



From Sanctions to Martial Law and a State of Emergency

Extrajudicial Political Persecution and the West's War Against Russia : a Political Science Perspective.

Patrik Baab

Tue 30 Jun 2026 36 min read

Editor's note: This speech was delivered at the AfD's first conference on democracy, held in Berlin on June 27, 2026.

Sanctions are an instrument of power used to advance economic interests, political power, and cultural hegemony.[1] They can affect international relations, economic relations, criminal law, the labor market, or everyday violations of rules.

Today, however, they do not serve to uphold democratic values or prevent human rights violations. Rather, they are a weapon for securing the neo-imperialist dominance of the West and its leading power, the United States. They serve not only to force the subjugation of states beyond the use of direct military force, but also to eliminate domestic political opposition through extrajudicial, arbitrary measures and to enforce preemptive obedience among the general population by instilling fear.

I would like to illustrate this with four examples: 1. The measures taken against the German journalist Hüsein Dogru as an example of the transition to anti-democratic rule. 2. The sanctions against retired Swiss Colonel Jacques Baud as an example of the supranational nature of sanctions. 3. The example of Ana Perez from Cuba: how sanctions, as an imperial, neocolonial instrument of oppression, affect an individual, and 4. The Magnitsky Act as a weapon to destabilize Russia in the struggle to secure U.S. hegemony.

I will show that sanctions are an instrument of domination employed by the United States and implemented independently by its European vassals. This serves as a particularly telling example of submission to the leading power at the cost of destroying one's own economy, democracy, and the rule of law. The goal is to exploit the vassals more intensely and to perpetuate the war against Russia.

Example 1: Hüssein Dogru - Transition to Antidemocratic Rule

Journalist Hüssein Dogru is a German citizen and was born in Germany. He was sanctioned by the Council of the European Union on May 20, 2025. The justification given was that he was spreading Russian disinformation. Dogru denies this. There was no court ruling.

An instrument of foreign policy power is being used domestically against a citizen without a legal basis for punishment, without a ruling in accordance with the rule of law, and without a hearing for the person concerned. This represents a new form of arbitrary rule.

Dogrus's bank accounts were frozen, his financial transactions restricted, and his access to money reduced to a monthly allowance of 506 euros. His bank often froze even this amount. The accounts of Dogrus's wife and mother were also frozen at times. The couple has three children: two newborns and a 7-year-old son. The well-being of his children is at risk because he can no longer provide for them.

The European Union bases the imposition of sanctions on Article 215 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.[2] Under paragraph 2, the Council of the European Union may, on a joint proposal from the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the Commission, adopt restrictive measures against natural or legal persons, as well as groups or non-state entities. At the secondary level, the sanctions are based on Regulation 2024/2642. The core element consists of financial sanctions under Article 2(1): "All funds and economic resources owned or held by, or in the possession of, the natural or legal persons, organizations, or entities listed in Annex I, or held or controlled by them, shall be frozen." [3]

In January 2026, the German Bundestag transposed EU Directive 2024/1226 into national law and tightened its provisions. The governing parties—the CDU/CSU and the SPD—voted in favor. The Greens (B 90/Grüne) and The Left abstained. The AfD voted against it. One of the most significant changes is the reclassification of numerous violations from administrative offenses to criminal offenses. This applies to certain transaction bans, payment bans, and acts of circumvention, as well as violations of the so-called "everyone's duty," which requires everyone to report potential sanctions violations to the authorities.[4] This insidiously intertwines extralegal sanctions with criminal law.

In effect, Dogru is thus deprived of all his rights. This violates human dignity (Art. 1 of the German Basic Law) and nullifies the fundamental rights enshrined in the Basic Law. Anyone who helps him is liable to prosecution. His wife's and mother's bank accounts were frozen "due to your son's existing control over the funds." [5]

The Cologne Administrative Court has since lifted the freeze on his wife's account, citing "serious doubts as to the legality" of the measures imposed by the Central Office for Sanctions Enforcement.[6]

The allegations against Hüssein Dogru are implausible for the simple reason that Dogru is critical of Russia and has condemned the Russian military entry into Ukraine as an invasion.[7] Freezing the bank accounts of relatives is tantamount to the reintroduction of the Nazi practice of "clan liability." The punishment is not based on proof of individual guilt, but on the logic of guilt by association.

Ninon Colneric, a legal scholar and longtime judge at the European Court of Justice, and her colleague Alina Miron from the University of Angers in France conclude in a legal opinion: "Based on the provisions of the 'UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights' (ICCPR) regarding freedom of expression, the analysis provides evidence that Council Decision (CFSP) 2025/963 and Council Regulation 2025/964 are incompatible with the protection of human rights." This refers to the statements and publications in the 17th EU sanctions package that turned Dogru and others into "unpersons." They violate Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union of December 2000 (freedom of expression and freedom of information). They also violate Article 45 of the Charter, which guarantees EU citizens freedom of movement, as well as Articles 15 and 17, which establish the right to property and the freedom to choose one's profession.[8]

All of these measures are illegal, inconsistent with the rule of law, and unconstitutional: "The response of European law to such situations," according to Axel Fersen of the SPD's Eppler Circle, "has been established for nearly two decades. It is known as the Kadi Doctrine. The Court of Justice of the European Union ruled in Case C-402/05 P (Kadi I) and in the subsequent decision C-584/10 P (Kadi II) that even sanctions motivated by security policy must respect the rights of the defense, the right to a fair hearing, effective judicial protection, and the right to property; that the Council must prove the validity of the grounds, rather than the affected party having to prove their innocence; that a general, vague justification is insufficient; and that even in the case of confidential information, judicial review must not be rendered meaningless. If the EU institution cannot provide such proof, the listing is invalid. The Union's own case law regarding its own instrument is that simple and that unambiguous. A Union that does not apply this doctrine within its own ranks but instead circumvents it deprives itself of its credibility as a community based on the rule of law." [9]

