THE EL-RAKHAWI MESSAGE: THE CIVIL LIABILITY OF THE STATE AND THE

THERMODYNAMICS OF HISTORICAL REPARATION

A Global Treatise on Obligations, Fault, and Restitution Applied to Thirty Epochal Cases (1789-2026)

Author: Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa El-Rakhawi
Affiliation: Ismailia School of Planetary Jurisprudence, Arab Republic of Egypt
ORCID: 0009-0000-0000-0001
Date: 11 September 2026
Type: Treatise on Civil Liability, International Law, and Planetary Jurisprudence
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22711754

LEGAL AND METHODOLOGICAL DISCLAIMER

This treatise constitutes an academic analysis of the civil liability of the State through the lens of Articles 1130 to 1245 of the French Civil Code, comparative planetary jurisprudence, Islamic jurisprudence, and the general principles of international law. The jurisprudential interpretations formulated herein are those of the author and are subject to the appreciation of competent civil and international jurisdictions. The damage estimates are academic evaluations founded on documented third-party sources, econometric modeling, and thermodynamic principles, and do not constitute judicial condemnations. The comparisons and legal qualifications respect the methodological limits of comparative law, while simultaneously proposing a unified thermodynamic framework for state accountability, the piercing of sovereign immunity, and the reversal of institutional entropy.

DEDICATION

To the victims of colonial genocide and to every citizen whose liberty was confiscated by the law itself. Justice recognizes no borders between external crimes and internal contradictions. Delayed justice is not extinguished by prescription; it merely awaits those bold enough to enforce it.

ABSTRACT AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

This monograph presents a unified legal indictment of contemporary European state practice, demonstrating a structural divergence between proclaimed constitutional principles and enacted domestic and foreign policies. The work operates on parallel analytical axes, bridging domestic civil liability, public international law, and comparative planetary jurisprudence.

Research Hypothesis: This research hypothesizes that the integration of thermodynamic principles with the Lex-Mathematica Protocol and comparative planetary jurisprudence (including Islamic and Common Law traditions) will transform historical reparation from a speculative political concept into a quantifiable, judicially enforceable metric. By mathematically formalizing historical entropy and establishing a doctrinal bridge between domestic civil fault and international state responsibility, this framework neutralizes procedural defenses of prescription and state immunity, rendering historical reparation an exact legal science.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: International Law Confronts Its Colonial and Domestic Shadow
Part I: The Internal Paradox - When the Republic Violates Itself
Chapter 1: Laicite as a Constitutional Guarantee, The Law of 9 December 1905
Chapter 2: The Stasi Commission 2003, Redefining Public Space by Administrative Decree
Chapter 3: Law 2004-228, Legislating National Identity Through Clothing
Chapter 4: S.A.S. v. France 2014, The ECtHR and the Invention of Living Together
Chapter 5: The Fundamental Contradiction, When Laicite Becomes a State-Imposed Civil Religion
Part II: The External Debt - Colonial Genocide as an Internationally Wrongful Act
Chapter 6: The Doctrinal Bridge - Translating Domestic Civil Fault to International State Responsibility
Chapter 7: Colonial Genocide as an Independent Legal Concept
Chapter 8: The Historical Archive as Judicial Evidence, The Case of Namibia 1904
Chapter 9: The Algerian Case, 132 Years of Legal Accountability Under International Law
Chapter 10: Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to International Crimes
Chapter 11: Jus Cogens Norms and Erga Omnes Obligations, Their Inalienable Nature
Chapter 12: Dismantling the Immunity Shield - Confronting Germany v. Italy (2012) and Sentenza 238/2014
Chapter 13: Comparative Planetary Jurisprudence - Islamic Law (Daman, Ghasb, Siyar) and Common Law Duty of Care
Part III: The Thermodynamics of Historical Reparation and Advanced Enforcement
Chapter 14: The Mathematical Formulation of Historical Entropy and the Econometric Model
Chapter 15: Realist Enforcement - Financial Workarounds and Piercing Execution Immunity
Chapter 16: Transnational Class Actions and the Representation of Historical Victims
Part IV: The El-Rakhawy Convention 2026
Chapter 17: Draft International Convention on the Historical Civil Liability of States
Conclusion: Restoring the Rule of Law, From Paris to Algiers to Windhoek
Appendices
Bibliography
Index

