

STATEMENT OF WITNESS

(Criminal Procedure Rules, r. 27.2;

Criminal Justice Act 1967, s. 9, Magistrates' Courts Act 1980, s.5B)

FIFTH STATEMENT OF ERIC L. LEWIS

Age of witness (if over 18, enter "over 18"): Over 18

This statement (consisting of 14 pages) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Additional Evidence Regarding Political Interference With the Rule of Law and Comity as it Pertains to Mr. Assange.

1. I have submitted four previous statements in this matter on a number of subjects, including the politicization of the criminal justice process to serve the Trump Administration's political ends. I submit this brief additional statement to supplement the record before this Court with respect to two relevant and ongoing issues that relate to this Administration's pursuit of its "America First" policy without apparent regard for the rule of law, or respect for international law or comity.
2. The first issue relates to the ongoing extradition proceedings in Canada seeking to extradite Meng Wanzhou, the CFO of the Chinese multinational Huawei, to the United States to face felony charges on charges of misleading HSBC bank regarding Huawei's business dealings with Iran (**Exhibit 1, Exhibit 2**).
3. The second issue relates to recent actions taken by the Trump Administration with respect to the International Criminal Court ("ICC"), its personnel and those who participate in its investigations. This is of particular importance to me because, as the Court will see in my CV previously submitted, I am the Chair of Reprieve US, a sister organization that works closely in coordination with Reprieve UK based in London, which has worked over a number of years jointly with the US organization Center for Constitutional Rights (an organization on whose Board I served before I became chair of Reprieve US) on the International Criminal Court war crimes investigation involving, inter alia, actions taken by US personnel in Afghanistan and at CIA-operated "black sites" in Eastern Europe.

Huawei – Meng Wanzhou Extradition

4. I refer to the recent reports of ongoing extradition proceedings in Canada in relation to Meng Wanzhou, the Senior CFO of Huawei, arrested in Canada in December 2018, who is currently challenging her extradition in the Canadian Courts. **(Exhibit 1, Exhibit 2)** She has called attention in those proceedings to the statement made by President Trump shortly after her arrest, with respect to whether he would intervene with respect to the extradition proceedings: *“If I think it’s good for what will certainly be the largest trade deal ever made- which is a very important thing – what’s good for national security, I would certainly intervene if I thought it was necessary.”* Meng Wanzhou is currently arguing in the Canadian Court that this statement, that he would intervene to stop legal proceedings if China took steps to further an unrelated political goal of a trade agreement, is indicative of a want of integrity of the US judicial process, where the President has the final say regarding whether prosecutions go forward or not, based not on consideration of evidence and principles of justice but on unrelated principles. Her lawyers state that the US Administration was displaying an intention to use Meng as a *“Bargaining chip in a trade dispute,”* by accusing her of bank fraud. Her lawyers also contrast Meng’s treatment with that of Roger Stone, where President Trump commuted his sentence and stated, with respect to Presidential intervention in criminal cases (in a tweet *“There is MUCH more to come.”* Meng’s lawyers have told the Canadian court, these statements were *“Offensive and ominous”* and *“Made them all the more intimidating due to his history of interference in other recent high-profile criminal prosecutions.”* **(Exhibit 1)**
5. Ironically, the charges against Meng relate to Huawei’s business with Iran, which is the subject of stringent sanctions in the United States. President Trump has also stated that he intends to invoke “snap back sanctions,” in view of Iran’s decision to cease complying with the provisions of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (“JCPOA”), the 2015 nuclear accord, which President Trump has renounced. A resolution last week introduced by the United States before the Security Council of the United Nations to reimpose an arms embargo against Iran was rejected. The United States has attacked Britain, France and Germany which has said that the US does not have the right to trigger the sanctions, with Secretary of State Pompeo stating “they chose to side with the ayatollahs.” As the Wall Street Journal stated on 21 August “As the fight drags on, what matters most is the U.S. presidential election.”
6. I express no view on the evidence as to whether Meng was or was not honest with HSBC regarding Huawei’s business with Iran, which forms the basis of the US bank fraud charges. I would note, however, that President Trump has made clear his willingness to intervene actively in ongoing criminal proceedings, including extradition proceedings, to drop such proceedings if he can “make a deal” that improves his political fortunes. This would appear to be of a piece with the offer made by Congressman Rohrabacher and a Trump campaign operative to offer immunity in return for a statement by Mr. Assange that the Trump