A grand coalition in the Bundestag supports these anti-democratic and illegal sanctions. Only the AfD members of parliament voted against transposing them into national law.[10] The active role played by the CDU/CSU and SPD, and the abstentions by B90/Greens and The Left, show that the anti-democratic forces are not to be found in the AfD, but rather within the ruling party cartel. This documents a new “extremism of the center”[11], an involution of parliamentary democracy[12] into a new form of authoritarian rule, while the AfD and BSW oppose the hollowing out of parliamentarism. This illustrates the transformation of democracy into a new, anti-democratic, and autocratic form of rule. The ruling party cartel is thus striving to introduce a dictatorship on velvet feet. It amounts to a “permanent coup d’état.”[13]

More than 340 state-funded nongovernmental organizations are aiding the ruling party cartel in its seizure of power and the transformation of parliamentary democracy into a state of intimidation by publicly defaming so-called “disinformation actors.”[14] They are the transmission belts of authoritarian rule, for they bring about a structural transformation of the public sphere into one of censorship and denunciation, thereby shattering the space for democratic debate. Together with extralegal sanctions, they serve to generate fear in order to enforce preemptive obedience among the population and to hollow out democratic processes.

Example 2: Jacques Baud—NATO is pulling the strings behind the scenes

Jacques Baud is a Swiss military analyst, a former colonel in the Swiss Military Intelligence Service, a former employee of the United Nations and NATO, and the author of numerous books in which he draws exclusively on Western sources but clearly diverges from NATO and EU propaganda. He, too, is accused of spreading Russian disinformation ([Here is our complete coverage of Jacques Baud](#)).

Like Hüssein Dogru, Jacques Baud has also been stripped of all his rights. He no longer has access to his bank accounts in the EU. He is no longer allowed to travel and is therefore unable to return to his home country. No one is allowed to support him; doing so would violate the sanctions. Even his Swiss bank, UBS, temporarily froze his account entirely. Following massive public protests, at least his pension can now be paid out again and his health insurance premiums can be deducted.

Jacques Baud has received a great deal of support from the citizens of Brussels. Passersby on the street offer him words of encouragement. Neighbors and local residents cook for him, do his shopping, and slip him food and money. The Swiss “Freiheitstrychler” (“Freedom Bell Ringers”) brought him food from his homeland and demonstrated in front of the Swiss Embassy in Brussels.

After some time, Switzerland lodged a half-hearted protest with the EU but took no further action. Neither was the EU representative in Bern summoned, nor was Jacques Baud issued a diplomatic passport to grant him diplomatic immunity and thus ensure his legal protection. An embassy counselor explained to the “Freedom Bell Ringers”: “We can’t just issue a diplomatic passport to every broke tourist in Thailand!” By saying this, he implied that a former Swiss officer who served his country in war zones and crisis areas should be treated the same as a sex tourist. This reveals the attitude. Despite growing public protests, Switzerland is going along with the sanctions and thereby submitting to the directives from Brussels. Swiss neutrality today exists largely on paper and has become worthless in practice.[15]

Jacques Baud denies the allegations. He points out that his analyses are based solely on Western sources, not Russian ones. He suspects that the sanctions against him were imposed at the initiative of the French government. For one thing, he says, “it was Paris’s turn,” and for another, his publisher, Max Milo, is based in Paris. His lawyers’ strategy is not to challenge the sanctions in principle, but to have their client removed from the sanctions list.

The Berlin-based law firm Hummel Legal concludes that, in imposing sanctions against Jacques Baud and others, the Council of the European Union is exceeding its authority by interfering in internal societal spaces for the expression of opinion. The accusation of “supporting Russian narratives” is a vague and generic charge, violates the principle of specificity under the rule of law, and allows for arbitrary application. The decision violates the freedom of expression under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, the freedom of the press under Article 11 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the freedom to choose an occupation under Article 15 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the fundamental right to freedom of movement under Article 45 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons with Switzerland, the fundamental right to property under Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, and the right to a fair trial under Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Council disregards the case law of the European Court of Justice and flouts the procedural principles of the rule of law. The conclusion: “The sanction decision of December 15, 2025, against Jacques Baud violates fundamental principles of the rule of law and infringes upon his fundamental rights. The sanction decision against Jacques Baud must be rescinded.”[16]

The wave of repression against opponents of the war and the government was initiated by NATO. At their 2023 summit in Vilnius, the governments of the member states announced that they would step up their cooperation with the EU in combating so-called “disinformation.”[17] This suggests that NATO is pulling the strings behind the scenes in the fight

against dissenting opinions. With its “Strategic Agenda 2024–2029,” announced in June 2024, the EU shifted course toward a war-readiness stance. In it, the Council of the European Union promises to “strengthen the EU’s resilience as part of a comprehensive approach covering all threats and the whole of society.” In doing so, the EU classifies anything it considers “disinformation” as an attempt at destabilization and places it on the same level as terrorism and violent extremism.[18]

Norbert Häring rightly points out that the EU is thereby effectively declaring critics of the government and NATO to be enemies of the state. As a result, an undeclared state of martial law already prevails in the EU: “This means that NATO is effectively governing behind the scenes, and the usual constitutional guarantees for peacetime—such as freedom of expression and freedom of information—no longer apply when issues important to NATO are at stake.” [19] Last year, the German federal government declared that it is bound by secret NATO objectives.[20] Research shows that the governments of NATO member states use all social organizations and forces as conduits to subject individuals who are guided by the peace mandate of the German Basic Law to reprisals.[21]

The EU thus presents itself as a supranational, lawless, and anti-democratic entity. It imposes measures to circumvent the rule of law in coordination with NATO. These extralegal sanctions are therefore part of martial law. They precede the full imposition of martial law, are intended to destroy the existence of political dissidents, and to force preemptive obedience among the EU population by instilling fear. They are thus intended not only to prepare for war against Russia but also to pave the way for the declaration of a state of emergency.