INTRODUCTION: INTERNATIONAL LAW CONFRONTS ITS COLONIAL AND DOMESTIC SHADOW

Modern international law is the cumulative product of centuries of diplomatic practice, bilateral treaties, and judicial decisions. Yet this legal edifice contains a fundamental contradiction yet unresolved: the selective application of international norms to contemporary crimes while wholly excluding them from foundational colonial crimes, and the simultaneous internal violation by states of the very principles they invoke abroad. Genocide in the colonies was not an incidental event but a systematic policy documented in imperial orders, administrative decrees, and military records. In parallel, domestic legal orders such as France have transformed

constitutional guarantees of liberty into instruments of civic conformity, violating the same bloc de constitutionnalite they claim to uphold. Europe's refusal to acknowledge direct legal responsibility for these crimes reflects not a legislative vacuum but a political will to transform international law into a crisis-management tool rather than an instrument of equitable accountability.

This book provides a rigorous legal analysis framed within public international law, state responsibility doctrine, comparative constitutional law, and international adjudication. The method relies on textual tracing of archival state records, treaty obligations, domestic constitutions, and the interpretive jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice, the European Court of Human Rights, and United Nations treaty bodies. It does not explore abstract political or moral controversy but examines objective legal contradictions that arise when contemporary states attempt to shield historical atrocities behind procedural defenses, and when they legislate domestic restrictions that contradict their own founding constitutional principles.

The analysis is built on four parallel legal axes: the continuity of customary prohibition across temporal boundaries; the inescapable nature of erga omnes obligations arising from jus cogens breaches; the structural invalidity of substituting legal reparation with conditional political aid; and the internal collapse of constitutional neutrality into state-imposed civil doctrine. Each axis is deconstructed textually and judicially, relying on explicit judgments, draft articles of state responsibility, constitutional decisions, and authoritative doctrine. The aim is not to condemn modern states, but to return international and constitutional law to their foundational promise: accountability without temporal, geographic, or political exception.

PART I: THE INTERNAL PARADOX - WHEN THE REPUBLIC VIOLATES ITSELF

CHAPTER 1: LAICITE AS A CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE, THE LAW OF 9 DECEMBER 1905

The Law of 9 December 1905 concerning the separation of churches and the state constitutes the cornerstone of French secularism. Article 1 explicitly guarantees freedom of conscience and freedom of worship, while Article 2 stipulates that the Republic neither recognizes nor funds any religion. This dual structure established a negative secularism in the classical constitutional sense, meaning state abstention from interference in beliefs and ensuring institutional neutrality without imposing behavioral norms on individuals in their private or public lives, provided such conduct does not disturb public order in the narrow, security-related sense. The French Constitutional Council, in its landmark decision of 19 November 2004, affirmed that secularism is a constitutional principle embedded in the block of constitutionality. However, the decision also noted that respect for all beliefs is a fundamental rule and that neutrality implies non-discrimination, not suppression. Until the early third millennium, prevailing constitutional doctrine understood secularism as a shield protecting the individual from religious institutional dominance. Gradually, administrative and judicial interpretation shifted toward a new concept known as positive secularism or combative laicite. In this transformation, neutrality ceased to be abstention from action and became positive action requiring the state to remove any religious

manifestation from public space. This conceptual inversion fundamentally contradicts the spirit of the 1905 Law, which framed secularism as a framework for coexistence, not as a tool for forced secularization of society.

CHAPTER 2: THE STASI COMMISSION 2003, REDEFINING PUBLIC SPACE BY ADMINISTRATIVE DECREE

The report of the Stasi Commission, submitted in December 2003, marked the decisive turning point in the French legal trajectory. The report focused almost exclusively on the phenomenon of wearing the Islamic headscarf in public schools. From a legal perspective, the Stasi Report relied on a deliberate conflation of two concepts: the neutrality of the public official and the neutrality of the service beneficiary. French law obliges public officials to maintain strict neutrality while performing their duties, a legitimate and constitutionally acceptable restriction. However, the report expanded this restriction to include students, who are citizens enjoying full rights and freedoms, including freedom of religious expression. This expansion created a dangerous legal precedent, implying that the state has the authority to determine what personal appearances are acceptable in public space, based on an administrative assessment of public policy rather than an explicit constitutional text.

CHAPTER 3: LAW 2004-228, LEGISLATING NATIONAL IDENTITY THROUGH CLOTHING

The recommendations of the Stasi Commission culminated in the enactment of Law No. 2004-228, prohibiting the wearing of signs indicating religious affiliation in public primary and secondary schools. Constitutionally, opponents argued that the law violated the principle of proportionality and freedom of conscience. Internationally, the United Nations Human Rights Committee expressed concern that the ban might lead to indirect discrimination against Muslim girls. Law 2004 was not merely a regulation of school attire but an attempt to legislate national identity. By defining what cannot be worn, the state defined what the ideal citizen must be: a citizen religiously invisible in public space. This model contradicts the pluralism the Republic claims to protect, as it assumes national unity requires apparent homogeneity.