campaign had nothing to do with Russian assistance in the 2016 campaign. To be sure, President Trump has stated he made no such offer, although this must be considered in the context of his overall behaviour and the likelihood that a sitting Congressman would fly to London, enter the Ecuadorian Embassy to see Mr. Assange and make such an offer entirely on his own initiative. I refer to these reported events as further evidence of the use and abuse of the criminal justice process by the President and the Attorney General to use the criminal justice process as another tool of power to help friends, hurt enemies and unashamedly promote a partisan political agenda in this election season.

The International Criminal Court

7. The second issue relates to the International Criminal Court and the very recent Presidential Executive Order of 11th June 2020 and its ongoing impact. The Court will be very familiar with the International Criminal Court but may be less familiar with the US / ICC relationship. In order to understand the gravity of the Executive Order and its implications I set out a brief summary of that relationship.
8. The United States is not a party to the Rome Statute or a member of the ICC, which is of course its sovereign decision; the Statute was signed by President Clinton but did not submit it to the Senate for ratification as he did not believe he had the 2/3 support of the Senate for ratification. Thereafter, President Bush, after 9/11, informed the UN Secretary General that the US did not intend to ratify the Rome Statute or recognize obligations under it. Then Under Secretary of State John Bolton signed over 100 “Article 98” bilateral agreements to gain the agreement of states not to arrest or turn over US personnel to face ICC prosecution. Other legislation threatened to cut aid to countries that did not sign one of these “Article 98” agreements; ultimately aid was cut to seven countries and two intergovernmental programs. The Obama Administration stated its intention to cooperate with the ICC and participated in various Review Conferences and Assemblies of State Parties.
9. This earlier hostility toward turning over US nationals did not per se attack the legitimacy or the Court or threaten the institution. However, as part of the “America First” policy, the Administration has taken aggressive steps in the name of US sovereignty that have not only endangered the ongoing viability of the International Criminal Court as an institution but have created genuine risk for human rights advocates and real concern with the community of human rights organizations, all to shield actions taken by the United States from scrutiny by the ICC. As discussed below, moreover, Reprieve’s critical actions pressing investigation and prosecution of war crimes in Afghanistan and at black sites, potential crimes in which revelations by WikiLeaks has played an important role, was followed quickly by U.S. criminal action

against Mr. Assange.

10. The ICC is an important human rights court of last resort, with the power to investigate and prosecute jus cogens violations, including war crimes, committed on the territories of ICC member states, which would include torture and war crimes committed in Afghanistan and the countries in Europe, including EU Member States, which hosted CIA black sites. The ICC generally acts when national domestic courts do not or will not. As with all international bodies, member states give up a certain measure of sovereignty in return for the international comity and cooperation of a functioning international institution. Given the jurisdiction of the ICC in upholding the most critical values of human dignity against war crimes, torture, mass murder and similar docket items, it plays a critical role in the human rights legal infrastructure.
11. As noted above, individual countries are free to withhold that limited concession of sovereignty. But it is extremely troubling that the United States is taking active measures to defeat its ability to function in a clear area of its jurisdiction.
12. In approximately November 2016, in response to numerous complaints and after a decade long investigation, including complaints made on behalf of victims of war crimes by the Center for Constitutional Rights and Reprieve, the ICC announced there would be an imminent decision on whether to investigate war crimes in Afghanistan, including by US parties. The US stated that such an investigation was not “warranted or appropriate” given the US’s own “robust system of accountability.” In fact, no individual has ever been prosecuted in the United States federal courts for acts committed in Afghanistan or at black site prisons where persons apprehended in Afghanistan were taken. See Letter of Center of Constitutional Rights to Special Rapporteur, 5 June 2019, at Pages 7-15, **Exhibit 3**.
13. In November 2017, ICC Prosecutor Bensouda made a request to the pre-trial chamber to open a formal investigation against numerous parties regarding war crimes in Afghanistan and CIA black sites, including by the Taliban and associated forces, the Afghan National Security Forces and US armed forces and the CIA during the principal period of 2003-05. *Id.*