Example 3: Anna Perez—Sanctions That Threaten Health and Lead to Death

You don’t know Ms. Ana Perez. She plays no role in the political debate; no one gives her a voice. She is one of the millions of victims of U.S. and EU sanctions policies. Her trail disappears somewhere between Havana and French Guiana.

In 2012, I received a call from a family I’m friends with in Santiago de Cuba: Their daughter Ana was in poor health; she had only three teeth left and could no longer chew. They didn’t have the money for dental treatment because they had to pay the clinic for the materials—if they were even available. I promised to help.

The poor dental health is a consequence of the sanctions the U.S. has imposed on Cuba since the revolution. This is because obtaining milk, milk powder, cheese, and sausage has been a problem on the island for years. As a result, parents—lacking sweets—let their children chew on sugarcane. It tastes sweet, but it’s poison for the teeth.

My own dentist advised against it. He said the cost of a complete dental restoration would be very high. It would require an artificial tooth root made of titanium or ceramic, which would be implanted into the jawbone. In addition, an artificial abutment would be needed as a base for the dental prosthesis. Third, a screw—also made of titanium—would be required as a prosthetic element for fixation. He said he would provide me with the necessary components, which would help keep the costs down.

Afterward, I wanted to discuss this with the dentist treating me in Havana. To my surprise, she said, “You don’t need to bring me any replacement parts.” She explained that while the materials I mentioned were subject to U.S. sanctions and could not be imported, “We have another way of making dental implants. We make them out of ivory!”

That left me speechless. After all, the ivory trade is heavily restricted internationally and largely banned. So how does the ivory get to Cuba? Then it suddenly dawned on me: The Cubans fought in Angola from 1975 to 1991. That deployment sealed the end of South African apartheid and Namibia’s independence. The export of ivory for medical purposes is strictly prohibited. But old trade contacts dating back to the era of the wars of independence apparently make a covert ivory trade possible.

In response to the Cuban Revolution and the expropriation of U.S. companies, the United States has imposed sanctions on Cuba since 1960. These include a comprehensive embargo: Nearly all economic transactions between U.S. citizens and companies are prohibited. The de facto oil blockade has led to massive energy shortages and power outages. Cuba is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, which is why travelers from Cuba can no longer easily enter the U.S. via ESTA. The financial restrictions have led institutions such as Visa and Mastercard to temporarily suspend payments to Cuba.

The sanctions have brought Cuba’s healthcare system to the brink of collapse. The medical system, once considered exemplary, is now suffering from a humanitarian crisis. In practice, extraterritorial financial restrictions, logistical hurdles, and fuel shortages are hindering medical care. Even basic antibiotics, painkillers such as aspirin, and anesthetics are in short supply in hospitals. Newborn care is now severely limited; according to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, infant mortality has doubled to 9.9 per 1,000 births, and the survival rate for children with cancer has dropped from 85% to 65%.

This means: Sanctions kill. According to a study by Francisco Rodríguez and colleagues, the results of which were published in the medical journal *The Lancet*, sanctions imposed by the United States and the European Union were responsible for 564,258 deaths annually from 1971 to 2021. This figure is significantly higher than the annual number of direct war casualties—106,000 deaths. [22] The total number of deaths during the period in question thus amounts to more than 28 million.

Sanctions are restrictive foreign policy instruments that are frequently applied to wide-ranging economic transactions with the aim of forcing a change in behavior through punitive measures. According to the Global Sanctions Database, the frequency and duration of sanctions have steadily increased since 1950, while their success rate in achieving their stated goal remains at around 30%. All economic sanctions have an adverse effect on human health. This is because they restrict access to medical products and health services, impair mental health, and undermine the human right to health.[23]

One-quarter of all countries were subject to sanctions between 2010 and 2022, most of them in Africa. [24] These sanctions typically involve the freezing of foreign assets, trade embargoes, or financial restrictions. They aim to destabilize countries that do not submit to the West's rules. Unless they are imposed with the approval of the United Nations—as was the case, for example, with some sanctions against apartheid-era South Africa—they are all illegal.

Sanctions are therefore not a tool for enforcing human rights or democracy. They are aimed at blackmail, inciting popular revolt, and regime change.[25] They are a neocolonial instrument of power wielded by the West and its leading power, the United States, and are part of their strategy to subjugate third countries. All this talk of human rights is hollow, self-serving propaganda intended to obscure political and economic interests. Especially since the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has sought to use sanctions to advance its interests.[26]

In addition, sanctions trigger strategies to circumvent them. Where they push target countries to the brink of economic collapse—as in the case of Cuba—they plunge those states into political instability and civil wars. The Cuban government is currently preparing for a protracted guerrilla war in the event of a U.S. invasion.[27]

Example 4: The Magnitsky Act—Propaganda Lies and the Sanctions War Against Russia

Filmmaker Andrej Nekrasov went through a nightmare with his 2016 hybrid of feature film and documentary, “The Magnitsky Act—Behind the Scenes”: massive criticism from the propaganda press and political backlash.[28]