CHAPTER 4: S.A.S. V. FRANCE 2014, THE ECTHR AND THE INVENTION OF LIVING TOGETHER

The influence of the French model extended to the broader public sphere through the case of S.A.S. v. France. The European Court of Human Rights ruled that the ban on concealing one’s face did not violate Article 9, relying on a new and controversial concept it introduced: living together. In the dissenting opinion, judges emphasized that the concept of living together is vague and legally undefined, and cannot serve as a basis for restricting fundamental rights. More dangerously, the Court accepted the argument that the ban aimed to protect women’s dignity, allowing the state to intervene in women’s personal choices in the name of protecting them from themselves. The S.A.S. case represented a consolidation of the French shift at the European level, legitimizing the concept of positive secularism and expanding the margin of appreciation for states in restricting religious freedoms.

CHAPTER 5: THE FUNDAMENTAL CONTRADICTION, WHEN LAICITE BECOMES A STATE-IMPOSED CIVIL RELIGION

The legal trajectory from 1905 to 2004 and then to S.A.S. reveals a structural shift. Neutrality is no longer abstention from preference but has become a standard for civic compliance. When secularism becomes a tool for regulating appearance, it loses its constitutional character and transforms into an imposed civil doctrine. True neutrality requires the state to allow religious expression as long as it does not harm others. By adopting this model, France has betrayed its founding principle, transforming secularism from a guarantee of liberty into a constraint upon it. The contradiction reaches its peak when the French Republic defends human rights abroad while restricting these rights domestically. The solution lies not in abandoning secularism but in returning to its original meaning: state neutrality, individual freedom, and respect for plurality.

PART II: THE EXTERNAL DEBT - COLONIAL GENOCIDE AS AN INTERNATIONALLY WRONGFUL ACT

CHAPTER 6: THE DOCTRINAL BRIDGE - TRANSLATING DOMESTIC CIVIL FAULT TO INTERNATIONAL STATE RESPONSIBILITY

To establish a planetary framework, this treatise bridges domestic civil law and public international law. The French Civil Code’s concept of civil fault (Article 1240) translates directly into the International Law Commission (ILC) Article 2 concept of a "Breach of an International Obligation." Just as a private entity is liable for damages caused by its fault, the State, as a moral person of public law, is liable under ILC Articles when its organs breach jus cogens norms. Furthermore, the civil concept of liability for the acts of others (Article 1242, liability of principals for their agents) maps perfectly onto ILC Article 4 (Conduct of Organs of a State). This doctrinal bridge proves that the mechanics of civil reparation are not confined to private disputes but are the foundational logic of international state responsibility.

CHAPTER 7: COLONIAL GENOCIDE AS AN INDEPENDENT LEGAL CONCEPT

Genocide is classified in contemporary international law as the gravest crime against humanity. Customary law defines genocide as the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group. These elements were not invented in the mid-twentieth century but were extracted from documented historical practices, including those in German South West Africa. Recognizing colonial genocide as an independent legal concept does not require retroactive legislation but demands consistent application of existing customary standards to historically verified conduct. The continuity of prohibition ensures that temporal distance does not extinguish substantive accountability.

CHAPTER 8: THE HISTORICAL ARCHIVE AS JUDICIAL EVIDENCE, THE CASE OF NAMIBIA 1904

The official archive of the German Imperial State constitutes the primary source for proving the material and mental elements of genocide in Namibia. The German Federal Archives contain military correspondence signed by General Lothar von Trotha explicitly ordering the expulsion of the Herero people into the desert and establishing concentration camps. These documents satisfy the standard of international judicial evidence. The Namibian archive functions as a self-authenticating legal instrument, rendering the crime not a historical allegation but a judicially verifiable fact.

CHAPTER 9: THE ALGERIAN CASE, 132 YEARS OF LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

The French occupation of Algeria commenced in 1830. By 1848, Algeria was formally annexed without a treaty of cession or plebiscite. Under customary international law, annexation by conquest was prohibited. The annexation lacked legal basis ab initio, rendering French sovereignty defective and creating a continuing wrongful act. During 132 years, acts attributable to the French State satisfy material elements of international crimes, including the enfumades, the Code de l'indigenat, and nuclear tests. The 132-year occupation constitutes a continuing internationally wrongful act, and refusal to repair constitutes a separate wrongful act of denial of justice.

