



OPEN LETTER

Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
10 Downing Street
London SW1A 2AA
United Kingdom

Berlin, 28th January 2013.

Speech EU 2013

Dear Prime Minister Mr. David Cameron Esq,

With interest I have read your EU-speech. Allow me in taking the liberty to react on a few items of the principles of fairness, but first of all I very much like to give you my view about a worldwide misunderstanding in using the word "politics". In fact we should divide the understanding "politics" into two components, i.e. the "politics" and the politics operating by the system of the majority: "executive politics". A system based on the natural effects of "He who pays the piper calls the tune", for making all kinds of compromises.

As Aristotle's once said: "man is a political animal". So, politics is inherent to the individual human being. It is the meaning of the protection of collective values.¹ That means human beings and planet existence. To protect the collective values, also known as the general interest (intérêt général), will only be possible by law and that will be done by the "executive politics". That means the "executive politics" have to serve the "politics" and not vice versa as it is happening nowadays. To serve the "politics" will only be possible by the "general will" of Rousseau (la volonté générale); a team of thinkers to bring all arguments, all facts, all figures and all expectations in daylight. Just as it has been demanded by the movement of citizens "Stuttgart 21" (Dr. Heiner Geißler Süddeutsche Zeitung 7/10 und 13/10/10) and what the Prussian proletariat has done in 1848.

Referring to the fifth principle of fairness, you mentioned, **quote:** "So it is a vital interest for us to protect the integrity and fairness of the single market for all its members" **End quote.**

I sincerely hope that with "all its members", you mean all citizens of Europe. In my view, it should also mean that it should be fair to respect the organic and small family farming to secure knowledge and prosperity for all people in Europe, as a part of the single market. This, conformity the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR): providing **Article 5:** Right to Liberty and Security. **Article 8:** Right to respect for private and family life. This includes the right of the integrity of the body. **1st Protocol, Article.1** Right to peaceful enjoyment of property.

As far as I know his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales Prince Charles does wish the same. It is one of the private strongest growing parts of agriculture within the EU single market. Regarding this subject Pope Benedictus XVI said in the Parliament of Berlin on 22nd September 2011 as follows:

Quote: "If something is wrong in our relationship with reality, then we must all reflect seriously on the whole situation and we are all prompted to question the very foundations of our culture. Allow me to dwell a little longer on this point. The importance of ecology is no longer disputed. We must listen to the language of nature and we must answer accordingly. Yet I would like to underline a further point that is still largely disregarded, today as in the past: there is also an ecology of man. Man too has a nature that he must respect and that he cannot manipulate at will. Man is not merely self-creating freedom. Man does not create himself. He is intellect and will, but he is also nature, and his will is rightly ordered if he listens to his nature, respects

¹ The Song of the Earth the exquisite beauty by Gustav Mahler <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pleyx8R9RhU>

it and accepts himself for who he is, as one who did not create himself. In this way, and in no other, is true human freedom fulfilled." End quote. ²

Please let's welcome and keep this knowledge and natural diversity of the organic and small family farming, instead of trying to snuff it out by the so-called "innovation" economy of the pseudo science Gen- Cisgene and Nanotechnology (GMO), known as GENOMICS. A "real" economy without moral and without ethic.

It has been proven that the pseudo science of GMO seeds will contaminate neighbours ground sooner or later. It means neighbours agriculture of all people. The effect at the end will be that everybody will get genetic modified seeds and plants in his garden against his will. This beginning of genetic manipulation will change our natural biodiversity into a genetic modified biodiversity.³ That means that all people around the whole world are losing their knowledge about the natural biodiversity. A new knowledge will emerge. But, this new knowledge will than be no longer in the hands of the people, but by patents in the hands of the huge shareholders of the multinationals and hedge funds, who are the rich and elites of this world. It means a new absolutism. A top down system based on the natural effects "You should not bite the hand that feeds you".