Nekrasov's interest was piqued by media reports about 36-year-old lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. According to the reports, Magnitsky had been arrested, tortured, and killed by Russian authorities because he had uncovered a \$230 million tax fraud. This is a story told by American hedge fund manager William Browder (see our article from October 4, 2023, “[Bill Browder: The So-Called ‘Human Rights Activist’—Who Himself Became Rich Through Shady Deals.](#)”). Browder rose to become the largest foreign investor in Russia: By the time of his expulsion in 2005, his fund had swelled to \$4 billion.[29] Nekrasov is enthusiastic about Browder's story. His film is funded by public broadcasting as well as Norwegian and Finnish sources.[30]

However, the narrative of corruption and state terrorism begins to unravel as the investigation progresses. Inconsistencies emerge that give Nekrasov and his editor pause in the editing room. Magnitsky increasingly appears not as the young, talented whistleblower, but as a mere accountant in William Browder's financial empire. Browder, who styles himself as Putin's number one enemy and a champion of human rights, gets tangled up in half-truths and obfuscations.[31]

In the end, even Nekrasov—a critic of Putin—concludes that Browder lied and fabricated his story to cover up his own illegal financial dealings, that Magnitsky was an accomplice in the cover-up, that there were verifiable grounds for suspicion underlying his arrest, and that he died in prison due to health issues and medical negligence, not as a result of torture.

Magnitsky was not actually a lawyer, but an accountant—an auditor at a law firm that Browder had been using for many years. In Magnitsky's original handwritten statement to the police, no one is accused by name of stealing the allegedly missing \$230 million in tax payments. Nekrasov's final verdict is that Browder is not a businessman of integrity, but rather the shrewd operator of a complex network of shell companies with ties to Russian gangsters—and he concludes that Magnitsky must have known about this. Nekrasov also suggests that Browder exploited Magnitsky's death to divert attention from his own shady dealings.[32]

Browder used Russian front men to acquire, among other things, shares in Gazprom, which were not allowed to be sold to foreigners in order to protect valuable companies. When Browder realized that with Nekrasov he was not getting the desired result, he cut the interview short and warned the director that he “had better not go into that.”[33]

The film was largely banned from distribution—not through overt censorship, but through a propaganda campaign and legal threats from financial investor William Browder and his associates.[34] The goal was to control public opinion.[35] Browder managed to push the Magnitsky Act through Congress. [36] It is important to note that, due to his business deals and his use

of tax loopholes, the financial investor renounced his U.S. citizenship in 1998[37] and became a British citizen, and that he was forced to leave Russia in 2003 following charges of tax evasion amounting to \$40 million. In 2005, his visa was revoked. [38]

In July 2016, Russian authorities provided the U.S. Department of Justice with comprehensive information regarding the allegations against Browder and submitted a 1,100-page investigative file. Additional information was shared in August. The Russian Prosecutor General inquired nine times about the progress of the investigation in the United States. The U.S. Department of Justice showed no interest in investigating the violation of its own tax laws. Meanwhile, Browder used his demonstrably false statements and his illegally obtained profits—which had been funneled into the U.S. via offshore companies—to fund his lobbying efforts for the Magnitsky Act and to financially support the election campaigns of Democratic Party politicians.[39]

According to Russian prosecutors, William Browder was recruited by the British intelligence agency MI6 as an agent under the code name “Solomon” throughout his entire stay in Russia.[40] When asked, he denies being an intelligence agent. [41] However, the hasty support for Browder and his possible involvement with intelligence agencies show that Browder’s activities were “part of a planned political campaign driven by powerful financial interests and forces of the ‘Deep State’ that profited from the plundering of Russia in the 1990s.”[42]

The case became something of a symbol in the West of criminal activities by the Russian state and led to the enactment of the Magnitsky Act in the United States, which imposed sanctions on Russian officials. The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act was passed by the U.S. Congress in 2012 as a bipartisan bill and signed by then-President Obama. This was followed in 2017 by “The Global Magnitsky Act,” which empowers the U.S. to impose sanctions for human rights violations worldwide.[43] In 2019, the European Parliament passed a corresponding resolution calling on all member states to enact laws similar to those of the U.S.[44]

Ultimately, the goal here is to impose sanctions on Russia by presenting false information—or, in other words, to use lies as part of the economic war against Russia. This, in turn, demonstrates that such sanctions are purely arbitrary measures. The Magnitsky Act is just one example of the many sanctions imposed by the U.S. and the EU against Russia.

The concept is outlined in theoretical terms in the RAND Corporation’s paper “Overextending and Unbalancing Russia.” The report examines how a series of measures—fostering domestic protests, supplying weapons to Ukraine, and damaging Russia’s reputation—could weaken and destabilize Russia. RAND notes that measures designed to impose economic costs would have a particularly high probability of success, including trade and financial sanctions, which would need to be comprehensive and multilateral.[45] It further states that military aid to Ukraine would “provoke a war between Russia and Ukraine” and that this would be “a very long, costly war for Russia,” “which Ukraine would almost certainly lose.” [46] The destruction of Ukraine was thus factored in as a means to weaken Russia in every conceivable way.

Yet the sanctions are missing their mark and proving to be a boomerang.

Michele Geraci, Italy’s Deputy Minister of the Economy, has explained why the sanctions against Russia are missing their mark: 1. They are based on wishful thinking, and their effectiveness has not been evaluated. 2. The sanctions are being thwarted by the resilience of a country that is self-sufficient in energy and resources. 3. The share of gas exports to the EU has been massively overestimated. They account for only 2.2% of the Russian GDP, not 25–30% as assumed. 4. Russia’s resilience as a nation has been underestimated; the people are not rebelling against Putin but are rallying behind his policies. 5. The ability of the Russian government and the Central Bank of Russia to counteract the sanctions pressure that has existed since 2014 through fiscal and monetary policy measures was underestimated. 6. Illusions about the strategy of internationally isolating Russia. Only 40 out of 193 countries have joined the sanctions regime; all 153 others continue to trade with Russia.[47]

The European Union—and the German federal government in particular—has thus plunged the economy into a cycle of recession. Those in charge see investment in the military-industrial complex and the political persecution of government critics as the only ways out.