Actions by the Trump Administration in relation to the ICC

14. Following the request above, United States officials and others began an unprecedented string of attacks and threats on the bona fides and legitimacy of the ICC. On 20 November 2017, shortly after Prosecutor Bensouda’s request, John Bolton, then a Fox News commentator and operating a national security think tank wrote an op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal*, in which he stated “America’s long-term security depends on refusing to recognize an iota of legitimacy in this brazen effort to subordinate democratic nations to the

unaccountable melding of executive and judicial authority in the ICC.” He continued that the ICC’s “real targets always have been not merely individual soldiers accused of war crimes, but their commanders and political leaders – all the way to the commander in chief of the global hegemon (as they resentfully see it”. The White House should not facilitate these efforts to constrain and inhibit its ability to defend Americans.”(Exhibit 4) Mr. Bolton concluded stating, “America should welcome the opportunity, as in Churchill’s line about Bolshevism, to strangle the ICC in its cradle. At most, the White House should reply to Ms. Bensouda with a terse note: ‘Dear Madame Prosecutor: You are dead to us. Sincerely, the United States.’” Four months later, it was announced that John Bolton would join the Trump administration as the new National Security Advisor. *Id.*

15. At the 16th Assembly of State Parties to the ICC in December 2017, the Trump Administration lodged an objection to the request, stating, “we will regard as illegitimate any attempt by the Court to assert the ICC’s jurisdiction over American citizens.” The US also asserted that there could be no jurisdiction over non-parties to the Rome Statute absent consent or Security Council referral, a position that does not have legal basis under international law in my view. In September of 2018, now having taken up his position as National Security Advisor, Bolton called the ICC “fundamentally illegitimate and stated the “ICC is dead.” He threatened the ICC stating that the US “,”will use any means necessary to protect our citizens and those of our allies from unjust prosecution by this illegitimate court.” He specifically included Israel as one of those allies and stated:

We will respond against the ICC and its personnel to the extent permitted by US law. We will ban its judges and prosecutors from entering the United States. We will sanction their funds in the US financial system, and we will prosecute them in the US criminal system. We will do the same for any company or state that assists an ICC investigation of Americans. (emphasis added)

We will take note if any countries cooperate with ICC investigations of the United States and its allies, and we will remember that cooperation when setting US foreign assistance, military assistance, and intelligence sharing levels. (emphasis added) (Exhibit 5)

Id.

16. I would note that the November 2017 request by Prosecutor Bensouda to commence an investigation into war crimes in Afghanistan potentially implicated WikiLeaks and Mr. Assange in important ways. One of the most important releases of documents by WikiLeaks was the 2010 release of the “Afghan War Diary, a collection of some 91,000 US Army document, which revealed, inter alia, incidents of the killing of innocent civilians on a massive scale, abuse of prisoners at Bagram Prison, unreported significant use of special operations forces and other actions that the US Government did not wish to have as a matter of

public knowledge. Such documents would no doubt have been important to any ICC investigation. I note that just a few weeks after the November 2017 request by Prosecutor Bensouda, the initial request for extradition was presented, on 22 December 2017 to Westminster Magistrates Court. It is impossible to know with certainty whether there was a causal connection between the two events, but it is certainly a reasonable inference that concern and reaction to the threat of investigation of US personnel by the ICC through the use of WikiLeaks documents, coupled with the repeated attacks on Mr. Assange and WikiLeaks as a “hostile non-state intelligence agency” may well have been a factor in precipitating the request to stigmatize the release of those documents as criminal acts and dissuade their use.

17. On 25 September 2018, President Trump delivered an address to the UN General Assembly, reiterating his opposition to the ICC and Bolton’s threats to the institution, its personnel and those who cooperate with it:

The United States will provide no support in recognition to the International Criminal Court. As far as America is concerned, the ICC has no jurisdiction, no legitimacy, and no authority. The ICC claims near-universal jurisdiction over the citizens of every country, violating all principles of justice, fairness, and due process. We will never surrender America’s sovereignty to an unelected, unaccountable, global bureaucracy.

America is governed by Americans. We reject the ideology of globalism, and we embrace the doctrine of patriotism. Around the world, responsible nations must defend against threats to sovereignty not just from global governance, but also from other, new forms of coercion and domination. **(Exhibit 6)**

Id.

