

Prof. Dr. Aris Christidis

Pestalozzistr. 68
35394 Giessen
Tel.: +49 / 641 / 480 81 80
Mob. : +49 / 172 / 844 81 22
Email: christidis@acm.org

Press release on Petition No. 1079/2011

I'm protesting with other petitioners in the EU Parliament in Brussels today, because our requests have been canceled from the agenda of the planned meeting of the Committee on Petitions. In formal terms, it is about postponing the public consultation of my petition.

In essence, the point is

- the genital mutilation and the sexual abuse of my children, tolerated and partially furthered by the German state; it was definitely condemned by the responsible Federal Commissioner for the reprocessing of sexual child abuse and several involved psychologists, but German courts refuse to hear these experts;
- the state-imposed, enforced Germanization of my children who have been signed out from Greek lessons with half a dozen of legal decisions without taking into account their will and who have been kept away from their relatives (all living in Greece) with another two-digit number decisions;
- the attempt of several government agencies of the Federal Republic of Germany
 - to criminalize me with faked criminal acts, rigged personnel records and court records - most recently on children trafficking ,
 - to psychiatrize me or to remove me from my position with a favorable expertise,
 - to ruin me economically with unnecessary trials or with faked fees.

The beginning of this conflict (after a nearly 50-year conflict-free life) dated on my public statement against the bombing of Yugoslavia (1999). After a series of phone announcements that the ministry in charge did not want to employ me as a professor, a long series of oppressive treatments began, first at official duty level, later (as part of my divorce) at the family level.

The background of this situation is the German executive that has been acting independently for several years, whose policy is determined by the dominant parties almost regardless of election results. Thus, the parliaments (the only elected state power) are virtually disempowered. With the virtual abolition of the accusation of law perversion (issued implicitly since the founding of the Federal Republic of Germany) and the pressure of the professional career of judges, the executive succeeds in thwarting any enforcement of human and civil rights against their will.

Meanwhile, a more refined division of labor among the instances of German justice has prevailed: Federal Courts (Federal Court of Justice, Federal Constitutional Court) deal almost exclusively with the disciplining of the legislature. Trials for individual rights are decided exclusively within the borders of single federal states, hardly ever reaching the Federal Courts. In addition, if possible, all cases are handled as non-public family or mental health care trials, in which one has little influence on the protocol that is anyway not public. For example, my complaint about the officially tolerated abuse of my children was interpreted as a libel suit to the children's mother. Even 7 years after divorce, we were considered as a family by court, the role of public authorities was ignored.

When it is impossible to exclude the public for formal reasons, the audience is arbitrarily kept away by repeatedly changing court dates and rooms, or by deciding "by correspondence", or even by proceeding with court sessions, to which nobody was summoned, so, judges can decide by discretion, because none of the parties involved has appeared. Then, the voices of concerned European partner countries are in vain.

In this context, Youth Welfare Services (Jugendamt) play a particularly elaborate role:

They represent a legally barely comprehensible instance and act on the request of the executive without a court order or even against court decisions (see the Porombka case, Petition 128/2007).

The present case of my children shows how the German Jugendamt understand their social mission of child protection: The two employees of the responsible agency, who were successively in charge of my children and spoke up for them were withdrawn by the trunk line, so there was no more contact for me.

My petition originally opposed the state-covered abuse of my children and their degradation to homeless "Displaced Persons" as well as against my degeneration to a migrant (which I never have been), who must stay in Germany and work for financing the Germanization of his children, without being allowed to even ask the doctors about the "progress" of their abuse.

My today's protest is also directed against the attempt of German Members of the EU Parliament to declare violation of human (esp. children) rights in Germany as private "*custody disputes*" and (according to Dr. P. Jahr, MEP) as subject to "*the respective national law*".

Of particular significance is an indication of the state of Hesse in its reply (25/11/2013) to an application filed by me for a state liability suit because of intimidation against me and use of sexual torture against my children: In the Google search with my name, the state's lawyers stated, "*one will recognize certain attitudes and convictions*".

At least the intention to trivialize a policy of disregarding securitized civil and human rights and openly declare political trials to be private matters of national jurisdiction makes the proceeding at the EU Committee on Petitions a political issue.

Prof. Dr. A. Christidis, Brussels, 1st of April 2014

Further information (for limited time):

<http://homepages.thm.de/christ/Start/EU-Pet/>