The Result

The sanctions imposed by the EU Council and individual member states violate the law and the German Basic Law. The EU is using the sanctions list as a weapon against critics and is maneuvering itself ever deeper into an abyss of lawlessness. [48]

The sanctions policy undermines the core elements of fundamental rights. It operates without an indictment, without a court order, without a hearing, and without a defense. The EU disregards the European Convention on Human Rights and European case law.[49]

These sanctions are either measures imposed by a supranational organization that lacks democratic legitimacy or unilateral measures taken by a hegemonic power that have not been approved by the United Nations. The Council of the European Union is composed of the executive bodies—that is, the government representatives of the member states—who were not elected by their parliaments to exercise legislative functions at the supranational level. This glaring democratic deficit is being exploited to undermine the rule of law in the member states.[50]

The sanctions are part of a new martial law that establishes a system of law without due process and grants authorities power without judicial proceedings. This new martial law can be seen as part of preparations for war. The apparent aim is to acclimate the public to new forms of arbitrary rule, which will then make it easier to declare a state of emergency. In a state of emergency, we will all become Hüssein Dogru and Jacques Baud: At that point, the right to freedom of movement under Article 11 of the German Basic Law, the privacy of correspondence, postal services, and telecommunications under Article 10 of the Basic Law, the right to the inviolability of the home under Article 13 of the Basic Law, the right to property under Article 14 of the Basic Law, the freedom to choose one's profession under Article 12 of the Basic Law, and the right to free development of personality under Article 2 of the Basic Law will be restricted.[51]

The EU and NATO have long been engaged in a war against Russia, albeit a covert one. This economic war is being waged not only through numerous rounds of sanctions but also through blatant acts of piracy. Hundreds of billions are being pumped into the arms industry. Both of these factors are leading to the impoverishment and deindustrialization of Western European societies. Potential protests are met with the full force of the police.

The Digital Services Act of 2022 succeeded in implementing the model of Germany's Network Enforcement Act (Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz)—which was already in place—across the entire EU. The aim is to assert control over the discourse on geopolitical issues through the fight against so-called disinformation and overt censorship. [52] So-called disinformation is classified as a threat to internal security, regardless of whether it is controlled or promoted from abroad. [53] It is the governments themselves that determine what constitutes disinformation. This opens the door to anti-democratic arbitrariness.

The EU's crackdown on critical journalists stems from a 2023 NATO summit decision.[54] The sanctions are orchestrated by NATO as part of its fight against disinformation and implemented by an EU that has mutated from a peace project into the Western alliance's war machine.

They represent an attempt to maintain the hegemony of Western elites under U.S. leadership and to halt the decline of the West. These sanctions demonstrate the destruction of international law by the West and the United States and the return of the law of the jungle in international relations. Furthermore, the West's sanctions are responsible for hundreds of thousands of deaths. They are an instrument of murder and do not contribute to the promotion of democracy.

The sanctions against Russia are intended to bring Russia to its knees economically. Then-Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock said, "This will ruin Russia." [55] The sanctions would remain in place, "no matter what my voters think." [56] The RAND Corporation has defined the goal as destabilizing Russia. The U.S. foreign policy strategist Zbigniew Brzezinski articulated the goal years ago of stripping Russia of its great-power status by breaking away Ukraine. [57]

Domestically, a permanent coup d'état is intended to secure the rule of transatlantic elites by hollowing out democratic procedures in such a way that the democratic facade is maintained. This amounts to the introduction of a dictatorship on velvet paws, whose claws remain invisible to the majority but are all the more effective for it. According to Giorgio Agamben, the state of emergency is transforming "into a constant practice of governance." [58]

This therefore constitutes a direct attack on the democracy of the member states—in Germany, on the peace clause of the German Basic Law—and on the central, inalienable fundamental and human rights. These measures are unlawful, unconstitutional, and anti-democratic, and serve to prepare for war. Anyone who supports them is violating the United Nations Charter, Article 26 of the Basic Law, and Section 80 of the German Criminal Code, which prohibits the preparation of a war of aggression.

Therefore, those forces in the German Bundestag that support the sanctions policy must be removed from office. Through their sanctions policy, the federal government and the parties that support it are attempting to undermine the constitutional order. According to Article 20 of the German Basic Law, all Germans have the right to resist when no other remedy is possible.

[1] See the definition of censorship by Hofbauer, Hannes: Zensur. Vienna 2022, p. 7