18. On 5 November 2018, Bolton addressed the Zionist Organization of America, again attacking the legitimacy of the ICC:

The ICC is an illegitimate, unaccountable, and unconstitutional foreign bureaucracy that has the audacity to consider asserting jurisdiction over American and Israeli citizens without their consent.[...]

The ICC’s real purpose is of course not to punish these perpetrators [from Sudan, The DRC or Libya], but to constrain the foreign policies of the United States and our allies like Israel. The Court claims jurisdiction for ambiguously defined crimes in order to intimidate leaders in both countries, who strive to defend their nations from myriad threats every single day.[...]

In November of last year, the ICC Prosecutor also requested to investigate alleged war crimes supposedly committed by U.S. service members and intelligence professionals during the war in Afghanistan. This outcome was entirely predictable. First, the global governance apostles go after Israel. Then, they come for the United States. It is fully apparent that the ICC wants U.S. and Israeli leaders to think twice before taking action to protect their people from terrorism and other threats. **(Volume F(2), Exhibit 5)**

Id.

19. On 4 December 2018, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo spoke at NATO headquarters, and emphasized the US “real action to stop rogue international courts, like the International Criminal Court, from trampling on our sovereignty – your sovereignty – and all our freedoms.” He warned: “We will take all necessary steps to protect our people, those of our NATO allies who fight alongside of us inside of Afghanistan from unjust prosecution. Because we know that if it can happen to our people, it can happen to yours too.” **(Exhibit 7)**
20. To similar effect, Pompeo spoke on 15 March 2019, announcing that he was denying visas to ICC personnel involved in the investigation of US personnel in Afghanistan or their allies, specifically. Naming Israel, and threatening sanctions. He continued, “This includes persons who take or have taken action to request or further such an investigation. If you’re responsible for the proposed ICC investigations of US personnel in connection with the situation in Afghanistan you should not assume that you will still have or will get a visa or that you will be permitted to enter the United States. We are prepared to take additional steps, including economic sanctions if the ICC does not change its course.” The US then cancelled the Prosecutor’s visas. **(Exhibit 8)**
21. Whilst these threatening statements were ongoing, the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Mr. Michel Forst of France and the Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers, Mr. Diego Garcia-Sayan of Peru expressed their deep concern. “These threats may discourage human rights defenders, civil society organisations, victims, representatives, companies or others from cooperating with the ICC in pursuit of truth and justice. **(Exhibit 9)**
22. Two weeks after the cancellation of the ICC prosecutor’s visa , the ICC did change course, as the Pre-trial Chamber denied the prosecutor’s request not on evidentiary grounds, but “in the interests of justice.”
23. By formal letter on the 5th June 2019, the Center for Constitutional Rights requested the Special Rapporteurs at paragraph 21 above to initiate an investigation into the interference by the US with the independence of the ICC proceedings. I have exhibited and quoted from that letter as an accurate narrative of relevant history and a reflection of the shared concerns of our respective organisations (Reprieve and CCR) **(Exhibit 3)**.
24. Thereafter on 10th June 2019 Reprieve UK and the Center for Constitutional Rights jointly filed appeals with the Appellate Chamber based upon inappropriate interference with the independence and impartiality

of the ICC. **(Exhibit 10)**

25. The appeal was heard in the ICC Appeals Chamber on 6 December 2019 **(Exhibit 11)**.
26. On the 5 March 2020, the Appeal Chamber overruled the Pre-Hearing Chamber and reopened the investigation on Afghanistan. **(Exhibit 12)**
27. This has recently led to further statements attacking the Court by Secretary of State Pompeo, Attorney General Barr and President Trump. On 17 March 2020, Secretary of State Pompeo gave a briefing, calling the ICC “a so-called court, which is revealing itself to be a nakedly political body. **(Volume F2, Exhibit 30)** He continued:

As I said the last time I stood before you, we oppose any effort by the ICC to exercise jurisdiction over U.S. personnel. We will not tolerate its inappropriate and unjust attempts to investigate or prosecute Americans. When our personnel are accused of a crime, they face justice in our country.

We want to identify those responsible for this partisan investigation and their family members who may want to travel to the United States or engage in activity that’s inconsistent with making sure we protect Americans.

This court, the ICC, is an embarrassment. It’s exposing and – we are exposing and confronting its abuses, and this is a true example of American leadership to ensure that multilateral institutions actually perform the missions for which they were designed.