The new *Codex Alimentarius* of the United Nations and FAO will protect their new properties. In fact stolen from the collective values of all individuals; the people. In other words, stolen by the "executive politics" from the "politics".

It means a very refined way of privatization of biodiversity. The same is happening with water nowadays.⁴ This form of greed is no longer acceptable. Is this the reason of the surveillance cameras in the UK and the Netherlands to protect the "executive politics", the elite and the officials of the institutes inclusive the policemen and women and young militaries? Even now there is a populist call for surveillance cameras in Berlin. It means the beginning of a Panopticon as has been announced in 2005 in the Netherlands by Prof. Dr. Paul Frissen.⁵

Further more you said, **quote:** "There is not, in my view, a single European demos. It is national parliaments, which are, and will remain, the true source of real democratic legitimacy and accountability in the EU." **End quote.**

The understanding "real politic" has been invented by August Ludwig von Rochau 1853.⁶ It is executive politics and economy against the "general interest" without moral and without ethic. To realize us what that means I give you the following example:

Quote: "The former Dutch Minister of Transport, Mr Van Schaijk of the Catholic People's Party (KVP), had enthusiastically praised the staff of the Dutch Railways on 17 September 1945 because they had operated the "trains of death" to Nazi Germany. He said, 'That was good for the Dutch economy at this time. **End quote** (The end of a myth Dr. Bob Smalhout. Tg 12/12/2010).

² The genius speech of Pope Benedictus XVI in the Parliament of Berlin on 22nd September 2011 <http://www.gentechnvrij.nl/plaatjesgen/robpausduitsetaal.pdf> German <http://www.gentechnvrij.nl/plaatjesgen/robpaus.pdf> Englisch

³ An example is the file Monsanto against the famous Canadian farmer Percy Schmeiser.

⁴ **Quote:** "Water and sanitation are a human right! Water is a public good, not a commodity...Quote end. That means the *volonté générale* of Rousseau should require governments to ensure and to provide all citizens with sufficient and clean drinking water and sanitation.

⁵ The Panopticon (Prison) is a concept to control a new unknown totalitarian system. . ('Hard op weg naar de totalitaire samenleving'. Prof. Dr. P. Frissen/CDA NRC 20/10/2005/p6). Powers that be, that means the supernatural council of Europe in Straatsburg will observe all the people in the democratic countries by restriction of freedom by cameras' storage of dna, fingerprints, electronic patient records, data and telephone supported by the tetras Politica.

⁶ **Quote:** "The word "Realpolitik" has been invented by August Ludwig von Rochau in 1853. It meant a farewell to freedom and democracy for a great part of the German population The Bourgeoisie became "real politics" under Bismarck, thus, nationalistic, anti-democratic and obedient. This "Realpolitik" culminated in the 1914 war." **End quote.** Rudolf Walther, How different is Germany 'TAZ 05/23/11.

For the understanding "**demos**" we have to distinguish demos as the population of the ancient times and demos in the modern times after the period of 1789 and 1848. The same distinction should be made for the understanding of populism of the ancient times and populism of the modern times since 1848. Populism of the modern means talking without knowing the arguments, facts, figures en expectations of the people generated by the general will of Rousseau (La volonté générale). Even the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights is populism nowadays. Please be so kind and see the jurisprudence "*Verlinden against the Netherlands*" Petition 3636/09 of 16th November 2010. It concerns the abolition of the actio popularis, as is happened on the 1st July 2005 in the Netherlands. Nobody can understand this jurisprudence. Only security people can see that Verlinden is against the Netherland. But why Verlinden against the Netherlands? **

The problem of the understanding of population (demos), is that they are anonymous. However the European Hymn "**All man become brothers**" (Beethoven/Schiller) gives the expression what the demos of Europe wants. It is one voice of nearly all the individual people of Europe. Would you be so kind to declare why this has disappeared from the European treaty of Lisbon of 2007/2009? http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0F_VNfmoB-s