[2] <https://dejure.org/gesetze/AEUV/215.html>

- [3] <https://www.bundestag.de/resource/blob/1102364/EU-6-030-25.pdf>
- [4] <https://www.advant-beiten.com/aktuelles/sanctions-compliance-bundestag-beschliesst-verschaerfung-des-sanktionsstrafrechts>
- [5] <https://www.nachdenkseiten.de/?p=151147>
- [6] <https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/article/fall-hueseyin-doru-gericht-aeussert-ernsthafte-zweifel-an-kontosperre-seiner-ehefrau-10028800>
<https://www.nachdenkseiten.de/?p=151147>
- [7] Zeise, Simon u. Raphael Schmeller: Vorwurf Russland-Propaganda: Wie ein deutscher Journalist durch EU-Sanktionen kaltgestellt wird. Berliner Zeitung, 15.11.2025, <https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/article/eu-sanktionen-deutscher-journalist-russland-propaganda-10005566>
- [8] Hofbauer, Hannes: Aller Rechte Beraubt. Mit außergerichtlichen EU-Sanktionen zum autoritären Staat. Wien2026, S. 183-185
- [9] Fersen, Axel: Eine Belastungsprobe für den Rechtsstaat. Eine neue EU-Sanktionspraxis und die Schutzgüter der freiheitlich-demokratischen Grundordnung. Erhard-Eppler-Kreis, Substack, 20.05.2026, <https://erhardepplerkreis.substack.com/p/eine-belastungsprobe-fur-den-rechtsstaat>
- [10] <https://norberthaering.de/propaganda-zensur/sanktionsgesetz/>
- [11] Lipset, Seymour Martin: "Fascism" - Left, Right, and Center. In: Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics. Baltimore 1981, S. 127-152. Deutsch: Lipset, Seymour Martin: Der "Faschismus", die Linke, die Rechte und die Mitte. In: Nolte, Ernst (Hg.): Theorien über den Faschismus. Köln 1976(4), S. 449-491. Siehe auch: Geiger, Theodor: Panik im Mittelstand. Die Arbeit: Zeitschrift für Gewerkschaftspolitik und Wirtschaftskunde, H. 10, 1930, <https://library.fes.de/cgi-bin/digiarb.pl?id=01021&dok=1930&f=637&l=654&c=637>
- [12] Agnoli Johannes: Die Transformation der Demokratie. Frankfurt a. M. 1978, S. 11
- [13] See also Baab, Patrik: Staatsstreich in Permanenz. <https://forumgeopolitica.com/de/artikel/staatsstreich-in-permanenz-die-zensur-industrie-und-das-verwertungsmodell-des-digitalen-kriegs-kapitalismus-teil-i>
<https://forumgeopolitica.com/de/artikel/staatsstreich-in-permanenz-die-zensur-industrie-und-das-verwertungsmodell-des-digitalen-kriegs-kapitalismus-teil-ii>
- [14] <https://liber-net.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/de-report-de.pdf>
<https://www.nachdenkseiten.de/?p=152185>
- [15] <https://forumgeopolitica.com/de/artikel/jacques-baud-von-der-eu-im-namen-der-bekämpfung-von-falschinformationen-zensiert>
- [16] Hummel, Wolfgang J.: Rechtsgutachten der Sanktionen gegen Jacques Baud. Hummel Legal, Berlin 2026
- [17] “As we step up our efforts to build resilience, we will continue to work with our partners who are undertaking similar efforts, particularly the European Union. (...) We will continue to combat disinformation and misinformation, including through positive and effective strategic communication. We will also continue to support our partners in strengthening their resilience to hybrid challenges.” Häring, Norbert: Der Bannstrahl der EU gegen kritische Publizisten geht auf einen NATO-Gipfelbeschluss von 2023 zurück. Geld und mehr v. 06.01.2026, <https://norberthaering.de/propaganda-zensur/eu-sanktionen-nato-gipfel/>
- [18] “We will strengthen our democratic resilience, among other things by (..) countering attempts to destabilize us, including through disinformation and hate speech. (...) We will counter attempts to sow division, radicalization, terrorism, and violent extremism.” Häring, Norbert: Der Bannstrahl der EU gegen kritische Publizisten geht auf einen NATO-Gipfelbeschluss von 2023 zurück. Geld und mehr v. 06.01.2026, <https://norberthaering.de/propaganda-zensur/eu-sanktionen-nato-gipfel/>
- [19] Häring, Norbert: Der Bannstrahl der EU gegen kritische Publizisten geht auf einen NATO-Gipfelbeschluss von 2023 zurück. Geld und mehr v. 06.01.2026, <https://norberthaering.de/propaganda-zensur/eu-sanktionen-nato-gipfel/>
- [20] Häring, Norbert: Bundesregierung bestätigt Bindung an geheime NATO-Ziele. Geld und mehr, 07.07.2025, <https://norberthaering.de/macht-kontrolle/nato-ziele/>

[21] Baab, Patrik: Staatsstreich in Permamenz. <https://forumgeopolitica.com/de/artikel/staatsstreich-in-permanenz-die-zensur-industrie-und-das-verwertungsmodell-des-digitalen-kriegs-kapitalismus-teil-i>

<https://forumgeopolitica.com/de/artikel/staatsstreich-in-permanenz-die-zensur-industrie-und-das-verwertungsmodell-des-digitalen-kriegs-kapitalismus-teil-ii>

[22] "In their panel analysis, Francisco Rodríguez and colleagues once again demonstrate that sanctions do kill: economic sanctions imposed by the USA or the EU were associated with 564 258 deaths (95% CI 367 838–760 677) annually from 1971 to 2021, higher than the annual number of battle-related casualties (106 000 deaths)." The health toll of economic sanctions. *The Lancet Global Health*, Vol. 13, Issue 8, 08/2025

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X\(25\)00278-5/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(25)00278-5/fulltext)

[23] The health toll of economic sanctions. *The Lancet Global Health*, Vol. 13, Issue 8, 08/2025

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X\(25\)00278-5/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(25)00278-5/fulltext)

[24] The prosecutors say that Mr. Browder was assigned the code name Agent Solomon by Western intelligence, while Mr. Navalny was called Agent Freedom.