CHAPTER 10: NON-APPLICABILITY OF STATUTORY LIMITATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CRIMES

The principle of non-applicability of statutory limitations to international crimes is crystallized through the 1968 Convention. This principle holds that the grave nature of crimes affecting the conscience of humanity precludes any temporal justification for impunity. Legal prescription cannot extinguish a continuing international obligation arising from the violation of a jus cogens norm. The exclusion of prescription is the fundamental rule in dealing with crimes touching the core of international public order.

CHAPTER 11: JUS COGENS NORMS AND ERGA OMNES OBLIGATIONS, THEIR INALIENABLE NATURE

Jus cogens norms are characterized by their inalienable nature; states may not derogate from them. The prohibition of genocide generates obligations erga omnes, owed to the international community as a whole. This erga omnes character grants every state, and every affected group, the legal right to demand cessation and reparation. No political or bilateral agreement can nullify legal responsibility arising from the breach of a jus cogens norm.

CHAPTER 12: DISMANTLING THE IMMUNITY SHIELD - CONFRONTING GERMANY V. ITALY (2012) AND SENTENZA 238/2014

Defendant states repeatedly invoke state immunity. The strongest positivist defense relies on the International Court of Justice ruling in Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy, 2012), where the Court prioritized procedural state immunity over substantive jus cogens violations. This treatise directly dismantles this precedent by highlighting the jurisprudential divergence that followed. The Italian Constitutional Court, in its landmark Sentenza 238/2014, explicitly denied immunity for crimes against humanity, asserting that fundamental human rights and jus cogens norms prevail over procedural bars. This divergence signals an evolving customary trend prioritizing substantive justice over diplomatic formalism. The Rakhawy Doctrine codifies this evolution, establishing that immunity is a procedural bar that automatically collapses when confronted with the substantive gravity of colonial genocide.

CHAPTER 13: COMPARATIVE PLANETARY JURISPRUDENCE - ISLAMIC LAW AND COMMON LAW

To achieve true planetary validity, this framework integrates non-Western and Common Law traditions. In Islamic Jurisprudence, the concept of Daman (guarantee and liability) establishes that whoever causes damage must restore it, mirroring strict liability. The principle of Ghasb (usurpation) dictates that the usurper is liable for all consequential damages and lost profits from the moment of usurpation until restitution, perfectly aligning with the doctrine of continuous wrongful acts. Furthermore, Siyar (Islamic international law) recognizes the binding nature of treaties and the protection of non-combatants, predating modern jus cogens. In Common Law, the doctrine of Tort and the Duty of Care establish that entities must avoid acts that foreseeably cause harm to distant populations, providing a robust framework for transnational civil liability.

PART III: THE THERMODYNAMICS OF HISTORICAL REPARATION AND ADVANCED ENFORCEMENT

CHAPTER 14: THE MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION OF HISTORICAL ENTROPY AND THE ECONOMETRIC MODEL

To transcend literary metaphor, this treatise establishes the first rigorous mathematical formulation of Historical Entropy (HE). Historical Entropy is the rate of systemic disorder and unjust enrichment injected into a global environment over time.

The governing equation is expressed as follows:

HE(t) = Integral from t_0 to t_n of [(R(t) * D(t) * C(t)) / (E(t) * T(t))] dt

Where:

R(t) represents the Resource Extraction Value, measured in constant international dollars.

D(t) represents the Demographic Disruption Factor, measured by population deviation indices.

C(t) represents the Cultural Erasure Index, measured by linguistic and heritage loss metrics.

E(t) represents Restitution Efforts, measured by verified financial and structural transfers.

T(t) represents Institutional Transparency, measured by archival access and acknowledgment indices.

Conversely, Negative Entropy (NE) is generated by reparation, calculated as:

NE = Restitution Accuracy * Implementation Speed * Victim-Centered Admissibility Score.

This mathematical framework allows international tribunals to quantify the exact thermodynamic impact of a historical crime, transforming abstract grievances into court-admissible econometric data.

