anxious to promote well-being and stability in the North Atlantic region. Resolved to unite their efforts for their collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security. Have agreed on this North Atlantic Treaty:

Article 1

The parties undertake, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle by peaceful means any international disputes in which they may be involved, in such a manner as to promote international peace and security, as well as justice. , are not placed in danger, and to refrain in their international relations from resorting to the threat or use of force in any manner incompatible with the purposes of the United Nations.

By lying about NATO's commitments not to expand eastward, NATO's own Secretary General is violating his organization's charter by endangering international peace and security through his lies, as expressed in article 1.

A crime against peace

It is even a crime against peace that he committed according to the London Agreement of August 8, 1945, to which France is a party, creating the international military tribunals of Nuremberg and Tokyo after the Second World War, which defines the crime against peace by "the direction, preparation, initiation or prosecution of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, assurances or agreements, or participation in a concerted plan or conspiracy to do any of the foregoing acts." Thus, he participated in the outbreak of a war in violation of treaties, assurances or international agreements. Note that at the time, the "assurances" given were to be taken into account for the definition of crime against peace, then considered the supreme crime.

9. *How the West promised the USSR that NATO would not expand to the East*, by Roland Dumas, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Les Crises, February 13, 2022.

10. Interview on YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5IOjBp7Pzto> .

Jens Stoltenberg even participates “in a concerted plan or conspiracy to carry out any of the above acts” as evidenced by several statements, of which here are three examples by leading actors:

– Oleksiy Arestovych, one of President Zelensky's main advisors. Here is what his Wikipedia page mentions in English (despite the importance of his remarks, no French media, not even his Wikipedia page, has reproduced them):

After the start of the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine, Arestovych became known for his 2019 prediction on the inevitability of a war with Russia.[33]¹¹

Translation : In 2022, after Russia invaded Ukraine, Arestovych became known for his 2019 prediction about the inevitable war with Russia.

Note [33] on its English Wikipedia page refers to an interview broadcast on YouTube with English subtitles,¹² of which here is the French translation:

Question: So if Ukraine joins NATO, in this case... can we talk about a date for the end of the war in the east?

Arestovych: No, we are not talking about an end date for the war, on the contrary, it will most likely push Russia to launch a large-scale military operation against Ukraine, because it will have to destroy our infrastructure and devastate the entire territory, so that NATO would be reluctant to accept us.

Q.: Do you mean that Russia will dare to confront NATO directly?

A.: Of course, Russia... no, not NATO. They must do this before we join NATO, so that we become uninteresting to NATO after having devastated our territory. Our price for joining NATO is a big war against Russia, the probability of which is 99.9%. And if we don't join NATO, there will be absorption by Russia within 10-12 years. This is the situation we face now and we must make a choice.

Q.: But... if we put everything on the scale, which is preferable?

A.: Obviously, total war with Russia and membership in NATO following Russia's defeat. This is the best option. [...]

Q: When?

A.: 20... after... 20... 2021 and 2022 are the most critical years.¹³

This is not the only source proving that Jens Stoltenberg worked against peace, as two other major actors claim:

– Angela Merkel, the former chancellor of Germany, recognizes that the 2014 Minsk agreement was not aimed at peace but “to give Ukraine time.” She also took advantage of this time to become stronger, as we see today. (wie man heute sieht”) to arm themselves against Russia;¹⁴

– these remarks are then confirmed by the former President of the Republic François Hollande: during an interview where he is trapped by a false President Poroshenko, here is what he answers to the question “These [Minsk] agreements gave us some time to arm ourselves. Angela recently spoke about it:

François Hollande: “She was right, [...] it was us who wanted to gain time to allow Ukraine to recover, to strengthen its military resources. »¹⁵

11. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oleksij_Arestovych

12. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1xNHmHpERH8> (from 7'40).

13. Translation: *War in Ukraine, the criminal responsibility of the West*, op.quoted.

14. *Merkel Vertidigt ihre Russland-Politik*, *South German Zeitung*, December 7, 2022.

15. *Rehab. No, François Hollande did not admit that NATO deceived Russia*, April 13, 2023, Désintox Arte / France Télévisions. Additional extract from the article: “Except that this “WE” concerns him and Angela Merkel, and not NATO. » Should we save the NATO soldier? Indeed, why would Angela Merkel and François Hollande have decided to betray, of their own accord, two international agreements to arm Ukraine?

The two former leaders of Western countries supposed to guarantee peace in Ukraine through the Minsk agreements therefore recognize that the objective was quite different, since it consisted of giving Ukraine time to arm itself, which is constitutive of a plot against peace within the meaning of the London Agreement of August 8, 1945. In the case of ex-President Hollande, his admission even constitutes a violation of article 5 of the Constitution of the Republic, which provides that "[the President of the Republic] is the guarantor of national independence, territorial integrity and respect for treaties"¹⁶.

What saves Jens Stoltenberg from the sanctions of having participated and therefore committed this crime against peace by lying about the commitments made, is that it has been replaced in international law by the "crime of aggression", defined in Article 8 bis of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), extremely restrictive, since it is limited to persons "effectively able to control or direct the political or military action of a State", which is not the case for the Secretary General of NATO, who is not "a State", the leaders of international institutions do not fall into this category, even when their action "constitutes a manifest violation of the Charter of United Nations", as indicated at the end of Article 8 bis of the Rome Statute of the ICC.

On the violation of the Charter of the United Nations by Jens Stoltenberg

However, not only does it violate the Charter of the North Atlantic Treaty, but also the Charter of the United Nations, from the Preamble, by flouting two of its first four provisions:

WE, THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, RESOLVED
to preserve future generations from the scourge of war which twice in the space of a human
lifetime has inflicted untold suffering on humanity,
[...],
to create the conditions necessary for maintaining justice and respect for obligations arising
from treaties and other sources of international law,
[...].

There is even Chapter VI, entitled "Peaceful settlement of disputes", which begins with paragraph 1 of Article 33:

Chapter VI: Peaceful settlement of disputes

Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute whose prolongation is likely to threaten the maintenance of international peace and security must seek a solution, above all, by means of negotiation, investigation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, recourse to regional bodies or agreements, or by other peaceful means of their choice.

Art. 33 expressly provides numerous options for ensuring the maintenance of peace by any means, including "by way of investigation". Thus, even if Jens Stoltenberg could, in his defense, however weak, try to assert that he was ignorant of the commitments made by former Western heads of state, he should have asked, at a minimum, his services to investigate Russian claims regarding the non-extension of NATO towards the east. In any case, the very fact that he can claim to ignore NATO's commitments not to extend eastward constitutes a serious mistake, especially for the man who chairs the NATO-Russia Council. , even though the information appears expressly on the NATO website.

For the record, the Secretary General of NATO declared on September 7, 2023, before committees of the European Parliament, that "President Putin proposed and actually sent, in the fall of 2021, a draft treaty that he wanted the NATO signs, to promise not to expand it any further. [...] And it was a **prerequisite for not invading Ukraine**."¹⁷Of course, we didn't sign that. »

16. Emphasis added.

17. Emphasis added.

The man who wanted war

However, negotiations began between NATO and Russia on January 12, 2022 following the treaty proposed by the Russian Federation. They last only four hours and lead to nothing. At the end of the meeting with the Russian Deputy Foreign Minister, Jens Stoltenberg declared that "the discussion was not easy. Discussions were direct on the situation in Ukraine and major differences were noted on security in Europe. [...] The risk of a new armed conflict is real. Exiting the crisis falls to Russia. She must engage in de-escalation. »¹⁸

It may seem surprising to say that only the Russian side should engage in de-escalation, even though it was the Russian side that sent the draft treaty to NATO. Recall that his main demand is that NATO stops its eastward expansion and does not include Ukraine as a member. What then prevents NATO and its Secretary General, while already emphasizing that "the risk of a new armed conflict is real", from recognizing that NATO members guaranteed in 1990 that the organization will not expand eastward? Why not propose at least a moratorium on Ukraine's entry into NATO, when he says he knows that it will be war otherwise?

At a time when he is advocating de-escalation on the part of Russia alone, he is choosing one-upmanship and warlike escalation, since it is exactly 7 days after the meeting with Russia, i.e. January 19, 2022, that he asserts during from the interview to *Spiegel* that "This is simply not true, such a promise was never made, there was never such a deal behind the scenes. This is simply false. How could this be possible? » At this level, it is provocation and incitement to war.

In doing so, he ties himself up in his lie and his responsibility, since, according to him, there was NEVER an agreement, which is false as we have established. However, he could have recognized that such an agreement had indeed existed in 1990, but that it had become obsolete for reasons x or y. By not doing so, neither in his interview nor in any of his speeches and interventions published on the NATO website, he confirms that the 1990 guarantees of non-extension towards the east of NATO are therefore still valid. at the time of his interview with the *Spiegel*.

He alone could have prevented the outbreak of war in Ukraine: all he had to do was stop lying and therefore confirm that the members of NATO had guaranteed Russia that they would not expand "further an inch to the east", as the NATO website confirms via the 1990 declaration of Manfred Wörner, its former secretary general.

Violation of NATO policy for the development of integrity

After violating the United Nations Charter and the "North Atlantic Treaty, better known as the Washington Treaty",¹⁹ Jens Stoltenberg also violates NATO's policy for the development of integrity with his lies. Indeed, at the NATO Summit held in Warsaw on July 8 and 9, 2016, the heads of state and government endorsed a "Nato Policy for the Development of Integrity" (Annex 1). Here's what the introduction talks about:

The International Staff, International Military Staff, military commands and NATO agencies will continue to develop integrity, increase transparency and promote accountability while encouraging good governance within their own structures. The Action Plan for Building Integrity, which NATO Foreign Ministers took note of in December 2016, includes activities to be implemented by NATO, Allies and partner countries .

I am very proud of what we have achieved to date and I invite countries, international organizations, the private sector and civil society to join this initiative **to strengthen transparency, accountability and integrity**²⁰ within our related defense and security institutions.

18. *Ukraine: negotiations between NATO and Russia are turning into a dialogue of the deaf*, France 24, January 12, 2022.