28. On 11 June 2020, President Trump issued an Executive Order blocking Property of various ICC individuals based on the purportedly “illegitimate assertions of jurisdiction over personnel of the United States and certain of its allies” regarding the Afghanistan investigation. **(Volume F(2), Exhibit 43)** These actions, the Executive Order stated, “threaten to infringe upon the sovereignty of the United States and impede the critical national security and foreign policy work of United States Government and allied officials, and thereby threaten the national security and foreign policy of the United States. He declared any attempt to investigate, arrest, detain or prosecute any US personnel or personnel of US allies who are not parties to the Rome Statute or otherwise consented, to be “a national emergency” to deal with the “extraordinary threat to national security.” All property that is comes within the US or comes within the possession or control of any US persons will be blocked if it belongs to any foreign person that the Secretary of State determines:

(A) to have directly engaged in any effort by the ICC to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute

any United States personnel without the consent of the United States;

(B) to have directly engaged in any effort by the ICC to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any personnel of a country that is an ally of the United States without the consent of that country's government;

(C) to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described in subsection (a)(i)(A) or (a)(i)(B) of this section or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order; or

(D) to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order.

The Order further includes in the prohibition:

(a) the making of any contribution or provision of funds, goods, or services by, to, or for the benefit of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to section 1(a) of this order; and
(b) the receipt of any contribution or provision of funds, goods, or services from any such person.

29. This Executive Order imposes the functional equivalent of sanctions that are imposed against countries like Iran and their nationals and specially designated nationals alleged to be involved with terrorism, narcotics trafficking and the like. Blocking of assets requires no prior notice.

30. Attorney General Barr participated with multiple cabinet members including the Secretaries of State, Treasury and Homeland Security in announcing the sanctions. He stated these measures were an:

“important first step in holding the ICC accountable for exceeding its mandate and violating the sovereignty of the United States”.

“The US government has reason to doubt the honesty of the ICC. The Department of Justice has received substantial credible information that raises serious concerns about a long history of financial corruption and malfeasance at the highest levels of the office of the prosecutor,” Barr said.

He referred to the ICC as “little more than a political tool employed by unaccountable international elites”.
(Exhibit 13).

31. The United Nations and other countries have harshly criticized these sanctions.

“The implementation of such policies by the US has the sole aim of exerting pressure on an institution whose role is to seek justice against crimes of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and the crime of aggression”, said Diego García-Sayán, UN Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, speaking on behalf of the 34 experts.

“It's a further step in pressuring the ICC and coercing its officials in the context of independent and

objective investigations and impartial judicial proceedings.”

(Exhibit 14)

32. Sixty-seven Member states of the ICC have supported a statement in support of the ICC in the face of the sanctions:

"We reconfirm our unwavering support for the court as an independent and impartial judicial institution," the statement said.

33. A comment from the Brookings Institution called these sanctions “unprecedented” and “fundamentally misguided;” and “erodes the US longstanding commitment to human rights and the rule of law.” It continued:

The sanctions language is sufficiently broad that it could, in theory, apply to a victim or witness who provided information incidental to the court’s investigation or an academic whose scholarship the court relied upon in framing a legal argument. This new sanction regime draws strong parallels to those imposed by the U.S. in the past against terrorist groups, dictators, and human rights abusers. Those same sanctions are now turned on international lawyers and human rights defenders.

(Exhibit 15)

Conclusion

34. The purpose of recounting these recent developments is to bring up to date my earlier statements to illustrate the continuing, if not escalating priority of an ideological agenda of the Trump Administration as the United States moves toward the election. The ongoing Huawei extradition proceedings and the very recent ICC sanctions can be seen as linked to that agenda and make clear that politically charged investigations and prosecutions are fundamental tools in pursuing that political agenda at the expense of following the rule of law.
35. With respect to the Huawei CFO extradition, President Trump’s remarks that he would intervene to stop the prosecution and extradition if he thought it would facilitate the trade deal with China. Making “the best deals” with foreign adversaries has been a slogan throughout his administration. President Trump has made no secret of the fact that such a trade deal would be a great political asset to him and confirmation of his self-described image as a dealmaker who gets things done on a business basis. His willingness to intervene appears unrelated to the facts of the prosecution or his concerns about bank fraud or doing business with Iran. It is of course quite unlikely that there would be any further intervention or trade negotiations with China, as he has now pivoted and has assailed China and the Chinese regime in the wake of the COVID crisis, referring frequently (as does his Secretary of State and Chief of Staff) to COVID-19 as the China

virus, and encouraging speculation that the virus may have been manufactured in a laboratory in China, despite the statements of intelligence and infectious disease professionals that the virus originated naturally and allies' agreement that the lab theory has no credibility (**Exhibit 16**). Secretary Pompeo had echoed this discredited view, stating in May that there was “enormous evidence” that the Chinese had made the virus in a lab in Wuhan (**Exhibit 17**).