[25] Kuzmarov, Jeremy: "A New Battlefield for the United States": Russia Sanctions and the New Cold War. *Socialism and Democracy*, 2020, https://www.academia.edu/50949119/_A_New_Battlefield_for_the_United_States_Russia_Sanctions_and_the_New_Cold_War

[26] Kuzmarov, Jeremy: "A New Battlefield for the United States": Russia Sanctions and the New Cold War. *Socialism and Democracy*, 2020, https://www.academia.edu/50949119/_A_New_Battlefield_for_the_United_States_Russia_Sanctions_and_the_New_Cold_War

[27] Cuba distribuye armas a civiles ante el temor latente de una invasión militar de EEUU. *Diario Versión Final*, 06.06.2026, <https://diarioversionfinal.com/xvf-portada/vf-principal/cuba-distribuye-armas-a-civiles-ante-el-temor-latente-de-una-invasion-militar-de-eeuu/>

[28] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uhc85JrGYow>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=suYTAC0JkQA>

[29] <https://www.spiegel.de/wirtschaft/unternehmen/britisch-russischer-wirtschaftskrimi-es-ist-wie-beim-schiffeversenken-a-659672.html>

[30] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380128363_The_Magnitsky_Act_Behind_the_Scenes_Andrei_Nekrasov_2016

[31] "Available documentary evidence and testimony, including those collected in a civil case before the Federal Court of the Southern District of New York, confirmed that the 'facts' reported by Browder to the US Congress, put down into the text of the act from his hearsay, were either deliberately distorted, or contrary to the truth. However, the same story has been put as the basis of the Global Magnitsky Act currently considered in the Congress. Governmental and legal investigations revealed that William Browder, CEO of Hermitage Capital Management (Guernsey) and a financial advisor to Hermitage hedge fund (which existed until 2013 under the control of HSBC Group), a British citizen, who renounced his US citizenship in 1998 for tax reasons, had for 10 years lived in Russia on a tourist visa, in the period from 1999 to 2006 implemented in the territory of Russia an illegal scheme of buying up Gazprom shares by foreign companies to bypass the ban on foreign direct investments into Gazprom shares without permission of the Government of Russia." Confidential - Bill Browder, WP-Content, 11.2021,

<https://www.billbrowder.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Confidential-Grin-letter-given-to-Dana-Rohrabacher-April-2016.pdf>

https://volksbuehne.adk.de/praxis/the_magnitsky_act_behind_the_scenes/index.html

[32] Komisar, Lucy: The Man Behind the Magnitsky Act. *100Reporters - New Journalism for a new Age*, 20.10.2027, <https://100r.org/2017/10/magnitsky/>

Details in: Krainer, Alex: *The Killing Of William Browder*. Monaco 2017, https://globalbridge.ch/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/TheKillingOfWilliamBrowder_PrintLayout_6x9-1.pdf

[33] Komisar, Lucy: The Man Behind the Magnitsky Act: Did Bill Browder's Tax Troubles in Russia Color Push for Sanctions? *100Reporters*, 20.10.20217, <https://www.thekomisarscoop.com/2017/11/the-man-behind-the-magnitsky-act-did-bill-browders-tax-troubles-in-russia-color-push-for-sanctions/>

Hoke, William: Russia Says Browder Laundered Funds, Might Have Killed Magnitsky. Taxnotes, 26.11.2018, <https://www.taxnotes.com/featured-news/russia-says-browder-laundered-funds-might-have-killed-magnitsky/2018/11/21/28mf7>

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380128363_The_Magnitsky_Act_Behind_the_Scenes_Andrei_Nekrasov_2016

[34] "Nekrasov's reputation as a fearless investigative documentarist destroyed; he suddenly found himself labeled a stooge of the Putin regime at best, a participant in a conspiracy to malign Magnitsky, at worst. In the US, the film was effectively banned; no distributor would touch it. It had only one private screening, at the Newseum in Washington, DC, that was supposedly paid for by Natalia Veselnitskaya, a bit player in the Trump scandals, a screening that Browder's lawyers vigorously attempted to prevent on the grounds that the film is defamatory... I see this affair as censorship masquerading as a libel case, and it played out that way in much of Europe. In the UK, where it's easy to sue for libel, the film was likewise shunned; on the continent, Browder's legal threats led the European Parliament to cancel an announced screening at the last minute; German public television withdrew its support, leading to its cancellation in France as well, essentially ending the possibility of any other public screenings. The picture has been publically screened in Norway and at a few unimportant film festivals, the notable exception being the Moscow International Film Festival." Younblood, Denise J.: Tha Magnitsky Act: Behind the Scenes, Andrej Nekrasov, 2016. Paper presented at the ASEEEES National Convention, San Francisco, 2019, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380128363_The_Magnitsky_Act_Behind_the_Scenes_Andrei_Nekrasov_2016

<https://www.politico.eu/article/meps-dragged-into-russia-film-row-lawyer-whistleblower-sergei-magnitsky-act-andrei-nekrasov-documentary/>

[35] Diesen, Glenn: The Magnitsky Act & Narrative Control. Substack, 09.01.2025, <https://glennDiesen.substack.com/p/the-magnitsky-act-and-narrative-control> und <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PNblKoJgt2c>

[36] <https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-25190975>

[37] Federal Register Volume 63, Nr. 204, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-1998-10-22/html/98-28284.htm>

[38] <https://100r.org/2017/10/magnitsky/>

<https://www.telepolis.de/article/Aufklaerung-ueber-den-Magnitski-Fall-4080217.html>