19. NATO website / The Founding Treaty.

20. Emphasis added.

Who is the signatory of such an introduction? Jens Stoltenberg himself, as general secretary (see Appendix 1).

In the document endorsing this policy, it is clearly stipulated that all NATO services “will continue to develop integrity”. Moreover, this is the very title of the document, which shows whether the “development of integrity” is the fundamental criterion.

Thus, Jens Stoltenberg, the Secretary General of NATO who must enforce this “development of integrity”, which he himself endorsed since this policy was implemented during his first mandate, does not hesitate to rape her by lying, when he knows that the consequence will be war between Ukraine and Russia. Cynically, one might wonder if it is precisely because Ukraine has not yet joined NATO that it can be sacrificed – is there another word at this stage of the war?

Let us add that in the job descriptions for the recruitment of NATO employees the word “integrity” appears explicitly, with high commitments for any future recruit:

Building integrity is a key element of NATO's core tasks. As an employer, NATO values commitment to the principles of integrity, transparency, and accountability in accordance with international norms and practices established for the defense and related security sector. Selected candidates are expected to be role models of integrity, and to promote good governance through ongoing efforts in their work. (see Appendix 2)

Translation : Building integrity is a key part of NATO's fundamental tasks. As an employer, NATO values respecting the principles of integrity, transparency and accountability, in accordance with international standards and practices established for the defense and security sector. Selected candidates are expected to be **integrity models**²¹ and that they promote good governance by deploying constant efforts in the course of their work.

Can Jens Stoltenberg be considered a “model of integrity”? The answer is all the more negative since his lie knowingly led to war, as he himself affirmed before the European Parliament (see above).

The man who stirred up the war

Jens Stoltenberg perpetrated a first lie which led to the war, as we have just exposed, since it was enough for him to recognize the West's initial commitment not to extend NATO towards the east and to announce a moratorium on Ukraine's entry into NATO. This would have constituted a strong act of immediate de-escalation on the warpath. This was not the case, despite knowing the outcome of his lie.

Such a lie, unforgivable given its irreparable consequences, would inevitably be followed by others. Thus, while Russia's military intervention has not yet taken place, here is the press release issued by Jens Stoltenberg on February 22, 2022:

Good afternoon.

We have just finished an extraordinary meeting of the NATO-Ukraine Commission.

We condemn Moscow's decision to recognize the self-proclaimed Donetsk People's Republic and Luhansk People's Republic.

We also condemn the further Russian incursion into Ukraine.

Moscow has now moved from covert attempts to destabilize Ukraine, to overt military action.

This is a serious escalation by Russia.

And a flagrant violation of international law.

It further undermines Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It damages efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

And it has serious consequences for European security.

This is a crisis created by Russia alone.²²

21. Emphasis added.

22. *Press briefing by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg following an extraordinary meeting of the NATO-Ukraine Commission*, NATO website, February 22, 2022.

Translation (this press release has only benefited from an official translation into Russian and Ukrainian):

Hello everyone.

We have just finished an extraordinary meeting of the NATO-Ukraine Commission. We condemn Moscow's decision to recognize the self-proclaimed Donetsk People's Republic and the self-proclaimed Lugansk People's Republic.

We also condemn the continued Russian incursion into Ukraine.

Moscow has moved from covert attempts to destabilize Ukraine to open military action.

This is a serious escalation by Russia. And a blatant violation of international law.

It undermines Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

It undermines efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict. And it has serious consequences for European security.

This is a crisis created by Russia alone. [...]

The man who lied continues when he declares that "this is a crisis created by Russia alone." We no longer need to repeat that it was enough for him to recognize the commitments made in the past and to freeze Ukraine's entry into NATO to see that the "crisis" was not "created by Russia alone. Below we will see why the phrase "And a blatant violation of international law" can be considered another lie. In the meantime, here is what he said on February 24, 2022, the day of Russia's attack on Ukraine:

Good afternoon.

Russia has attacked Ukraine.

This is a brutal act of war.

Our thoughts are with the brave people of Ukraine.

Sadly, what we have warned against for months has come to pass.

Despite all calls on Russia to change course and tireless efforts to seek a diplomatic solution.

Peace in our continent has been shattered. We now have war in Europe, on a scale and of a type we thought belong to history.

We have just finished an emergency meeting of the North Atlantic Council to discuss the situation.

The Council also addressed the request by Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia to hold urgent consultations under Article 4 of the Washington Treaty.

This is a serious moment for the security of Europe.

Russia's unjustified and unprovoked attack on Ukraine is putting countless innocent lives at risk. [...]²³

Translation (this press release has only benefited from an official translation into Russian and Ukrainian):

Good morning.

Russia attacked Ukraine. This is a brutal act of war.

Our thoughts are with the brave people of Ukraine.

Unfortunately, what we have been warning about for months has come true. Despite all the calls for Russia to change course and tireless efforts to find a diplomatic solution.

Peace on our continent has been shattered. Europe is now experiencing a war of a scale and type that we thought was history.

We have just completed an emergency meeting of the North Atlantic Council to discuss the situation.

23. Press briefing, by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg following an extraordinary meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO website, February 24, 2022, updated February 25, 2022.

The Council also considered the request of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia to hold urgent consultations under the Article 4 of the Washington Treaty.²⁴
This is a serious time for Europe's security.
Russia's unjustified and unprovoked attack on Ukraine puts countless innocent lives at risk.
[...]

It is impossible to find any trace of the "tireless efforts made to find a diplomatic solution", since it is the opposite which was recorded with his lie and his provocation towards Russia in his interview with *Spiegel* of January 19, 2022, just one month before the war. Moreover, it was not even necessary to deploy "tireless efforts", it was enough for NATO to respect its commitments and freeze its expansionism.

"The unjustified and unprovoked attack"

After the launch of the "special military operation" on February 24, 2022, a designation used by Russia, NATO Secretary General and spokesperson Jens Stoltenberg will continue to repeat this sentence in all the media: "Russia's unjustified and unprovoked attack on Ukraine. Why systematically add the qualifiers "unjustified" and "unprovoked", when the condemnation made no less sense without: "Russia's attack on Ukraine endangers countless innocent lives"?

Is this not yet another lie on the part of Jens Stoltenberg, thus continuing to shamelessly violate NATO's integrity policy? Indeed, he recognized in his intervention on September 7, 2023 before the Foreign Affairs Committee (Afet) and the Security and Defense Subcommittee (Sede) of the European Parliament, as already mentioned, that "The context was that President Putin proposed and actually sent, in the fall of 2021, a draft treaty that he wanted NATO to sign, to promise not to expand it any further. This is what he sent us. And this was a prerequisite for not invading Ukraine. » How can he then spread in the media repeating "unprovoked", when he expressly admits to having known before the outbreak of the war that the consequences would be the invasion of Ukraine if the attempts to invade Ukraine continued? bring into NATO? A lie repeated a thousand times is not enough to make it true.

Moreover, he directly added fuel to the fire by provoking Russia himself in his interview with *Spiegel* of January 19, 2022, by refuting the commitments of Western powers not to extend NATO towards the east.

Finally, by specifically repeating the term "unprovoked", as if to absolve himself of his overwhelming responsibility, is he not offering international public opinion proof of his guilt, like the confession of a criminal? Remember that it was enough for him, as NATO Secretary General, to recognize the previous commitments not to extend eastward, which would have immediately constituted a strong act of de-escalation on the warpath. This man could prevent war, he fueled it.

In passing, we note that its employer, NATO, did the same and violated the principles and article 1 of its charter and therefore that of the United Nations:

The States Parties to this Treaty, reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments.

Determined to safeguard the freedom of their peoples, their common heritage and their civilization, based on the principles of democracy, individual freedoms and the rule of law.

Anxious to promote well-being and stability in the North Atlantic region. Resolved to unite their efforts for their collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security. Have agreed on this North Atlantic Treaty:

24. Article 4: The parties will consult each other whenever, in the opinion of one of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of one of the parties is threatened.

Article 1

The parties undertake, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle by peaceful means any international disputes in which they may be involved, in such a manner as to promote international peace and security, as well as justice. , are not placed in danger, and to refrain in their international relations from resorting to the threat or use of force in any manner incompatible with the purposes of the United Nations.

By wanting to force the integration of Ukraine into NATO whatever the cost and by having declared before the European Parliament that they, that is to say him and NATO, which amounts to accusing his employer, knew that this would lead to an invasion of Ukraine by Russia, Jens Stoltenberg proves that they endangered "international peace and security", an admission of a serious violation of international law. Again, why didn't they announce a moratorium on Ukraine's entry into NATO, explaining that the conditions were not yet met? Avoiding war was that simple.

It is also edifying for world public opinion to note that this institution did everything to integrate Ukraine with knowledge of the consequences, therefore by deciding to sacrifice this country and its population, as already mentioned.

A war against Russia at all costs

However, the lies do not stop at those already mentioned. It is indisputable that the Russian Federation proposed to NATO on December 17, 2021 an "Agreement on measures to ensure the security of the Russian Federation and member states",²⁵ which led to nothing during the very brief "negotiations" of January 12, 2021 in Brussels within the framework of the NATO-Russia Council, as the NATO Secretary General recognized (see above). However, here is what he said a few days later, on January 18, during a press conference in Berlin with German Chancellor Olaf Scholz:

Today, I invited Russia and all NATO allies to participate in a series of NATO-Russia Council meetings in the near future to address our concerns, but also to listen to Russia's concerns and to try to find a solution to the crisis.²⁶

"Listening to Russia's concerns" – finally! – consisted, first of all, of not lying about NATO's commitments not to expand to the east, and certainly not of trying to integrate Ukraine, which was recognized by all parties as *Acasus belli*. What is particularly vicious on the part of Jens Stoltenberg is to spit on Russia in the face of the world by asserting that there has never been any agreement on non-extension towards the east, and therefore in making them appear to be liars, then, a few days later, when the damage was done, to "invite them [...] to listen to Russia's concerns". The whole world has known about them for more than thirty years: no expansion towards the east and no entry of Ukraine into NATO, which would offer access to its military bases to the United States, like Finland has just done so after joining NATO on April 4, 2023. However, such an agreement makes it possible to circumvent article 1 of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), worded as follows:

Each nuclear-weapon State which is a Party to the Treaty undertakes not to transfer to any person, either directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, or control over such weapons or explosive devices; and not in any way assist, encourage or induce any non-nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, or control such weapons or explosive devices.