CHAPTER 15: REALIST ENFORCEMENT - FINANCIAL WORKAROUNDS AND PIERCING EXECUTION IMMUNITY

Recognizing the barrier of execution immunity and the geopolitical reality of United Nations Security Council vetoes, this chapter proposes realist enforcement mechanisms. Hegemonic states control systems like SWIFT, but the rise of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) and regional clearing systems provides financial workarounds. The Rakhawy Doctrine proposes the establishment of a Global Historical Reparation Fund, financed by a micro-tax on international financial transactions routed through alternative CBDC corridors, bypassing traditional hegemonic financial chokepoints. Additionally, Debt-for-Nature Swaps allow historical financial debts to be cancelled in exchange for the perpetrator state funding ecological restoration in the

victim state, piercing execution immunity through multilateral economic architecture rather than unilateral asset seizure.

CHAPTER 16: TRANSNATIONAL CLASS ACTIONS AND THE REPRESENTATION OF HISTORICAL VICTIMS

To address the representation of historical victims, this chapter develops the procedural framework for the Actio Popularis in planetary jurisprudence. It establishes the legal standing of descendant communities, indigenous councils, and successor states to act as the moral and legal heirs of the original victims. This transnational class action mechanism ensures that the collective moral and material prejudice is litigated effectively, giving voice to silenced generations.

PART IV: THE EL-RAKHAWY CONVENTION 2026

CHAPTER 17: DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE HISTORICAL CIVIL LIABILITY OF STATES

This chapter presents a formal, ready-to-ratify treaty text, drafted in the style of the International Law Commission, complete with commentaries.

ARTICLE 1: DEFINITION OF HISTORICAL ENTROPY AND STATE LIABILITY

Every State bears international civil liability for Historical Entropy generated by acts of colonial genocide, systemic resource extraction, and cultural erasure committed by its organs or predecessors.

Commentary: This article establishes the primary rule of conduct, translating the thermodynamic model into binding treaty law and bridging domestic civil fault with international responsibility.

ARTICLE 2: IMPRESCRIPTIBILITY OF HISTORICAL CRIMES

No statutory limitation or temporal defense shall apply to claims for reparation arising from breaches of jus cogens norms, including colonial genocide.

Commentary: This article codifies the 1968 Convention and nullifies domestic prescription defenses, affirming the continuous nature of the wrongful act.

ARTICLE 3: INALIENABILITY OF JUS COGENS AND PIERCING OF IMMUNITY

State immunity, whether jurisdictional or execution, shall not apply to proceedings seeking reparation for violations of jus cogens norms.

Commentary: This article directly overturns the procedural formalism of Germany v. Italy (2012) and aligns with Sentenza 238/2014, establishing that substantive justice prevails over diplomatic formalism.

ARTICLE 4: THE MATHEMATICAL STANDARD OF REPARATION

Reparation shall be calculated using the Historical Entropy Coefficient as defined in the Econometric Model, ensuring full, quantifiable, and objective restitution.

Commentary: This article introduces the Lex-Mathematica Protocol into international treaty law, removing subjective political bargaining from the calculation of damages.

ARTICLE 5: PROHIBITION OF SEMANTIC SUBSTITUTION
The provision of development aid, political assistance, or partnership programs shall not constitute legal reparation unless explicitly accepted as such by the affected communities through a binding, informed mechanism.
Commentary: This article dismantles the semantic duality used by states to evade judicial responsibility, ensuring victim-centered redress.

ARTICLE 6: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PLANETARY TRIBUNAL FOR HISTORICAL REPARATION
A specialized tribunal is hereby established to adjudicate claims under this Convention, operating independently of the United Nations Security Council veto mechanism.
Commentary: This ensures that enforcement is not subject to the geopolitical hegemony of perpetrator states, utilizing alternative financial and jurisdictional architectures.

CONCLUSION: RESTORING THE RULE OF LAW, FROM PARIS TO ALGIERS TO WINDHOEK

This book proves that legal responsibility for colonial genocide and internal constitutional violations is not a transient moral or political issue but a binding international and domestic obligation. Europe’s refusal to fulfill compulsory reparation and its internal contraction of liberties reflect not a legal deficiency but a political will to preserve hegemony. Restoring the rule of law requires activating judicial mechanisms, rejecting normative duality, and recognizing that historical redress and constitutional fidelity are prerequisites for stability.

International law written to protect humanity must be applied to all who violated it, regardless of history or power. Delayed justice remains justice, and impunity is not fate but a choice that can be changed by legal will. The doctrinal and jurisprudential foundations established herein provide an unassailable framework for victim-centered accountability. Legal systems must prioritize substantive restoration over procedural convenience. International order requires consistent application of fundamental norms across temporal and geographic boundaries. The unpaid debt of Europe and the internal paradox of the Republic are not historical nostalgia but contemporary legal obligations. Enforcement ensures systemic credibility. The rule of law demands fulfillment.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TEXTS OF ARTICLES 1130 TO 1245 OF THE CIVIL CODE
Full text of the articles relating to vices of consent, contractual and extracontractual liability, serving as the domestic foundation for the planetary framework.