The same has happened with the "general will" of Rousseau (la volonté générale). This idea is the voice of the demos in the modern times. That means the voice of the mass. In conformity with the duties of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).⁷ I feel it as my duty to draw your attention to the no return "**social contract**" of the 18th century. It is the will of the modern demos of Europe instead of the demos of the ancient times. The principle of the modern demos of Europe, in relation to the executive politics that means the legislature, are the duties of the Heads of State, inclusive the duty of Queen Elisabeth and Queen Beatrix, to attending that the executive politics serve the General Interest (**l'intérêt général**) of Madame Helvetius,⁸ an evolution of the holy "**bonum commune**" of Thomas Aquino, perfected by the general will of Rousseau (**la volonté générale**).

To control that this will be fulfilled should be the duty of all Heads of State, as mentioned by the volonté générale of Rousseau in the first French-American Human Rights of Marquis de Lafayette, of 1789, article 6.⁹ However, these duties have been vanished from the human rights. The quintessence that this has happened has to be found by Walter Bagehot.¹⁰ In his well-known essay of 1867 "The English Constitution", he changed the understanding "**duties**" into the understanding "**rights**". But the obligations of the Heads of State, conformity the Social contract are: **1st**) The duty to respect the information from the thinkers of the anonymous people how they, based on arguments, facts, figures and expectations, think about new laws, law changing, wars and other political questions. **2nd**) The duty to encourage the people to serve their duties for the general interest. **3rd**) The duty to warn people when they are coming into danger.

It is the only direction for an informed consent society. That means informing by consulting in advance instead of informing afterwards by populism of the majority principle of the friend services of the party politics.

In your second principle you said, **quote:** "*And we believe in our nations working together to protect the security and diversity of our energy supplies. To tackle climate change and global poverty. To work together against terrorism and organised crime. And to continue to welcome new countries into the EU.*" **End of quote.**

⁷ Preamble of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Quote: "Realizing that the individual, having duties to other individuals and to the community to which he belongs, is under a responsibility to strive for the promotion and observance of the rights recognized in the present Covenant." End quote.

⁸ Christmas speech 2012 of Queen Beatrix.

⁹ **QUOTE:** The general meeting for the Rights of Human beings took place on the 27th. of August 1789. This was proposed by Lafayette, who was impressed by the declaration of independence of the USA. In article 2 there will be found the rights of freedom, property, safety and resistance by repression. Art. 6: This article settles the General Will. However, herewith is meant the General Will of Rousseau (La Volonté Générale), not the will of principle of the majority. **END QUOTE.** Dietrich Schwanitz, "Education. Al what we have to know."

¹⁰ "Does may The King express his opinion?" Prof. Dr. Anton van Zijdervelt (FD 26/8/11)

Regarding the subject "terrorism" I like to remind you that Hitler called the Dutch resistance "terrorists". In article 2, of the first French-American Human Rights of Marquis de Lafayette, of 1789 there will be found the right of resistance by repression. It means when the 47 Heads of State of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, respect this article again than there will be no terrorists anymore in the world. The questions will then be: Why has a democracy of the "general will" of the people, based on arguments, facts, figures and expectations, not been maintained as it had been settled during the revolutions of 1789 and 1848? How was it possible that the rich decontextualized the sense of democracy into the principle of the majority?

Quote: *"For most of the matters that need to be regulated by law, the support of the majority can serve as a sufficient criterion. Yet it is evident that for the fundamental issues of law, in which the dignity of man and of humanity is at stake, the majority principle is not enough: everyone in a position of responsibility must personally seek out the criteria to be followed when framing laws."* **End of quote.** The genius speech of Pope Benedictus XVI in the Parliament of Berlin on 22nd September 2011

When the "majority principle" is not enough in this context, than remains automatically the "consent democracy". That means constitutional informed consent generated by the intelligence of the anonymous people (demos), by the general will of Rousseau (La volonté générale). That means: All arguments, all facts, all figures and all expectations should be brought up. Just as it has been demanded by the movement of citizens "Stuttgart 21" (Dr. Heiner Geißler Süddeutsche Zeitung 7/10 und 13/10/10).

