

Dear T.

Thank you for the Octagon form.

I've read the ten points (pages 1/2): Nothing about them stands out as special. They read like guidelines you might find in psychiatric nursing schools — only adjusted for police officers or prosecutors and framed in a judicial context. The document reflects the intellectual level of a Swiss „Fachhochschule“ (university for applied sciences), not a traditional university or the Swiss federal institute of technology (ETH).

Still, I see nothing unreasonable in it — **if** it is used solely to assess *convicts with proven histories of violence*.

The problem arises when ordinary citizens are assessed or monitored without their knowledge, without a conviction, and without a court order. In that case, it starts to look like a tool the **Stasi** might have used to profile dissidents — a serious breach of privacy and an abuse of power that could itself constitute a crime.

Page 2, Point 8 – “Sehen Sie Fehlprognosen als Chance”

The line “*Versuchen Sie, Informationen über den weiteren Verlauf beurteilter Fälle zu erfahren*” urges officers to “follow up” on the later lives of assessed individuals. That effectively encourages **unauthorized surveillance** — possibly even stalking, or at least something that would feel like stalking to those being watched.

I've also read sections 2.1 – 2.7. My thoughts briefly:

Point 2.1 – Personality

This section is selective and unprofessional — “psychiatry” repackaged for police. It aims to identify paranoid or querulous personalities. The issue is not the intention itself but the potential for abuse.

The phrase “*identifiziert vielerorts schweres Unrecht und will es aufdecken und / oder lösen*” could easily be misused to target critical journalists or political activists. In practice, many officers lack the training to distinguish between genuine wrongdoing and trivial complaints.

A neutral wording like “*identifiziert häufig Unrecht ...*” would be better, requiring concrete examples rather than unchecked impressions. Ironically, police and prosecutors **should** want to uncover serious injustice — yet in Switzerland, anyone too eager to do so risks being labeled unstable.

This could even include **rape survivors**, given the country's strongly patriarchal culture — arguably more so than Germany's. The case of **Jolanda Spiess**, mocked by the Tamedia / TX Group's *Tages-Anzeiger*, shows how victims are often treated.

The item “*tendiert zu einem ausgeprägten Schwarz-Weiss-Denken*” hints at a “borderline” label — a controversial diagnosis. Get HealthSec RFK jr. to comment on the borderline diagnosis, and you're there.

Likewise, “*hat eine hohe Bereitschaft, langanhaltend stark gekränkt zu reagieren*” tests for personality disorders, but the behavior it describes is tolerated among the rich and pathologized among the poor. It also fits people who seek compensation from the state years later — and are more likely to be **pathologized than compensated**.

“... reagiert in Beziehungen mit massiver Eifersucht.”

Valid in domestic-violence contexts, but irrelevant otherwise.

“ . ist gegenüber bestimmten Personen (-gruppen) feindselig eingestellt. ”

Homophobia, transphobia, racism, or patriarchal misogyny will likely be ignored. Yet criticism on the police or (alleged) “antifa” sympathies may be flagged. These forms allow pure opinion — checkmarks without evidence — inviting political misuse.

“ . ist in sozialen Situationen leicht aggressiv reizbar ... ”

Again a clinical question, but unfit for untrained officers or prosecutors to judge. The real issue is **intellectual and professional incompetence** in filling out such forms.

Point 2.2 – Psychological History

Should only be assessed by licensed psychiatrists, psychologists, or psychiatric nurses — never by police or prosecutors.

Point 2.3 – Criminal History

Official records can confirm this. Yet the form allows police to include **unverified suspicions**:

“Es sollen alle Informationsquellen berücksichtigt werden ... ”

and

“Eingestellte Verfahren können ... einfließen ... ”.

That means they can assume an offense occurred without any court ruling — something only judges should decide.

No justification is required for these classifications. The form enables officers to make **reputation-damaging claims** without evidence, such as:

- “Die Person rechtfertigt Gewaltanwendung mit Weltanschauungen.”
- “Die Person lehnt geltende Normen und Regeln ab.”

Most items need no proof or reasoning. Only *“Die Person ist mehrfach vorbestraft.”* requires documentation — but even that could be falsified by ticking “yes.”

The final question, *“Bei der Person wurde eine bedingte Entlassung widerrufen (Bewährungsversagen) ”*, also demands records.

Hence, **not all questions are bad**, but many can be used without evidence — creating a high risk of abuse.

Point 2.4 – History of Violence

The form cites official sources but also accepts

“Selbstberichte sowie plausible Drittinformationen.”

That lets false or defamatory statements slip in unchecked. The average officer simply lacks the education to filter them out.

Especially worrying is this passage:

“ . Die Prüfung der Angemessenheit der Gewaltanwendung sollte sich aber nicht (nur) auf formaljuristische Kriterien abstützen. ”

In plain terms: **court rulings don’t matter if the officer disagrees**. The phrase “formal legal criteria” needs precise definition to prevent arbitrary judgment.

Points 2.5 – 2.6 – Current Problem Behavior and Mental Stress

These questions concern risk factors for violence and must be answered only by qualified clinicians.

For example,

"zeigt deutlich selbstschädigendes Verhalten im Rahmen einer sonstigen psychischen Störung."

An untrained officer might label **transgender identity** as such behavior, believing in myths about “gender madness” or “self-mutilation.” That is profoundly irresponsible.

Point 2.7 – Context of Current Behavior

"Es geht darum, den Lebenskontext auf Faktoren zu untersuchen, die eine Gewaltanwendung begünstigen."

This clause opens the door to **broad, intrusive profiling** and ongoing surveillance.

So far, the two most problematic passages I can identify are, as said,

1. the line *“Versuchen Sie, Informationen über den weiteren Verlauf beurteilter Fälle zu erfahren”* as it urges officers to “follow up” on the later lives of assessed individuals extrajudicially. That effectively encourages unauthorized surveillance — possibly even stalking, or at least something that would feel like stalking to those being watched.
2. Especially worrying is this passage:
“. Die Prüfung der Angemessenheit der Gewaltanwendung sollte sich aber nicht (nur) auf formaljuristische Kriterien abstützen.”
In plain terms: court rulings don’t matter if the officer disagrees. The phrase “formal legal criteria” needs precise definition to prevent arbitrary judgment.

Both open the gate to arbitrary extrajudicial harassment of innocent citizens and even survivors.

I'll hand the form to the AI lab to finalize the analysis.

Best regards,
ZO