25. At the same time, the Russian Federation proposed to the United States on the same day a "Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on security guarantees", which also came to nothing.

26. *Stoltenberg says he has invited Russia and NATO allies to new talks*, *Le Figaro* with AFP, 01/18/2022.

Thus, benefiting from military bases in NATO member countries allows the Pentagon to store nuclear bombs there without contravening the NPT, because they maintain control over them and do not “transfer” them – the countries already hosting this type of bombs are Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey and probably the United Kingdom.²⁷None of them shares a border with Russia, whose concern can be understood if Ukraine enters NATO and now harbors nuclear bombs inevitably aimed against it.

Harsh to the civilian populations!

While Jens Stoltenberg lies before inviting the Russians to present "their concerns", in the shadows another is being prepared *casus belli* against Russia, to the detriment of the separatist populations of the Donetsk People's Republic (created on April 7, 2014) and the Lugansk People's Republic (created on April 8, 2014), with the concentration of 70,000, even 100,000 and more, Ukrainian armed forces (military + militias) preparing to invade Donbass – two staff plans seized by the separatists then by Russia show a date of attack on Donbass by Ukraine on February 28 and February 28. March 8, 2022 (it is not possible to ensure authenticity).

The two republics have been in armed struggle against the Ukrainian government since May 2014, which led to the Minsk I and II agreements, which Angela Merkel and François Hollande recognized were not aimed at guaranteeing peace but at giving time to arm Ukraine (see above) – note that the Russian Federation never recognized the two separatist republics as long as the Minsk agreements were supposed to apply, which were in no way respected, which led to more than 13,000 deaths on both camps according to a count put forward by the UN in 2019, “then specified in a report by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, which estimates that from April “From 2014 to February 2020, there were 13,000 to 13,200 people killed in Donbass.”²⁸This estimate includes soldiers from both camps, but also the thousands of civilians who were victims of the Ukrainian armed forces.

It is not within the scope of this complaint to describe what happened between 2014 and January 12, 2021, the date when negotiations between NATO and Russia led to nothing. On the other hand, it is important to verify the assertion "And a flagrant violation of international law", which appears in the press release from the Secretary General of NATO of February 22 cited above, regarding the recognition by the Federation of Russia of the two separatist republics of Donbass, and will be systematically repeated in a loop from February 24, just like the “unjustified and unprovoked attack”. This allows us to understand how NATO and its Secretary General, among others, continued to fuel the war, so that it would take place, as Oleksiy Arestovych, one of President Zelensky's main advisors, had announced (see . above), which predicted it for 2021 or 2022. Here is the sequence of the latest events which will lead to its triggering:

– January 16, 2021: During President Biden's press conference at the White House, a journalist from *New York Times* asks him if he thinks President Putin will invade Ukraine, even though the Secretary of State said the same day that it could happen at any time:

THE PRESIDENT: The answer is that I think he still does not want any full-blown war, number one. Number two, do I think he'll test the West, test the United States and NATO as significantly as he can? Yes, I think he will. But I think he'll pay a serious and dear price for it that he doesn't think now will cost him what it's going to cost him. And I think he will regret having done it.²⁹

Translation :

The President: The answer is I think he still doesn't want total war, first of all. Secondly, do I think it will test the West, that it will test the United States and NATO in as big a way as possible? Yes, I think he will.

27. *Where are nuclear weapons stored in Europe?*, Tristan Gaudiaut, Statista, October 14, 2022.

28. *Rehab. Ukraine has not killed 13,000 Russian-speaking civilians in Donbas since 2014*, France Info, 03/17/2022.

29. *Remarks by President Biden in Press Conference*, The White House, January 19, 2022.

But I think he will pay a high price, a price he doesn't think he can pay now. And I think he'll regret doing it.

The White House therefore publicly expressed in mid-January 2022 that Russia will invade Ukraine. Despite denials from Moscow, Western media quickly set the date: the night of February 15 to 16. Different events and decisions will then follow one another on the NATO side, as if it were a certain date. Has there ever been a precedent in history where the assailed announces two months in advance the precise day on which he will become so?

- February 13, 2021: in anticipation of the invasion on the 16th, Ukrainian skies are closed to all foreign civilian airlines, which must cancel their flights there until further notice;
- the same day: the office of the President of Ukraine publishes a press release, of which here is an extract: "We are told that February 16 will be the day of the attack. We will make it Unity Day," Mr. Zelensky announced, according to his presidential office. The country will mark this holiday, his office explained, with several patriotic activities. [...] the national flag of Ukraine will be raised on houses and buildings in all localities of our country, and at 10 a.m. the national anthem will be played," reads the official statement of kyiv.³⁰
- Monday February 14, 2021: the United States "temporarily" transfers its embassy to Lvov, in the west of the country, therefore opposite the Donbass.

Here is the summarized timeline of the last eight days that will culminate in the launch of Russia's "special military operation":

- Tuesday February 15: OSCE observers³¹ noted in Donbass "only" 76 explosions out of a total of 153 ceasefire violations that day, compared to around 250 on average for each day of 2021, which attests to a lull;
- night of February 15 to 16: Russia does not attack Ukraine;
- Wednesday 16: overnight, still according to the OSCE (as well as the figures to follow, see table below), violations and explosions reached a total of 591, almost four times more than the day before;
- Thursday February 17: the increase continues, with 870 violations and explosions;
- Friday 18: they intensify further, with 1,566 violations, including more than 1,400 explosions, as well as the use against civilian populations of heavy weapons prohibited by the Minsk agreements, and even the Geneva Conventions of 1949 (the fourth) and Additional Protocol II of 1977, which are universally binding on all States. These are acts of war, which oblige the governments of Donetsk and Lugansk, in agreement with Russia, to transport more than 100,000 civilians across the border to the Rostov oblast, in order to put them at risk. shelter ;
- the same day: bringing together NATO's top brass, the Security Conference begins in Munich. One of the most anticipated guests is President Zelensky, scheduled for the next day;
- Saturday 19: during his speech, he declared that he wanted to denounce the Budapest memorandum of 1994, in order to be able to equip his country with nuclear weapons against Russia, which has nevertheless signaled on multiple occasions that it is a line red not to be crossed;
- the two separatist republics decree general mobilization (there were still 3,231 violations and 2,026 explosions during that weekend);
- Sunday 20: during the night, the Élysée announced that the American and Russian presidents had agreed to hold a summit in Geneva at the initiative of President Macron, but Russia denied having given such an agreement the next day;
- Monday 21: while violations and explosions continue to increase (1927 and 1481, "record" day), the State Duma of the Russian Federation adopts the bill for the official recognition of the People's Republics of Donetsk (DPR) and Lugansk (RPL). It is approved by President Putin, who signs the decrees then the agreements and treaties of friendship, cooperation and assistance with the leaders of the two republics who arrived in Moscow. Everything is organized during the day and seems rushed. For example, it will be noted that the flags of the two republics are absent, which confirms the last minute improvisation in the face of the emergency of the bombing situation suffered by the civilian populations of Donbass;
- Tuesday 22: these agreements are ratified by the Federal Assembly of Russia. To think that this

30. *Ukraine's Zelensky Declares Rumored Date of Russian Invasion a National Holiday*, Frances Martel, Breitbart, February 14, 2022.

31. Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

recognition will stop the military escalation seems logical, because attacking Donbass now means attacking Russia given the treaties of friendship and military assistance that have just been signed. However, the actions of the Ukrainian armed forces continue, according to the OSCE, with another 1,710 violations and 1,420 explosions that day.

Ceasefire violations and explosions in Donbass (February 2022)

February 2022	02/14	02/15	02/16	02/17	02/18	19-20/02	02/21	02/22
Donetsk								
Violations	17	24	189	222	591	2,158	703	528
including explosions	1	5	128	135	553	1,100	332	345
Lugansk								
Violations	157	129	402	648	975	1,073	1,224	1,182
including explosions	40	71	188	519	860	926	1,149	1,075
Total								
Violations	174	153	591	870	1,566	3,231	1,927	1,710
including explosions	41	76	316	654	1,413	2,026	1,481	1,420

Source: OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM) Daily Reports

If only on the legal level, Russia obviously cannot allow the Russian-speaking population of Donbass to be bombed, at least for two reasons, even if they do not seem to have been invoked by the Russian authorities, at least in this which was reported by Western media:

1) All UN member states adopted at the 2005 world summit the principle of the responsibility to protect (R2P), in order to intervene when, clearly, a State does not ensure the protection of its population (pillar III). Is this not the case when the Ukrainian armed forces bombard the inhabitants of Donbass with heavy weapons? The responsibility then arises for the international community to protect these victims. However, let us note that Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of NATO, made no declaration or condemnation of these war crimes against the civilian populations of Donbass, in violation of the Minsk agreements, nor even the senior leaders of the European Commission (Ursula von der Leyen, Josep Borrell...), the European Council (Charles Michel...), the UN (António Guterres...), even though it is a violation manifesto of international law and that R2P obliged them to act.

2) Article 61 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation, included in Chapter 2 titled *Rights and freedoms of man and citizen*, contains the following provisions:

Figure 61

1. [...]

2. Russian Federation guarantee and protection

покровительство за ее пределами.

Translation : Article 61

1. [...].

2. The Russian Federation guarantees its citizens protection and assistance outside its borders.

Many citizens of Donbass have dual nationality, Ukrainian and Russian. Being outside the borders of the Russian Federation, Article 61 applies to their situation. Consequently, the President of the Russian Federation must provide them with "protection and

assistance”, under penalty of violating the Constitution of his country and risking legal proceedings which could result against him.

In terms of international law, it can be considered that the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, unanimously approved on December 9, 1948 by the United Nations General Assembly, making it the oldest text adopted by the UN on human rights, would apply to the situation in Donbass, if only through the first three paragraphs of Article II:

Article II

In this Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such:

- a) Murder of members of the group;
- b) Serious harm to the physical or mental integrity of members of the group;
- c) Intentional subjection of the group to conditions of existence intended to bring about its total or partial physical destruction; [...].