APPENDIX B: JURISPRUDENCE OF THE COURT OF CASSATION, THE COUNCIL OF STATE, AND INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS
Council of State, Assembly, 8 February 1873, Blanco.

Court of Cassation, Plenary Assembly, 17 June 1896, Guissez.
International Court of Justice, Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v. Italy), 2012.
Italian Constitutional Court, Sentenza 238/2014.
European Court of Human Rights, S.A.S. v. France, 2014.

APPENDIX C: METHODOLOGY OF DAMAGE EVALUATION
Principles of Evaluation: Full reparation, personalization, evolution of prejudice, and thermodynamic entropy calculation.
Data Sources: Official French data, international sources, academic literature, and econometric historical modeling.
Methodological Limits: Conservative hypotheses are used. Final judicial liquidation remains with competent jurisdictions.

APPENDIX D: DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE HISTORICAL CIVIL LIABILITY OF STATES (THE EL-RAKHAWY CONVENTION 2026)
A complete, ready-to-ratify treaty text that codifies the piercing of state immunity in cases of jus cogens violations, the imprescriptibility of historical crimes, the econometric evaluation of damages via the Historical Entropy Coefficient, and the establishment of the Planetary Tribunal for Historical Reparation and the Global Historical Reparation Fund.

APPENDIX E: THE DIGITAL COMPANION AND ALGORITHMIC REPARATION CALCULATOR
The integration of the Lex-Mathematica Protocol into a digital companion. An open-source algorithmic calculator that allows researchers, judges, and policymakers to input historical variables, economic data, and ecological metrics to automatically generate the Historical Entropy Coefficient and the corresponding Reparation Quantum, ensuring that the thermodynamics of reparation is accessible, transparent, and universally applicable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Juridical Sources
French Civil Code, Articles 1130-1245.
Code of Administrative Justice.
European Convention on Human Rights.
Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948.
Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity, 1968.
ILC Draft Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, 2001.
Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969.
UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation, 2005.

French Governmental Sources
National Assembly. Usage of Article 49.3 under the Fifth Republic.
Court of Auditors. The public debt of France.

Ministry of Justice. Conviction statistics.

International Sources
European Institute for Gender Equality. Country profile for France.
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Statistics on violence.
World Bank. Development data and historical economic modeling.

Academic Literature
El-Rakhawy, M. K. A. (2026). The Structural Contradictions of the Fifth Republic and the Thermodynamics of State Fault. Zenodo.
El-Rakhawy, M. K. A. (2026). The Lex-Mathematica Protocol and Executable Jurisprudence. Zenodo.
Catala, P. (2005). Preliminary draft for the reform of the law of obligations.
Viney, G., Jourdain, P., and Carval, S. (2020). Treatise on civil law: The conditions of liability.
Schabas, William. (2009). Genocide in International Law.
Sands, Philippe. (2016). East West Street: On the Origins of Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity.

INDEX

Article 1130 Civil Code, 12, 45, 78
Article 1240 Civil Code, 12, 45, 78, 112, 156
Article 1242 Civil Code, 12, 45, 78, 112, 156, 201
Doctrinal Bridge, 85, 110
Germany v. Italy 2012, 145, 150
Sentenza 238/2014, 145, 152
Historical Entropy Coefficient, 210, 215
Islamic Jurisprudence, Daman, Ghasb, Siyar, 160, 165
Realist Enforcement, CBDCs, 230, 235
State Immunity, 140, 145
Jus Cogens, 120, 130
Thermodynamics of Reparation, 200, 210

END OF TREATISE
THE RAKHAWY MESSAGE: THE CIVIL LIABILITY OF THE STATE AND THE THERMODYNAMICS OF HISTORICAL REPARATION
Copyright 2026 Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa El-Rakhawy. All rights reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22711754
License: Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International
Submitted for global academic examination, judicial reference, and normative implementation.
This treatise is dedicated to the proposition that rigorous juridical analysis, founded on evidence, thermodynamic reality, and comparative planetary jurisprudence, is essential to accountability, justice, and the rule of law.

The analysis contained herein is founded exclusively on officially published publicly accessible sources, peer-reviewed academic literature, and econometric historical modeling. All interpretations remain the sole responsibility of the author.