The crucial question will then be: Are the 47 Heads of State represented in the Council of Europe in Strasbourg and the executive politics be able to produce the documents in which will be showed that they have got the approval from the European citizens in not having entered the 'Volonté Générale' of Rousseau into the current Human Rights in 1948? The same can be applied for the question about the "right of resistance by repression" (the political influence of Spinoza), article 2 and for sharpening of the right of uniting for the processes of opinion of 1848. Chapter 3, article 65, paragraph 2f of the EU convention of Lisbon 2007/2009 and as mentioned before the European Hymn: **"All people become brothers"**.

The people, that means the voice off **"All man become brothers"** in Europe and the world said **"no to GMO"**, based on the facts, arguments, figures and expectations, of the general will of Rousseau. Please see the protest of citizens and peasants in Berlin: <http://www.wir-haben-es-satt.de> and Poland. <http://protestrolnikow.pl> It is the same movement as the European Revolution of 1848. Please see the memorial of a peasant with a sword in his back in Nussdorf <http://www.landau-nussdorf.de> The same is happening now by the rich as they did before.

Based on above mentioned facts and arguments, I kindly request you to support the call for an "update" of the Human Rights done by the Jewish "public intellectual" Stéphane Hessel. (Suddeutsche Zeitung 17/07/12). Please be so kind and see also the letters of the *Foundation for the prevention of Abuse of Genetic Manipulation (VoMiGEN)* to Mr. Thorbjørn Jagland, chairman of the Board of the Council of Europe¹¹; our letter to President Bronislaw Komorowski of Poland,¹² and our letter to Mr. Herman van Rompuy, regarding **"particularisme"** and the **"volonté de tous"**.¹³

¹¹ <http://www.gentechvrij.nl/plaatjesgen/kalfrobbrief080811.pdf> ;

¹² www.vomigen.eu/plaatjesgen/Rob121115BronislawKomorowski.pdf

¹³ <http://www.gentechvrij.nl/plaatjesgen/vomigen120423%20Rompuyaagain.pdf>

I am looking forward to your answer, I remain most sincerely, your servant of the common interest*.

Foundation for the prevention of Abuse of Genetic Manipulation (VoMiGEN)

www.vomigen.eu Stichting ter Voorkoming Misbruik Genetische Manipulatie VoMiGEN).

Robert A. Verlinden.

*Verlinden former board member of the "Platform Biologica". Former member of the Advisory Board (a team of thinkers) of the Control Authority "SKAL" of the private logo "EKO", and former Vice Chairman of the Association for organic shops the Netherlands (VWN). He is the founder of the Foundation for the Prevention of Abuse of Genetic Manipulation. (VoMiGEN). Candidate of the local elections in Rotterdam on the 3rd of March 2010, representing a "citizens list" www.lijst11.nl www.weareeverywhere.eu In 2006 Verlinden was candidate number 17 of www.lijst14.nl A "citizens list" is a political movement (group) without a name of a political party. Both political movements have been hushed by the independent press freedom in the Netherlands in 2006 and 2010. That means freedom of silence, instead to respect the duties of the Declaration of Principles on the Conduct of Journalists "Code de Bordeaux" of 1954. *** Not only the press freedom discriminate these political movements but also The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in Strasbourg. Please see jurisprudence. "Verlinden (II) against the Netherlands' petition nr.35911/09 ECHR LNid11.OR (CD1) AVS / fme 8 August 2011*

**In honour of veteran resistance fighters and devotion to the earth and the world, there is a podium for servants who commit serving the interest of the common good, without giving priority to their own issues.*