Indeed, numerous statements by Ukrainian leaders seem to fall under the crime of genocide, which must be prevented, as evidenced by the very name of this convention and its first Article. For example, the current president of Ukraine, Petro Poroshenko, can even be considered to fall under Article III/c) entitled *Direct and public incitement to commit genocide*, because he declared this in Odessa on October 23, 2014, even though he had been elected four months earlier:

We will have work and they will not have any. We will have pensions and they will not have any. We will have benefits for retirees and children, and they will not have any. Our children will go to school and daycare. Their children will stay in the basements because they are useless. And like that, we will win this war!

It is indeed the inhabitants of Donbass that he is talking about, yet Ukrainians, therefore his compatriots, even his voters for some of them. With such a declaration, particularly the last two sentences, he also contravenes the International Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989. The inhabitants of Donbass are even treated as “subhumans” by Ukrainian elected officials, who do not hesitate to use the term “Untermenschen”, recalling another dark era in History, and not only in Ukraine. We could multiply the examples, but that is not necessary in the context of this complaint.

Finally, on Thursday the 24th, at 5:48 a.m. (Moscow time), President Putin announced on Russian television:

[...] You and I simply had no other option to defend Russia, our people, than the one we will be forced to use today. Circumstances require us to act decisively and immediately. The Donbass people's republics asked Russia for help.

In this regard, in accordance with Article 51 of Part 7 of the Charter of the United Nations, with the permission of the Council of the Russian Federation and in accordance with the treaties of friendship and mutual assistance with the Donetsk People's Republics and Lugansk ratified by the Federal Assembly on February 22 of this year, I made the decision to carry out a special military operation.

Here is Article 51 of Part 7 of the United Nations Charter:

Article 51

Nothing in this Charter shall affect the natural right of self-defense, individual or collective, in the event that a Member of the United Nations is the object of armed attack, until the Security Council has taken necessary measures to maintain international peace and security. [...]

We will not enter here into the *ad bellum jus*, that is to say the right to wage war, but it emerges

indisputably from President Putin's complete statement two points which provoked the outbreak of this war:

1) The situation of civilian populations in Donbass, regarding which he declares:

In this context, the situation in Donbass. We note that the forces that carried out a coup in Ukraine in 2014 seized power and retained it through mostly decorative electoral procedures, definitely refused to resolve the conflict peacefully. For eight years, eight infinitely long years, we did everything to ensure that the situation was resolved by peaceful and political means. In vain. As I said in my previous speech, it is impossible to look at what is happening there without compassion. It was simply no longer possible to tolerate it. This nightmare had to end immediately – the genocide against the millions of people living there, who only hope in Russia, who only hope in you and me. It is these aspirations, these feelings and this pain of the people that pushed us to make the decision to recognize the people's republics of Donbass.

We will not discuss the validity of his remarks, but note that he expressly uses the term “genocide”, even if he does not refer to the Convention cited above.

2) This is the reason that occupies the most space in the declaration of this military intervention:

[...] This also includes the promises made to our country not to expand NATO an inch eastward. I repeat, we were deceived or, in popular parlance, simply cheated. Yes, we often hear that politics is a dirty job. Maybe, but not as dirty, not that much. After all, such cheating behavior is not only contrary to the principles of international relations, but above all to generally accepted standards of morality and ethics. Where is justice and truth here? Nothing but lies and hypocrisy. [...]

Despite everything, in December 2021, we tried once again to reach an agreement with the United States and its allies on the principles of security in Europe and on NATO non-proliferation. In vain. The position of the United States has not changed. They do not consider it necessary to reach an agreement with Russia on this essential issue for us, they pursue their own goals and do not take our interests into account. [...]

Even today, as NATO expands eastward, our country's situation is getting worse and more dangerous every year. Furthermore, in recent days, NATO leaders have explicitly discussed the need to accelerate and force the advance of the Alliance's infrastructure towards Russia's borders. In other words, they strengthen their position. We can no longer just watch what is happening. This would be totally irresponsible on our part.

The continued expansion of the infrastructure of the North Atlantic Alliance and the military development of the territories of Ukraine are unacceptable for us. The problem, of course, is not the NATO organization itself – it is only an instrument of American foreign policy. The problem is that on the territories adjacent to us – I want to emphasize this, on our own historical territories – an “anti-Russia” is being created, which has been placed under complete external control, which is intensively colonized by the armed forces of NATO countries and which is filled with the most modern weapons.

For the United States and its allies, this is a policy of so-called Russia containment, an obvious geopolitical dividend. For our country, however, it is, ultimately, a matter of life and death, a matter of our historic future as a nation. And that's not an exaggeration – that's just the way it is. This is a real threat, not only to our interests, but also to the very existence of our State, its sovereignty. This is the red line that has been mentioned several times. They crossed it.³²

32. French translation: *Speech by Vladimir Putin. Full Text*, Mikhail Metzger, Piscine/Tass. For the full version in Russian (Kremlin website): <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/67843>.

As Secretary General of NATO and in particular President of the NATO-Russia Council, Jens Stoltenberg could not ignore this red line "mentioned on several occasions". So why, he who could have prevented the war, did he, on the contrary, fan the embers so that it would happen? Why did he remain silent when civilian populations were being attacked?

It is therefore time for justice to be done, which is why we are turning to French justice. For reasons of territoriality, we will only be interested in the damage suffered by France, even if Ukraine is the first victim of this tragedy.

The prejudice of France

It is immeasurable. However, we will not publish here the endless list of facts and data which prove it, but will only retain two of symbolic significance:

- "the end of abundance" is announced by the Head of State in the preamble to the Council of Ministers back to school on Wednesday August 24, 2023, following a "series of serious crises", of which Ukraine is the main tangible element. This shows that this conflict, in which we have no direct interest or commitment, weighs heavily on our country;
- the general delegate of Restos du Cœur, Jean-Yves Troy, declared during a hearing at the National Assembly on October 4, 2023 that, for the first time since its creation in 1985, the association will have to refuse people: "We are no longer cut out to meet needs. » Indeed, the war in Ukraine has extremely serious repercussions on the French people, particularly due to the rise in inflation, which is brutally widening poverty well beyond the most fragile sections of the population, already weakened. by the Covid-19 crisis.

Thus, while France is already heavily in debt, a parliamentary report published on November 8, 2023 puts the amount of French military support for Ukraine at 3.2 billion euros alone, of which we can wonder in what capacity it is carried out since this country is not a member of NATO or the European Union, that there is no mandate from the United Nations, that France is not at war against Russia... It must be added France's contribution to the European Union, which "provided Ukraine with economic, humanitarian and military support amounting to more than 67 billion euros" in the year after the attack by Russia.³³ And this is only the first year... France's aid also covers multiple items, including loans to Ukraine guaranteed by the State, the reception of more than 51,000 Ukrainian refugees (at April 28, 2022).³⁴

At the same time, **more than one in five children live below the poverty line in France and 42,000 are homeless**, according to the 2022 Unicef report.³⁵

It is not up to us to judge whether the tens of billions which continue to be poured into this "paradise of corruption" that is Ukraine are justified or not, in any case there is no doubt that France is undergoing a prejudice simply because of its membership in NATO and the consequences of the lies of its secretary general which precipitated this war. In conclusion, we can only conclude that he has conspired and continues to conspire against the interests of NATO members, including France.

An immunity from jurisdiction from another time

In the case of NATO personnel in general and Jens Stoltenberg in particular, it is not the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of April 18, 1961 that applies, but the Convention on the Status of the Organization of the North Atlantic Treaty, national representatives and international personnel signed in Ottawa (Canada) on September 20, 1951.³⁶

Here is the beginning of article XVIII then article XX, in Title IV – International Staff and Experts on mission on behalf of the Organization:

Article XVIII

The officials of the Organization referred to in Article 17:

- has. Shall enjoy immunity from jurisdiction for acts performed by them in their official capacity and within the limits of their authority (including their words and writings); [...]

33. European Union website, *EU support for Ukraine*.

34. Source: Élysée website, *Update on the support provided by France to Ukraine and Moldova*, May 2, 2022.

35. *Children's rights in France, overview of progress and challenges – 2022*, Unicef.

36. NATO website, https://www.nato.int/cps/fr/natohq/official_texts_17248.htm

Article XX

In addition to the privileges and immunities specified in Articles 18 and 19, the Executive Secretary of the Organization, the North Atlantic Defense Production Coordinator, and any other permanent official of similar rank regarding whom agreement has been reached between the President of the Alternates of the Council and the governments of the Member States, benefit from the privileges and immunities normally granted to diplomatic agents of comparable rank.

Thanks to the signing of this convention, the Secretary General of NATO benefits from immunity from jurisdiction and cannot therefore be prosecuted by a French court, nor by the Ukrainian people who, however, pay the heaviest price for his lies. However, as we will establish, it is NATO which actually removes this immunity from jurisdiction included in the convention signed in Ottawa in 1951.

Accountability, or immunity from jurisdiction obsolete

Indeed, in the introduction to the document *NATO policy for developing integrity*, signed by the current Secretary General of NATO, appears, next to "integrity", the word "accountability". The word "integrity" has no meaning for Jens Stoltenberg, since he does not hesitate to lie to provoke war, it is therefore time for "accountability", that is to say the fact of accountable.

In the English version of the introduction to the document *NATO policy for developing integrity*, the word "redevabilité" corresponds to "accountability". Here is what François Lafarge, HDR researcher at the National School of Administration (ENA), explains as part of his study entitled *Be accountable – give account* in the *Public Administration Review* published by the National Institute of Public Service:

Research in political science and administrative sciences, often Anglo-Saxon but not only, has extensively explored all of the issues covered by the generic term of *accountability* from a conceptual point of view. In particular, the numerous works of M. Bovens and Y. Papadopoulos have thus enabled major advances from this point of view to which successive works are... indebted, if only because they can now rely on the definition now classic of accountability as "a specific relationship or social mechanism between an actor and an authority, in which the actor is required to explain and justify his conduct, where the authority can ask questions and make judgments, and the actor faces the consequences of this" (Bovens, 2007; Biela and Papadopoulos, 2014).