[39] "The Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation also possesses information that W. Browder and other persons have committed offences to the detriment of the United States, and this information has been repeatedly reported to the competent American authorities. For example, in May 2016, the U.S. Embassy in Moscow was informed about the activities of a transnational criminal organization headed by W. Browder and involving the U.S. investment firm Ziff Brothers Investments owned by brothers Dirk, Robert and Daniel Ziff. In July 2016, over 1,100 pages of relevant materials on tax and other economic crimes committed by W. Browder with the participation of the owners of the Ziff Brothers Investments fund both in Russia and the United States were transferred to the U.S. Department of Justice. Additional information was provided in August 2016. Subsequently, the Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation nine times reminded its colleagues in Washington about those materials, including twice to the U.S. Attorney General (in 2017-2018) Jeff Sessions. However, so far American law enforcement agencies have not demonstrated their willingness to put an end to the breach of their own legislation. Meanwhile, lobbying by W. Browder for the Magnitsky Act based on his deliberately false statements was financed by the funds of criminal origin that had been moved illegally from Russia to the United States through a chain of offshore companies. Some of these funds were also used to sponsor the election campaigns of American politicians. In particular, W. Browder's accomplices from Ziff Brothers Investments repeatedly made donations to the election fund of the Democratic Party of the United States – from 400 000 dollars in 2008 to 1,200 000 dollars in 2016. The total amount of money donated to the Democratic Party by Ziff Brothers Investments and Hermitage Capital is almost 2 million dollars." https://tanzania.mid.ru/en/press-centre/news/regarding_william_browder_s_criminal_activities/

[40] "Prosecutors contend that Mr. Browder had colluded with an agent of Britain's foreign intelligence agency, MI6, 'to cause the death of S. L. Magnitsky,' by persuading Russian prison doctors to withhold care. The motive, according to what prosecutors said were intelligence intercepts, was to start a scandal, or 'a significant news trigger to discredit the Russian Federation in the eyes of the international community.' The prosecutors say that Mr. Browder was assigned the code name Agent Solomon by Western intelligence, while Mr. Navalny was called Agent Freedom." Kramer, Andrew E.: Turning Tables in Magnitsky Case, Russia Accuses a Nemesis of Murder. New York Times, 22.10.2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/22/world/europe/russia-sergei-magnitsky-william-browder.html?eafs_enabled=false

[41] "At our first session, in London, Bill Browder did not act like someone who feared for his life. I had expected to find elaborate security at his building. Instead, I was given a perfunctory glance and waved up to the Hermitage offices, which overlook London's picturesque Finsbury Square. I began to wonder if there was a hidden security system in place, speculating, as others have, that Browder either was protected by or had a special relationship with M.I.6, Britain's foreign-

intelligence service. Curious, I asked him, point-blank, "Are you M.I.6?" He hesitated and then said, cryptically, "I work with so many levels of British law enforcement, I never know who is working for whom." When I broached the subject again, months later, he bristled: "I am definitely not under British protection. I have to protect myself. I am not M.I.6. I am not C.I.A. I am not anything. I bet there are nine intelligence agencies listening as we speak. But that is because I am not an agent of *anyone's*—I am a completely independent operator. If I were really an agent of M.I.6, why would I be having so many problems opening a criminal case [in the U.K. against the oligarchs]? Maybe this is a double fake-out! The *Russians* are accusing me of being a C.I.A. agent!" Brenner, marie: "I see Him as a Modern-Day Pablo Escobar": Inside Bill Browder's War Against Putin. Vanity Fair, 11.11.2018,

<https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2018/11/bill-browder-war-against-putin?srsid=AfmBOoozO1AkPza-X4EI3dT9TwdmqcOH0qYw639zBtmBftBmPTF0NDSw>

[42] Kuzmarov, Jeremy: "A New Battlefield for the United States": Russia Sanctions and the New Cold War. Socialism and Democracy, 2020, https://www.academia.edu/50949119/_A_New_Battlefield_for_the_United_States_Russia_Sanctions_and_the_New_Cold_War

[43] <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46981>

[44] <https://publikumskonferenz.de/blog/andrei-nekrasov-im-interview-mit-weltnetz-tv-the-magnitsky-act/>

[45] Dobbins, James u.a.: Overextending and Unbalancing Russia: Assessing the Impact of Cost-Imposing Options. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica 2019, https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB10014.html

[46] Dobbins, James u.a.: Overextending and Unbalancing Russia: Assessing the Impact of Cost-Imposing Options. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica 2019, https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB10014.html

[47] https://x.com/michele_geraci/status/2067272132380258429

[48] <https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/article/eu-abgeordnete-sanktionsregime-wenn-von-der-leyen-geht-ein-segen-10014552>

[49] <https://forumgeopolitica.com/de/artikel/jacques-baud-von-der-eu-im-namen-der-bekämpfung-von-falschinformationen-zensiert>

[50] Hofbauer, Hannes: Aller Rechte Beraubt. Mit außergerichtlichen EU-Sanktionen zum autoritären Staat. Wien 2026, S. 209

[51] <https://transition-news.org/wie-deutschland-per-spannungsfall-auf-den-krieg-gegen-russland-vorbereitet-wird>

[52] ebda, S. 211

[53] <https://norberthaering.de/propaganda-zensur/hybrider-krieg/>

[54] <https://norberthaering.de/propaganda-zensur/hybrider-krieg/>

[55] <https://www.rnd.de/politik/ukraine-krieg-baerbock-ueber-sanktionen-das-wird-russland-ruinieren-RZDYS2DEPRK5OST7ZGGRZ6UN4I.html>

[56] <https://www.tagesschau.de/faktenfinder/baerbock-zitat-101.html>

[57] "Ukraine, a new and important space on the Eurasian chessboard, is a geopolitical pivot because its very existence as an independent country helps to transform Russia. Without Ukraine, Russia ceases to be a Eurasian empire." Brzezinski: The Great Chessboard, New York 1997, S. 46

[58] Agamben, Giorgio: Ausnahmezustand. Frankfurt a. M. 2020(8), S. 14

ARTICLE TAGS:

Analysis Speech EU Europe Federal Republic of Germany