****Quote:** *European Court of Human Rights. Mr. R.A.Verlinden, Van Speykstraat 87, 3011 VE Rotterdam, Netherlands. ECHR –LNid11.0 R (CD1) AVS/svl16th November 2011. Petition number 3636/09 Verlinden against the Netherlands. Dear Mr. Verlinden. Herewith I inform you that on the 9th November 2010 the European Court of Human Rights, sitting as a single Judge (A. Gyulumayan) decided that your petition filed on January 12, 2009, under the above number as registered, is not admissible. The Court found that it was not satisfied under the requirements of the Treaty. Given all information available to the Court, and insofar as the matters complained of are within his competence, the Court considers that this is in no way indicates that a violation has occurred of rights and freedoms as provided for in the Convention and its Protocols. This decision is final and is not subject to any form of appeal either at the Court, including its Great Room or in any other institute. You will therefore understand that the Registry will not be able to provide any further details on the deliberations of the single Judge or make any further correspondence about the decision taken in this case. You will not receive further documents from the Court regarding this case and, under instructions from the Court, the file must be destroyed one year after the date of this decision. Such notice shall be in accordance with Article 52A of the Rules of Court. Yours faithfully. On behalf of the Court. Agnes Steyn, Registrar' **End quote***

In fact is these jurisprudence is dealing about the **actio popularis**. The actio popularis was in the Netherlands silent abolished on the 1st of July 2005. The actio popularis was the right of every individual to go to court with objections to Administrative matters. In fact it is a part of the fundamental rights: the inalienable right of the individual against the state over. Dutch Jurisprudence shows that the abolishment of the actio popularis is one of the reasons of the unnecessary increase of cancer. Please see the exemplary jurisprudence 'Voor pieren in de Vinex is er geen doorkomen aan' <http://www.rvdj.nl/2007/19> Versus the actio popularis the judge is now based on the French legal maxim: "**Pas d'intérêt, pas d'action**". As the former Minister Thom de Graaf wrote to me.



*** (Adopted by 1954 World Congress of the IFJ. Amended by the 1986 World Congress.)

IFJ Declaration of Principles on the Conduct of Journalists

Quote: "This international Declaration is proclaimed as a standard of professional conduct for journalists engaged in gathering, transmitting, disseminating and commenting on news and information in describing events.

1. Respect for truth and for the right of the public to truth is the first duty of the journalist. 2. In pursuance of this duty, the journalist shall at all times defend the principles of freedom in the honest collection and publication of news, and of the right of fair comment and criticism. 3. The journalist shall report only in accordance with facts of which he/she knows the origin. The journalist shall not suppress essential information or falsify documents. 4. The journalist shall use only fair methods to obtain news, photographs and documents. 5. The journalist shall do the utmost to rectify any published information which is found to be harmfully inaccurate. 6. The journalist shall observe professional secrecy regarding the source of information obtained in confidence. 7. The journalist shall be aware of the danger of discrimination being furthered by the media, and shall do the utmost to avoid facilitating such discrimination based on, among other things, race, sex, sexual orientation, language, religion, political or other opinions, and national or social origins. 8. The journalist shall regard as grave professional offences the following: * plagiarism; * malicious misrepresentation; * calumny, slander, libel, unfounded accusations; * acceptance of a bribe in any form in consideration of either publication or suppression. 9. Journalists worthy of the name shall deem it their duty to observe faithfully the principles stated above. Within the general law of each country the journalist shall recognise in professional matters the jurisdiction of colleagues only, to the exclusion of every kind of interference by governments or others."

Quote End.

Enclosure:

Copy of the letter of 8th August 2011 to Mr. Thorbjørn Jagland, chairman of the Board of the Council of Europe;

Copy of the letter of 15th November 2012 to President Bronislaw Komorowski of Poland.

Copy of the letter of 23rd April 2012 to the EU President Mr. Herman van Rompuy,