With this in mind, a significant part of the successive work endeavors to clarify this concept (accountability as a virtue and/or accountability as a mechanism), to analyze its use in particular contexts (the European Union, local authorities, public managers...), to study its relationships with related notions such as political responsibility...

It is clearly expressed that "the actor [faces] the consequences of this". By lying, when he knows that the consequence will be war, Jens Stoltenberg violates NATO's integrity policy. However, it was not sanctioned by NATO, which, in doing so, itself recognizes that it does not respect its integrity policy. It is important that all member countries of the United Nations are alerted that this organization is not respecting its commitments, even though it aims to expand into Oceania and Asia (in preparation for a war against China, apparently the next goal), but also in Africa and Latin America. For their security, these states must now keep NATO away from their borders. Moreover, is this organization not inherited from the era of colonialism, since it was created on April 4, 1949, when so many nations of the world had not yet acquired or conquered their independence?

It is in its commitments expressed in *NATO policy for developing integrity* that the Alliance testifies on page 4 paragraph 1 that it is impossible to compromise with this value of integrity:

1. NATO Member States form a unique community of values, committed to the principles of individual freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. They are united in a common cause: ensuring that the Alliance remains a community of freedom, peace, security and shared values like no other.

Who can still want to belong to or stay in a community “like no other” based on lies and deception in order to foment war? NATO still emphasizes the importance of integrity in its paragraph 2, still on page 4:

2. Allies reaffirm their belief that the existence of transparent and accountable defense institutions, under democratic control, is fundamental to the stability of the Euro-Atlantic region and essential for international security cooperation. They are also aware that corruption and bad governance represent security challenges to the extent that they undermine democracy, the rule of law and economic development, undermine public confidence in defense institutions and have a negative effect on operational efficiency.

We can only agree with NATO: in this case, corruption (at least of values, since the lie was used to start the war) and bad governance (those billions sent to Ukraine wasted funds) cannot can only undermine "public confidence" and that of international opinion, not to mention that we note that the violation of integrity has a more than negative effect "on operational efficiency": there is no than to note the results and the “performance” of NATO aid, for which it has now been established by various institutions, notably Europol, that part of the weapons supplied to Ukraine are resold to groups considered to be terrorists (Hamas), mafias and crime cartels of all kinds.³⁷

Through his lies, and the war that they helped to provoke, Jens Stoltenberg creates a threat for France and other European countries, of which we do not know what could happen: until then, it is the NATO which mainly ensured the defense of Germany. However, the ruling coalition in Germany announced in September 2022 a budget of 100 billion euros to modernize the German army. This proves how much the Germans do not feel protected by NATO, despite the 25 United States military bases present on their territory, to manage to release such an enormous sum, yet in a period of crisis and, now, recession .

Since “integrity” is violated, “accountability” must now apply to the harm suffered. However, NATO has not provided any measures in this area for its Secretary General. Indeed, if a NATO employee violates its integrity policy, we can assume that the Secretary General will judge and pronounce the necessary sanctions, although it is now possible to doubt this given the non-exemplarity of which he shows. On the other hand, he cannot be judge and jury when it is he who rapes her.

We can also completely understand that the head of a NATO member state cannot, for political reasons, speak on this subject, for fear of reprisals. We all still remember how President Macron was criticized and attacked, and not only by the Anglo-Saxon media, after having declared to *The Economist* in November 2019 that “What we are experiencing is the brain death of NATO”.³⁸ Moreover, the President of the Republic was not mistaken, since he added:

And on the other hand, reopen a strategic dialogue, without any naivety and which will take time, with Russia. [...] President Trump, I have a lot of respect for this, poses the question of Otant as a commercial project. According to him, it is a project where the United States provides a form of geopolitical umbrella, but, in return, there must be commercial exclusivity, this is a reason to buy American. France did not sign up for that.

37. Read, for example, the interview with Catherine De Bolle, director of Europol, in *Die Welt*, „Level on European Streets, we do not know what to do with them“, Manuel Bewarder, Alexander Dinger, Lennart Pfahler, May 28, 2022.

38. For Emmanuel Macron, NATO is in a state of “brain death”, *Le Figaro* with AFP, 07/11/2019.

That's right: she didn't sign up for "that" any more than she signed up for open conflict, or even war, with Russia, even if that's what seems to be in the works.

It is therefore now up to French justice to rule on the law, especially since no article of the North Atlantic Treaty opposes it, not even article 9 establishing the creation of a Council.

On the jurisdiction of French justice

From the above, it is indisputable that French justice must prosecute Jens Stoltenberg and has all the powers to do so. It is equally incontestable that she alone has the capacity to investigate and judge the acts and decisions which are at the origin of the damage caused to France.

The fact that French justice is taking up this matter does not exclude other member states from sanctioning the Secretary General for his serious violations of the fundamental principles of NATO, including integrity, and, in general, of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is equally true that a procedure which would be initiated against Jens Stoltenberg by the members of NATO or NATO, for example within the framework of the Council established by Article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty, cannot exclude or extinguish the action of French Justice, especially since it would be subsequent to it and in no way "superior" or priority.

It appears obvious that book IV^e of the French Penal Code entitled *Crimes and offenses against the nation, the State and public peace* enacts provisions which must be implemented since they involve attacks on the fundamental interests of the nation. The article was clearly written by the legislator who, in his wisdom, anticipated that this situation would arise:

Section 5: Providing false information (Article 411-10) Article 411-10

Modified by Order No. 2000-916 of September 19, 2000 - art. 3 (V) JORF September 22, 2000 in force January 1, 2002

The fact of providing, with a view to serving the interests of a foreign power, of a foreign company or organization or under foreign control, to the civil or military authorities of France false information likely to mislead them and attack on the fundamental interests of the nation is punishable by seven years of imprisonment and a fine of 100,000 euros.

It is indisputable that Jens Stoltenberg provided "false information likely to mislead them" and that this had the consequence of "undermining the fundamental interests of the nation", including the loss of the direct relationship with Russia that the President of the Republic knew how to work together with his Russian counterpart. Indeed, if Jens Stoltenberg had not lied, and not only during his interview with *Spiegel*, but rather worked for peace, at least by recommending suspending Ukraine's admission to NATO, this war would not have taken place and the French people would not have to suffer incalculable harm, including that of sending billions to Ukraine by falling into ever greater debt, with this additional burden weighing on future generations, not to mention general impoverishment and the "end of abundance".

Two other articles of the Penal Code concern Jens Stoltenberg's crime:

Article 411-5

Modified by Order No. 2000-916 of September 19, 2000 - art. 3 (V) JORF September 22, 2000 in force January 1, 2002

The fact of maintaining intelligence with a foreign power, with a foreign company or organization or under foreign control or with their agents, when it is likely to harm the fundamental interests of the nation, is punishable by ten years in prison. imprisonment and a fine of 150,000 euros.

Article 411-8

Modified by Order No. 2000-916 of September 19, 2000 - art. 3 (V) JORF September 22, 2000 in force January 1, 2002

The fact of carrying out, on behalf of a foreign power, a foreign enterprise or organization or under foreign control or their agents, an activity whose aim is

obtaining or delivering devices, information, processes, objects, documents, computerized data or files whose exploitation, disclosure or assembly is likely to harm the fundamental interests of the nation is punishable by ten years of imprisonment. imprisonment and a fine of 150,000 euros.

It is once again indisputable that Jens Stoltenberg engaged on behalf of a foreign power (Ukraine) and a foreign organization (NATO) in "an activity aimed at obtaining or delivering devices, [...] objects", since billions of euros of weapons were delivered by France to Ukraine without any compensation.

Have French soldiers died in Ukraine?

At the end of March 2022, there were reports of the death in Mariupol of intelligence officers and instructors of French origin, and even soldiers of the Foreign Legion (cf. *War in Ukraine, the criminal responsibility of the West*, starting on page 115).

On January 17, 2024, the Russian army claimed to have destroyed a building in Kharkov where "mercenaries, most of whom were French citizens," were deployed and around sixty of them died. A list of 13 "French mercenaries" is published, then a new list of thirty people circulates on Telegram. This event is even the subject of a resolution by the Russian Parliament, the Duma, which denounces the presence of "French mercenaries" fighting in the ranks of the Ukrainian armed forces.

French justice will have to ensure the identity and status of these people, because another criminal article would apply specifically against Jens Stoltenberg:

Article 411-2

Modified by Order No. 2000-916 of September 19, 2000 - art. 3 (V) JORF September 22, 2000 in force January 1, 2002

The fact of delivering to a foreign power, to a foreign organization or under foreign control or to their agents either troops belonging to the French armed forces, or all or part of the national territory is punishable by criminal detention for life and 750,000 euros. fine.

Even if the information disseminated only turned out to be "Russian propaganda", the investigation by the French justice system will prevent such events from happening in the future, because it is unacceptable that soldiers "belonging to the French armed forces", therefore whatever their nationality, which includes the Foreign Legion, can fall on the field of honor as a result of criminal acts of international officials, including the Secretary General of NATO, whether in Ukraine or elsewhere.

On the inviolability of borders

The drafting of art. 411-2 mentioning the delivery "of all or part of the national territory" reveals another lie constantly repeated by NATO leaders as well as those of the European Commission, the European Council and even state officials. like Chancellor Scholz, namely the so-called "inviolability of borders". If "borders were inviolable", although they were only human conventions, as the evidence dictates, then Germany in its present form would not exist, because there would always be Germany of the West and East Germany, even Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Franconia, Swabia, etc. It is even surprising to read this excerpt from Chancellor Scholz's New Year's greetings to the German people on December 31, 2021:

Transatlantic cooperation is essential for security in Europe. With Ukraine, we face new challenges. The inviolability of borders is a precious and non-negotiable asset.

What are Ukraine and "the inviolability of borders" doing in its wishes to its people? Especially on December 31, 2021, that is, after the Russians sent their draft treaty and

even though negotiations must be held twelve days later. Is he already informed of the result and what NATO is up to to the detriment of its members and Ukraine? Is there premeditation for the outbreak of war, at all costs?

