



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power
Crimes Against Humanity Need Dealt with Under the Law

Tonight I lost subscribers and I'm okay with that—but with a caveat. When I write that certain members of US Administrations (to numerous to list), are guilty of capital crimes and should suffer consequences for those acts under the law, I mean—*under the law*. As an adherent to the Constitution, I do not condone extra-judicial acts of violence.

Could there be a time when Americans would, by necessity, have to take down a tyrannical government by force? There could be, just as America used force to separate from Britain, but only in terms of the Declaration of Independence. Thomas Jefferson made the point that the federal government might, from time to time, have to be removed by the citizens. But it would need to be done legally—not as a lynch mob.

There is one crime in the constitution, treason. A capital crime? I think it is. Who in recent history (in my opinion), conducted treason and subject to trial? Biden, W. Bush, Bill/Hillary, Cheney, Blinkin, Sullivan, Fauci, Trump—and most of his advisors/cabinet.

What are the crimes they could be charged with? The Nuremberg trials (1945–1946) were a landmark in international law that established individual accountability for, and legally defined, the 'crime of aggression' as the 'supreme international crime'. When discussing Nuremberg in the context of

treason, the UN Charter, and the Geneva Convention, it is characterized in the following way: to initiate a *war of aggression* is not only an international crime; it is *the supreme international crime*, differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself *the accumulated evil of the whole*.

Precursor to the UN Charter: Although the Nuremberg trials took place just as the UN Charter was adopted, the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal (London Charter) was the first instrument to define *Crimes Against Peace*, which meant planning, initiating, or waging a war of aggression. This definition laid the foundation for the prohibition of the use of force in Article 2(4) of the UN Charter.

Individual Responsibility: Nuremberg shattered the idea that only states can be guilty of aggression, establishing that *crimes against international law are committed by men, not by abstract entities*.

Nuremberg and Treason (Constitutional Context): Rejection of the *Act of State* Defense: While domestic treason involves a citizen betraying their own country, Nuremberg dealt with a different issue: international accountability. The defendants argued they were acting on behalf of the German State and should have immunity. The tribunal rejected this, ruling that the obligation to follow international law outweighs the obligation to follow national law.

Nuremberg and the Geneva Convention—Precursor to Modern Laws: The Nuremberg trials were based on the violation of existing international laws, such as the Hague Conventions. However, often brutal, atrocities exposed

at Nuremberg directly led to the expansion of international law, culminating in the 1949 Geneva Conventions, which provide greater protections for civilians and prisoners of war.

Crimes Against Humanity: A key innovation at Nuremberg was the prosecution of *Crimes Against Humanity*, which allowed for the punishment of atrocities committed by a government against its own citizens, not just against foreign nationals.

Nuremberg is described as the *true beginning of international criminal law* because it took the concept of aggressive war and made it an individual, criminally punishable act.

Those are the codes—so how do they apply? To conduct murder/genocide/eradication of a people, extra-judicially, is an act of aggression—codified at Nuremberg as the worst of crimes. In terms of aggressive murder/genocide conducted by the United States and Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, most of his government, along with Donald Trump and most of his advisors should be charged (from my vantage), with the most heinous of war crimes and brought to justice. For that being justice—I have no doubt.

Is it going to happen? Of course not. Just as Trump promised to go after Hillary Clinton for her crimes and did not because he was getting ready to out-aggress Hillary Clinton/Victoria Nuland. As many of his predecessors—Trump will likely die in his bed.

A reader writes: 'I am surprised you are still writing, maybe the powers that be aren't as vengeful as history has shown.' I wonder about the same thing. Will some of my colleagues and I be subjected to the vengeance of

history before this plays out? I'm not sure but I want it known that I abide by the law of the land, and I neither support nor encourage anyone to take extrajudicial actions against the government.

To take the law into one's own hands is to do what I accuse the US government of doing—something outside the bounds of justice—rendering us no better than those we accuse of treason and acts of aggression punishable by death, under the law. But even under the law do I advocate these individuals suffer capital punishment? I'd be okay with seeing Trump picking up debris along the interstate stretch—Ashland to Medford.

The only way I gain new readers (and I'm losing a bunch), is from the middle—not the right or left. If you know someone who might benefit from my articles, please forward them so I can maintain subscribers against un-subscribers. Get my articles by e-mail with a request, or comment: erik@neverhadaboss.com. Thank you.