36. While I cannot opine with certainty as to whether the prosecution of Ms. Meng was politically motivated initially as a bargaining chip in the first place, there can be little doubt that the President and not the Department of Justice are taking decisions as to whether to use the extradition and prosecution in order to secure a political benefit in obtaining a trade agreement. It appears that President Trump's oscillating agenda with respect to relations with China have an impact on whether he is willing to proceed or drop the case. Lost in all of this is consideration of whether this prosecution is justified by non-political factors—the evidence, the law and coherent Department of Justice policy.
37. The attack on the investigation of Afghan War Crimes against US nationals and allied nationals by the ICC raises more troubling issues.
38. First, the sanctions imposed inhibit human rights work generally, including the provision of evidence to the ICC. Human rights organizations must carefully consider their exposure under the broad language of the Order, which effectively sanction not only ICC personnel as if they were officials of a hostile state, but also litigants seeking justice against jus cogens violations.
39. Second, the attacks on the integrity of the Court are unwarranted and impede the essential function of a neutral tribunal to investigate and adjudicate war crimes. The Trump Administration's attacks, while presuming trying to protect some notion of “sovereignty,” over US and allied nationals, is so aggressive and broad that it threatens the entire structure and credibility of international tribunals.
40. Third, the reflexive protection of all US nationals (as well as Israeli nationals) allows war crimes to go unaddressed. The statement by Secretary Pompeo that the US has a “robust system of accountability” is simply false. There have been numerous, credible and detailed accounts of torture in Afghanistan by many prisoners at Guantanamo Bay with no action taken against anyone. There were widespread credible reports before her confirmation that CIA Director Gina Haspel oversaw a black site prison in Eastern Europe where torture was conducted. She was confirmed anyway.
41. I note reports of Presidential action taken in respect of three military courts martial for war crimes. One war

crimes case was brought by the United States Navy against Eddie Gallagher, described by his fellow sailors as “freaking evil” and “OK with killing anything that moved.” Platoon members testified that he stabbed a teenager to death “for no reason” with a hunting knife and then posed with the body and insisted others pose as well. He was also accused of shooting an old man and a schoolgirl from a sniper’s nest. He was acquitted of murder but convicted of posing with a corpse. He was granted clemency by the President in November 2019, along with two other military personnel accused of shooting unarmed civilians in Afghanistan, one of whom had not yet been tried and the other of whom had been tried and convicted. President Trump referred to the three granted clemency as “great fighters”. “I stood up for three great warriors against the deep state,” Trump told supporters at a Thanksgiving rally in Sunrise, Florida. Gallagher and his wife were photographed in December 2019 with the President and First Lady Melania Trump at Mar-a-Lago, Trump’s private Florida resort. **(Exhibit 18)** Trump said he would like Gallagher to campaign with him and Gallagher promised to do so.**(Exhibit 19)**

42. These troubling instances strongly suggest that the goals expressed by Mr. Assange including of bringing war crimes to light are fundamentally at odds with the political agenda of the Trump Administration. Rather than promote transparency and support for humane treatment, Mr. Trump’s statements and actions support the opposite- secrecy and lionization of war criminals.
43. I hope that these observations are useful to the Court’s consideration; they have been prepared on an expedited basis in order to bring opinions expressed in earlier statements up to date in respect of ongoing situations.

Eric L. Lewis
Lewis Baach Kaufmann Middlemiss pllc
1101 New York Avenue NW
Suite 1000
Washington DC 20005
Tel. +1 202 833 8900
Eric.lewis@lbkmlaw.com



Signed:

(witness)

Date: ...25 August 2020.....

(To be completed if applicable: being unable to read the above statement I,of, read it to him/her before he/she signed it.