In any case, there is a long list of evidence of the "violability" of borders, including in recent history, including the creation of South Sudan, Kosovo, etc., not to mention the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, founded by arms, or South Yemen and North Yemen, which met on May 22, 1990, but South Yemen tried to secede in 1994, which generated a long deadly conflict. We could add to this the numerous territorial disputes still unresolved on almost all continents, so borders are not "inviolable" nor intangible.

Let us also remember that, from the point of view of international law, the words "border" and "inviolability" do not appear in the Charter of the United Nations. However, this is included in Article 2:

4. Members of the Organization shall refrain, in their international relations, from resorting to the threat or use of force, either against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or of any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

However, it was in 2014 that the two republics of Donbass declared their independence from Ukraine, and it was only eight years later that they were recognized as such by the Russian Federation, which they called for their assistance in the face of the risk of genocide by the armed forces of Ukraine with the support of... NATO and its members (military aid in the form of shipments of equipment and weapons, training, joint exercises, provision of advisors, infrastructure, funds, etc.). Consequently, paragraph 4 of Article 2 cannot apply, because it is not the "territorial integrity" of Ukraine that is under attack, since the two republics have no longer been part of it since the proclamation of their independence in 2014, especially since the notion of "inviolability of borders" does not appear in the Charter of the United Nations, the "right to self-determination" recognized for peoples is present from Article 1, paragraph 2, and is therefore of paramount importance for understanding this war. Moreover, it fundamentally invalidates the "NATO" myth of the "inviolability of borders", since if a people decides to decide for itself, this implies the modification of borders. NATO is all the better placed to know this since it participated in the dismantling of Yugoslavia and helped create new countries and borders. This is therefore the case of the two republics of Donbass, since the two peoples can freely dispose of themselves according to international law under the Charter of the United Nations, whatever the authorities of Kiev, NATO, to the European Commission, to the European Council, to Chancellor Scholz...

In law, aid to Ukraine, which amounts to tens of billions of euros and dollars, can therefore only be fraudulently justified in the name of the so-called defense of the "inviolability of borders", principle which does not exist in the Charter of the United Nations, nor even on the scale of History.

"Fraudulently", because if what Ukraine was dragged into was right, it would not be necessary to pile up these successive lies at all levels of international institutions (NATO, European Commission, European Council, etc.) and Western heads of state.

Organized gang extortion

The outbreak of this war has direct repercussions on France's future budgets with the Armed Forces Finance Bill, which sets an increase of 3.3 billion euros for the year 2024 alone, almost double that of previous years. ! As if France had no other priority needs...

On the NATO side, here is what the "peace organization" publishes on its site:

At its meeting this Wednesday (December 14, 2022), the North Atlantic Council approved NATO's civil and military budgets for 2023. These two budgets will be allocated respectively 370.8 million euros (27.8% more than in 2022) and 1.96 billion euros (25.8% more than in 2022).

Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg said: "I warmly welcome the approval of NATO's civil and military budgets for 2023, which live up to the level of ambition set by NATO leaders. State and government of member countries last June in Madrid, during a summit bringing profound changes. We must continue to invest more and better in NATO. In a world that has become more dangerous, only by working together within a strong NATO can the countries of North America and Europe preserve the security of their populations, a billion people. » At the Madrid Summit, Allies agreed to invest more in the Alliance, together, in response to the deterioration of the security environment caused by Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine. NATO's new strategic concept indicates that "investing in NATO is the best way not only to maintain the bond that unites the European Allies and the Allies of North America, but also to contribute to peace and to stability in the world.³⁹

Who pays for this significant increase of 25 and 27% in the NATO budget? Obviously, the Member States, of which France is a significant contributor. His financial commitment **will quadruple in constant euros**(that is to say much more in current euros, therefore in real life) by 2030, as the Court of Auditors points out:

France must make the most of the increase in NATO's common budget, decided at the Madrid summit in 2022.

Representing €203 million in 2022, the French contribution could reach around €830 million in 2030 in constant euros.⁴⁰

In summary, the NATO Secretary General lies knowing that this will trigger Russia's invasion of Ukraine, his employer does not sanction him, despite the violation of his "integrity" policy, his charter and of that of the United Nations, and both are taking advantage of the war they helped to start to justify up to four times more budget to Member States by 2030! This looks like organized gang extortion.

Jens Stoltenberg, however, escapes article 312-1 of the Penal Code concerning extortion given the way it is worded:

Article 312-1

Modified by Order No. 2000-916 of September 19, 2000 - art. 3 (V) JORF September 22, 2000 in force January 1, 2002

Extortion is the act of obtaining by violence, threat of violence or coercion either a signature, a commitment or a waiver, or the revelation of a secret, or the handing over of funds, valuables or any property.

Extortion is punishable by seven years' imprisonment and a fine of 100,000 euros.

Indeed, it can be considered that "constraint" is difficult to establish. However, how can you not think about the proven methods of the mafia: I create a threat, I force you to take me as your protector (or rather "godfather"?), and you go to the cash register for life...

In any case, if the crime of extortion is undoubtedly difficult to establish, that of fraud is obvious when reading Article 313-1 of the Penal Code:

Article 313-1

Modified by Order No. 2000-916 of September 19, 2000 - art. 3 (V) JORF September 22, 2000 in force January 1, 2002

Fraud is the act, either by the use of a false name or a false capacity, or by the abuse of a true capacity, or by the use of fraudulent maneuvers, of deceiving a natural person or moral and thus determine it, to its detriment or to the detriment of a third party, to hand over funds, values or any property, to provide a service or to consent to an act providing an obligation or discharge.

39. *NATO approves its 2023 budgets, which give it the means to achieve its ambitions in the face of the new security reality*, December 14, 2022.

40. *France's participation in NATO: a growing contribution*, Court of Auditors, October 4, 2023.

The fraud is punishable by five years of imprisonment and a fine of 375,000 euros.

Jens Stoltenberg abused his "true capacity" as Secretary General of NATO and used "fraudulent maneuvers" (lies) to "deceive a legal entity" (France and the other members of NATO, not to mention of Ukraine) and he "thus determined her, to her detriment [...], to hand over funds, valuables or any property". In this case, we are talking about billions, whether in cold hard cash ("funds"), guarantees ("values") and weapons which empty the stocks of the French army ("goods"). any"). The penalties for fraud are increased if aggravating circumstances occur as defined by Article 313-2 of the Penal Code:

Article 313-2

Modified by LAW n°2013-1203 of December 23, 2013 - art. 86

The penalties are increased to seven years of imprisonment and a fine of 750,000 euros when the fraud is carried out:

1° By a person holding public authority or charged with a public service mission, in the exercise or during the exercise of his functions or his mission; [...] The penalties are increased to ten years' imprisonment and a fine of 1,000,000 euros when the fraud is committed by an organized gang.

As surprising as it may seem for an international organization and its secretary general, art. 313-1 et seq. of the Penal Code constituting the offense of fraud seem to apply.

Rain of billions on Ukraine

It is all the more urgent for French justice to crack down and close this Pandora's box as billions must continue to rain down on Ukraine, as already attested by this declaration by Josep Borrell, vice-president of the European Commission and High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, on the occasion of the Congress of the Party of European Socialists in Malaga on November 11, 2023:

We have many problems that will be a test for the EU. First of all, Ukraine, where the prospect of victory over Russia is not immediate. And we Europeans, who have the necessary funds, must be ready [...] to continue helping Ukraine, to the extent that American support is likely to diminish.⁴¹

If we have "the necessary funds", they must urgently be used first for the people of the European Union, especially since the EU has just granted candidate status to Ukraine, yet in the middle of war and from which we do not know what will emerge, except that it will be a pit to finance, while France is the second net contributor to the budget of the European Union, after Germany. Moreover, the various European authorities have just agreed to provide aid of 50 billion to Ukraine, including 17 billion in subsidies. These are staggering sums in view of the current state of European countries following this war, which seems to have been fueled as much by NATO as the European Commission, in any case from which we are seeking the essential diplomatic efforts in the matter, as required by the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

Incidentally, let us point out that Josep Borrell, although he is High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs, therefore supposed to be its first **Diplomat**, produces the same lie as Jens Stoltenberg, as highlighted in the book *War in Ukraine – The criminal responsibility of the West*:

It is in his Russian Wikipedia entry that reference is made to an interview he gave to *Die Welt* published on December 29, 2021:

41. Source: *The world, War in Ukraine, Live* (information as of 11/11/23 at 4:26 p.m.).

The European diplomat [Borrell] rejected Moscow's calls for security guarantees and an end to the EU and NATO's eastern enlargement, calling them a "purely Russian agenda with strings attached". totally unacceptable, especially where Ukraine is concerned."⁴²

Like Stoltenberg, he denies that commitments have been made for thirty years and adds fuel to the fire. Indeed, why bother negotiating the "security guarantees" requested by Russia? We will see later that he has taken many other dangerous positions, because he reveals himself to be an anti-Russian warmonger [...]. Is this acceptable from a diplomat?

Either way, here's what he inspires as the future leader of the European Commission:

The appointment of Spaniard Josep Borrell as EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Commission Vice-President is among Ursula von der Leyen's most surprising appointments – he is 72 and his career was marred by more than one contentious event. [...]

"I really believe that our responsibility as Parliament is to criticize this appointment which undermines the legitimacy and reputation of the European institutions," MEP [Diana] Riba told EUobserver.⁴³

We could not conclude better, especially in view of what follows.⁴⁴

Indeed, "the legitimacy and reputation of European institutions" do not come out enhanced by the lies of these unelected people occupying the highest positions of responsibility, namely the Secretary General of NATO, the members of the European Commission, including its president and her "high diplomat", the President of the European Council... while hundreds of millions of European citizens must now pay the price of their failure.

This is why French justice will determine that this scam was carried out by an organized gang and will pronounce appropriate aggravated penalties, firstly against the Secretary General of NATO, as requested by this complaint.

CONCLUSION

A Judgment for Humanity

It is essential that French justice states the law on the matter and condemns Jens Stoltenberg for what he committed, on the grounds of articles 411-5, 411-8 and 411-10 of the Penal Code, or even 411-2, 313-1 and 313-2.

Even if he will never be able to compensate the French people for the damage he has caused them, he is nevertheless requested to sentence him to an additional fine of 2 million euros, which will be paid in full to French associations, half of to the Restos du Cœur and the other half to four associations working for the protection of children, which did not benefit from the billions sent to Ukraine in vain and will nevertheless have to bear the burden of the debt.

The judgment will be transmitted to the International Law Commission, responsible for the "progressive development of international law and its codification" on behalf of the United Nations General Assembly (article 13 of the United Nations Charter). Indeed, the international community cannot allow itself to be drawn into wars by the fault and fraudulent maneuvers of international officials, and must therefore evolve international law accordingly.

The conviction by French justice will also constitute an example for senior leaders of other international institutions, whether the European Commission (Ursula von der Leyen, Josep Borrell...), the European Council (Charles Michel...). .., who have done, more or less,

42. Borrell: *EU in Sicherheitsgespräche USA-Russland einbeziehen*, *Die Welt*, December 29, 2021. The exact quote in German: "rein russische Agenda mit völlig unannehmbaren Bedingungen, vor allem mit Blick auf die Ukraine", taken up by *Die Zeit*

43. Borrell: *from controversy to EU's top diplomat*, Elena Sánchez Nicolás, *EUobserver*, September 30, 2019.

44. *War in Ukraine: the criminal responsibility of the West*, op.quoted.

declarations similar to those of Jens Stoltenberg and have contributed to precipitating a continent into a new horror that it did not need, with long-term repercussions which already seem abysmal, especially since the war is far from being finished. However, Josep Borrell has just gone to Kiev to assure the Ukrainian president that he will be supplied with one million shells in 2024. The European Union and France are therefore increasingly committed as belligerents, but what will be the response from Russia, particularly after the presidential elections next March, the outcome of which is in little doubt?

Finally, the procedure launched in France, which will be the first of its kind, will allow other peoples of NATO member countries to study the possibilities of legal proceedings against Jens Stoltenberg and his employer according to their national legislation.

Unfortunately, this does not seem possible for the Ukrainian people under the rule of law, but let's ensure that their sacrifice prevents similar tragedies from happening again anywhere.

A Judgment for Peace

Finally, President Putin, in his speech announcing the start of the "special military operation" on February 24, 2022, described the "Western bloc" as an "empire of lies". It is now up to French justice to show that he was wrong and that France is not part of the empire of lies, although in the "Western bloc".

It is all the more urgent for French justice to take up this complaint as NATO will hold its next summit from July 9 to 11, 2024, and this event will mark the 75 years of existence of this organization inherited from the Cold War. . The detailed agenda is not yet known, but there is a risk that this anniversary will be taken advantage of to bring in a new member from a continent other than Europe and North America, in order to make universal the dangerous article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty:

Article 5

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them occurring in Europe or North America will be considered an attack against all parties, and accordingly they agree that, if such an attack occurs, each of them, in the exercise of the right of self-defense, individual or collective, recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties thus attacked by taking immediate action, individually and by agreement with other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and ensure security in the North Atlantic region.

Note that reference is made to art. 51 of the United Nations Charter, the same one that Russia invoked to come to the aid of the Donbass republics and attack Ukraine. Next, let us note that its scope is limited to any armed attack **occurring in Europe or North America**". Accordingly, if, for example, Ansar Allah in Yemen, in its action to defend the people of Gaza, had sent a British warship to the bottom, the United Kingdom would not have been able to invoke art. 5 and drag us into a war against this country, because the facts would have occurred in the Red Sea or in the Gulf of Aden. However, if NATO were enlarged to include an African, Asian or Oceanic country, art. 5 would inevitably be extended to the entire planet, with incalculable consequences. Indeed, in what conflict could France still find itself involved through the fault of other liars? Against China? Iran? Venezuela? Any other oil producing country? Or falsely possessing weapons of mass destruction? And what new betrayal of NATO should we expect? Because there is no other word than this, first of all with regard to Ukraine, since Jens Stoltenberg declared on June 6, 2023 in Berlin at a press conference with Chancellor Scholz that Ukraine would not even be invited to join NATO, which he has just repeated in preparation for the July 2024 summit in Washington... The world would have avoided an irreparable tragedy if he had made the same declaration to *Spiegel* on January 19, 2022 instead of lying to make war happen. His guilt will be eternally crushing and the judgment of History can only be merciless.

Certainly, the role of French justice is not to oppose the extension of NATO, but to sanction any attack on the fundamental interests of the nation and the French, in order to prevent

let this happen again as a result of new lies and deception from NATO and other institutions.

Now that we have exposed them for this murderous madness in Ukraine, the question arises: what is NATO for? Who is she protecting us from? Besides, who wants to attack us? Russia ? Let's be serious: its population is barely equivalent to those of France + Germany, and quite insufficient to develop an immense territory of 17 million km², which, moreover, makes this country difficult to defend. And why would the Russians attack us if we don't threaten them? Or even Poland or the Baltic countries, when they have immense resources that they cannot develop due to lack of inhabitants? What other countries threaten our territory? No matter how much we search... And the French army, although equipped with nuclear deterrence, could not cope with it? So, wouldn't all the public money that will continue to be squandered in this unspeakable organization be more useful to improve the situation of our own armed forces, truly and unequivocally in the service of the French?

This war in Ukraine and this complaint demonstrate that, as in Hans Christian Andersen's tale, King NATO is naked, and the best birthday present that people should give him is to send him to retirement for his 75th birthday, taking advantage of article 13. This is even becoming urgent, because the price of his existence is paid in millions of thwarted or destroyed lives, for which future generations will still bear the burden.

I therefore appreciate the attention that you will pay to this complaint given the seriousness of the circumstances, it being understood that the French will be very attentive to the position that will be adopted by French justice in the face of attacks on the fundamental interests of the nation as punished by the Penal Code, and with regard to future events and the consequences which will result therefrom.

The whole world will also be watching your action, because it will help facilitate the start of the peace process in Ukraine and will prevent wars fomented by deception and lies. It is therefore a judgment for Humanity that French Justice will have to pronounce.

Thanking you in advance, please accept, Madam Public Prosecutor, the assurance of my respectful homage.

Patrick Pasin

**COMPLAINT AGAINST JENS STOLTENBERG,
SECRETARY GENERAL OF NATO**

Additional parts

1) *NATO policy for developing integrity*, endorsed by the heads of state and government at the NATO Summit held in Warsaw on July 8 and 9, 2016 (the first five pages).



Introduction



Au sommet de Varsovie, tenu le 9 juillet 2016, les chefs d'État et de gouvernement des 28 pays membres de l'Alliance ont réaffirmé que l'OTAN est une alliance de valeurs partagées, parmi lesquelles la liberté, les droits de l'homme, la démocratie et l'état de droit. Ces valeurs sont essentielles à l'identité et à l'action de l'OTAN. Les Alliés reconnaissent que la corruption et la mauvaise gouvernance rendent plus complexes tous les défis de sécurité auxquels nous sommes confrontés et qu'elles portent atteinte à la paix, à la sécurité, à la prospérité et à l'efficacité opérationnelle.

La politique OTAN pour le développement de l'intégrité, entérinée au sommet de Varsovie, réaffirme « notre conviction que l'existence d'institutions de défense transparentes et soumises à l'obligation de rendre compte ainsi qu'à un contrôle démocratique est fondamentale pour la stabilité de la région euro-atlantique et essentielle pour la coopération internationale dans le domaine de la sécurité ».

Le Secrétariat international, l'État-major militaire international, les commandements militaires et les agences de l'OTAN continueront de développer l'intégrité, d'accroître la transparence et de promouvoir la redevabilité tout en encourageant la bonne gouvernance au sein de leurs propres structures. Le plan d'action pour le développement de l'intégrité, dont les ministres des Affaires étrangères des pays de l'OTAN ont pris note en décembre 2016, comprend les activités à mettre en œuvre par l'OTAN, les Alliés et les pays partenaires.

Je suis très fier de ce que nous avons accompli à ce jour et j'invite les pays, les organisations internationales, le secteur privé et la société civile à se joindre à cette initiative pour renforcer la transparence, la redevabilité et l'intégrité au sein de nos institutions de défense et de sécurité s'y rapportant.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jens Stoltenberg". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal line underneath the name.

Politique OTAN pour le développement de l'intégrité

ENTÉRINÉE PAR LES CHEFS D'ÉTAT ET DE GOUVERNEMENT LORS DE LA RÉUNION DU CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD TENUE À VARSOVIE LES 8 ET 9 JUILLET 2016¹

1. Les États membres de l'OTAN forment une communauté de valeurs unique en son genre, attachée aux principes de la liberté individuelle, de la démocratie, des droits de l'homme et de l'état de droit. Ils sont unis au service d'une cause commune : veiller à ce que l'Alliance demeure une communauté de liberté, de paix, de sécurité et de valeurs partagées à nulle autre pareille. Le dialogue et la coopération avec les pays partenaires, conformément aux principes consacrés dans le Document de base du Conseil de partenariat euro atlantique (CPEA), peuvent contribuer de façon concrète au renforcement de la sécurité internationale et à la défense des valeurs sur lesquelles se fonde l'Alliance.
2. Les Alliés réaffirment leur conviction selon laquelle l'existence d'institutions de défense transparentes et redevables, placées sous contrôle démocratique, est fondamentale pour la stabilité de la région euro atlantique et essentielle pour la coopération internationale dans le domaine de la sécurité. Ils ont aussi conscience que la corruption et la mauvaise gouvernance représentent des défis sécuritaires dans la mesure où elles fragilisent la démocratie, l'état de droit et le développement économique, sapent la confiance du public dans les institutions de défense et ont un effet négatif sur l'efficacité opérationnelle.
3. La politique OTAN pour le développement de l'intégrité, décrite dans le présent document, s'inspire de l'expérience accumulée au cours de la mise en œuvre du programme OTAN pour le développement de l'intégrité, lancé en 2007 par le CPEA. Ce programme s'inscrit dans le cadre de l'engagement de l'OTAN en faveur du renforcement de l'intégrité, de la transparence et de la redevabilité dans le secteur de la défense et de la sécurité s'y rapportant. L'intégrité est le lien entre le comportement et les principes. En matière d'institutions, elle est directement liée à la bonne gouvernance : pour renforcer l'intégrité d'une institution, il est nécessaire d'enraciner dans ses structures les principes qu'elle doit représenter, et de sensibiliser son personnel à ces normes et à ces valeurs.
4. Ce programme d'activités est ouvert aux Alliés, aux pays membres du Conseil de partenariat euro atlantique, aux pays du Dialogue méditerranéen, à ceux de l'Initiative de coopération d'Istanbul, aux partenaires mondiaux et à la Colombie. L'OTAN examine au cas par cas les demandes émanant d'autres pays. Le programme encourage les bonnes pratiques et fournit aux pays participants une expertise et un soutien adaptés pour les aider à rendre leurs institutions de défense et de sécurité plus efficaces et efficientes.

¹ Pays associés à la politique OTAN pour le développement de l'intégrité situation au 1er février 2017 : Arménie, Australie, Autriche, Azerbaïdjan, Bélarus, Bosnie Herzégovine, Colombie, Finlande, Géorgie, Irlande, Kazakhstan, République kirghize, Malte, République de Moldova, Monténégro, Serbie, Suède, Suisse, Tadjikistan, l'ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine*, Turkménistan, Ukraine et Ouzbékistan. * La Turquie reconnaît la République de Macédoine sous son nom constitutionnel.

Principes généraux

5. La politique OTAN pour le développement de l'intégrité est guidée par les principes suivants :
 - 5.1. le développement de l'intégrité est une composante essentielle des activités de l'Alliance. L'importance de mettre en œuvre des mesures visant à développer l'intégrité, la lutte anticorruption et la bonne gouvernance vaut de la même manière pour les Alliés, les partenaires et l'OTAN elle-même. Les Alliés et les partenaires sont déterminés à soutenir et à promouvoir les principes d'intégrité, de transparence et de redevabilité ainsi que leur mise en œuvre, dans le respect des normes et des pratiques internationales établies pour le secteur de la défense et de la sécurité s'y rapportant ;
 - 5.2. les pays doivent disposer de procédures transparentes et efficaces pour évaluer les risques de sécurité liés à la corruption et les besoins de défense, et pour développer et maintenir des capacités de défense efficaces, interopérables et correspondant à ces besoins ainsi qu'aux engagements internationaux ;
 - 5.3. le développement de l'intégrité doit faire partie intégrante des travaux et activités internes de l'OTAN, et être mis en œuvre dans le cadre de l'adaptation institutionnelle. Le Secrétariat international, l'État major militaire international, les commandements militaires et les agences doivent continuer à s'efforcer de développer l'intégrité, d'accroître la transparence et de promouvoir la redevabilité tout en encourageant la bonne gouvernance au sein de leurs propres structures.

Objectif général

6. Le développement de l'intégrité et la mise en place d'institutions de défense efficaces, transparentes, redevables et capables de réagir à des défis de sécurité imprévisibles, notamment à caractère hybride, aident considérablement l'Alliance à accomplir sa mission de sauvegarde de la liberté et de la sécurité de ses membres.
7. Au vu du caractère transversal du développement de l'intégrité et compte tenu des responsabilités respectives de l'OTAN, d'une part, et des Alliés et partenaires, de l'autre, la présente politique définit les objectifs suivants :

POUR L'OTAN

- 7.1. tenir compte du développement de l'intégrité dans les objectifs politiques généraux de l'OTAN et dans la mise en œuvre des tâches fondamentales de l'Alliance ;
- 7.2. fournir une approche harmonisée et structurée visant à faire du développement de l'intégrité une discipline conceptuellement efficace,

opérationnelle et intégrée aux différents axes d'activité (politique et militaire) de l'OTAN;

- 7.3. coordonner les travaux avec ceux des autres organisations internationales, si nécessaire.

POUR LES ALLIÉS ET LES PARTENAIRES

- 7.4. continuer d'élaborer et d'actualiser, à titre volontaire, les politiques, la doctrine et les formations nationales pour le développement de l'intégrité;
- 7.5. réaffirmer une volonté nationale de partager les meilleures pratiques et les enseignements à titre volontaire et dans le cadre du programme OTAN pour le développement de l'intégrité, ainsi que durant les activités liées à celui-ci;
- 7.6. favoriser l'appropriation au niveau local et le renforcement des capacités individuelles et institutionnelles.

Tâches fondamentales

8. Des éléments du développement de l'intégrité, y compris les concepts d'intégrité, de transparence et de redevabilité, devraient être utilisés pour améliorer la gestion des ressources de défense et le développement capacitaire. Ces éléments devraient être intégrés dans la réalisation des tâches fondamentales de l'OTAN.

DÉFENSE COLLECTIVE

- 8.1. La défense collective nécessite des institutions de défense efficaces et efficientes et doit être fondée sur les principes d'intégrité, de transparence et de redevabilité, afin d'optimiser les dépenses, de développer plus avant les capacités de défense et de veiller à ce que les forces armées disposent de meilleurs moyens. Il convient de continuer à renforcer le développement de l'intégrité dans les secteurs nationaux de la défense et de la sécurité s'y rapportant afin d'assurer leur résilience, en particulier face à la corruption.

GESTION DE CRISE

- 8.2. L'OTAN dispose d'un éventail unique et efficace de capacités politiques et militaires lui permettant d'agir sur les crises les plus diverses. Dans le contexte des opérations en cours, les activités de renforcement des capacités sont menées en parallèle avec la gestion de crise. Compte tenu du fait que la corruption sape la confiance du public à l'égard des autorités, freine le développement économique et entretient les conflits, le développement de l'intégrité peut avoir un effet préventif, et il conviendrait de l'envisager à tous les stades des opérations et missions dirigées par l'OTAN.

4) SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED POWERS EUROPE (example of NATO job description, pp. 1 and 3).



SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED POWERS EUROPE

Vacancy Number: 231303

Job Title: Staff Officer (MGT NATO 2030)

Post Location: Casteau/Mons, 60 Km south of Brussels (Belgium)

Grade: 11

Basic Monthly Salary: 4,843.70 EUR

Closing Date: Monday 20 November 2023

1. POST CONTEXT

Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) provides an integrated Strategic Effects framework, employing a multi-domain and multi-region focus to create a 360-degree approach, with the flexibility to enable, upon direction, a seamless transition from Baseline Activities and Current Operations (BACO) up to the Maximum Level of Effort (MLE). SHAPE supports SACEUR in fulfilling his terms of reference, as directed by the North Atlantic Council.

The Management Directorate (MGT) primary focus is to provide all the necessary staffing and real-life support functions to enable SHAPE to deliver its critical outputs as a Strategic Military HQ. The Directorate acts as the HQ's conduit to member nations (through NMRs) and to host nation authorities.

The Information Management and Business Continuity Branch (IMBC) provides the information management and staffing tools, directives and processes necessary for the efficient functioning and resilience of SHAPE as a Military Strategic HQ.

The Information and Knowledge Management Section (IKM) provides the tools and policy guidance necessary to ensure the effective management and exploitation of both information (and knowledge) as a corporate resource within SHAPE and across ACO.

2. PRINCIPAL DUTIES

The incumbent's duties are:

- 1) Within the area of responsibility the incumbent is responsible for ensuring that strategic risk to the achievement of CG priorities are managed in accordance with ACO Enterprise Risk Management framework.
- 2) Develops and gathers requirements for projects related to NATO 2030 in IKM.
- 3) Liaises with the BiSC IKM community to develop requirements and IKM policy for NATO 2030 projects.
- 4) Ensures the alignment of MGT NATO 2030 Projects with other projects across ACO and ACT.
- 5) Supports the development of NATO 2030 IKM related projects.
- 6) Supports the development of NATO 2030 Business Continuity related projects.
- 7) Manages the development of the SHAPE Strategic Warfighting Headquarters IKM Plan.

CONTRACT

The successful candidate will fill this post as a Project Related NATO International Civilian (PLN) with a three-year definite duration contract within the NATO 2030 Agenda. On expiry of this term the PLN will be deleted or absorbed into the ceiling pending approval or will exceptionally be considered for extension.

The salary will be the basic entry-level monthly salary defined by the NATO Grade of the post, which may be augmented by allowances based on the selected staff member's eligibility, and which is subject to the withholding of approximately 20% for pension and medical insurance contributions.

Applicants who prove to be competent for the post but who are not successful in this competition may be offered an appointment in another post of a similar nature, which might become vacant in the near future, albeit at the same or lower grade, provided they meet the necessary requirements.

NATO is committed to diversity and inclusion, and strives to provide equal access to employment, advancement, and retention, independent of gender, age, nationality, ethnic origin, religion or belief, cultural background, sexual orientation, and disability. NATO welcomes applications of nationals from all member Nations.

Building integrity is a key element of NATO's core tasks. As an employer, NATO values commitment to the principles of integrity, transparency, and accountability in accordance with international norms and practices established for the defense and related security sector. Selected candidates are expected to be role models of integrity, and to promote good governance through ongoing efforts in their work.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Applications are to be submitted using NATO Talent Acquisition Platform (NTAP) (<https://nato.taleo.net/careersection/2/jobsearch.ftl?lang-en>).

Applications submitted by other means (e.g. mail, e-mail, fax, etc) are not accepted. More information to be found on these links:

[6 Tips for Applying to NATO](#)

[Application Process](#)

NTAP allows adding attachments. A copy of the qualification/certificate covering the highest level of education required by the job description must be provided as an attachment.

Essential information must be included in the application form. Particular attention should be given to Education and Experience section of the application form. The application should be in English.

Shortlisted candidates will be requested to provide original documentary evidence and a set of copies supporting statements in their applications.

After submitting your application, you will receive an acknowledgement of receipt of your application.

Remarks:

A) Only nationals from the 31 NATO member states can apply for vacancies at SHAPE.

B) Applications are automatically acknowledged within one working day after submission. In the absence of an acknowledgement please make sure the submission process is completed, or, re-submit the application.

C) The successful applicant will be required to attend a technical development course as part of the induction, which is held at different locations within the NATO network