The open letter below was published on VoorWaarheid's website on February 3rd 2025 and emailed on February 6th to Prime Minister Schoof, the State Secretary for Health, Welfare and Sport, the Minister of Health, Welfare and Sport and members of the House of Representatives.

To: His Excellency Mr H.W.M. Schoof
Cc: State Secretary for VWS, Mr V.P.G. Karremans
Minister of Health, Welfare and Sport, Ms M.F. Agema
Cc: Members of the House of Representatives
Date: February 3rd 2025

Subject: Open letter safety mRNA injections

Dear Mr Schoof,

We hereby respond to the answers to parliamentary questions (1055) by MP Van Meijeren in response to the NORTH Group letter we sent. Our response and follow-up questions can be found after each question and the answer given by the State Secretary, Mr Karremans. We also have three additional questions to which we would like to receive your response.

Response and follow-up questions

Question 1

How do you assess the attached letter and scientific rationale from NORTH group on the safety and efficacy of the modified mRNA products for COVID-19? [1]

Answer 1

Dutch vaccination policy is based on independent scientific advice. Alarms about vaccines are continuously monitored and investigated. If warranted, appropriate action is taken to ensure the safety of vaccinations. In answering several written questions on COVID-19 vaccination, my predecessors in office have already addressed in detail the concerns raised in the aforementioned letter are expressed. I have included references to these earlier responses in my reply below.

Response/follow-up questions to answer 1

The RIVM , the CBG, the Health Council and Lareb are all involved in vaccination policy. In what way are these bodies independent?

The signals about safety are very much there. Why is no appropriate action being taken?

- This NPO radio programme admits deaths from COVID-19 injections. https://x.com/NPORadio1/status/1765825291648188609
- *" CBG: There are now >100 reports of death after vaccination."* https://open.minvws.nl/dossier/VWS-WOO/3478791-1040904-pdo/document/VWS-WOO-08-1109205

- *"1 is designated as serious and received epipen as treatment." https://open.minvws.nl/dossier/VWS-WOO/3477674-1040721-pdo/document/VWS-WOO-08-1042659*
- *"A total of 188 fatal cases have been reported worldwide so far." https://t.co/FBRZ1PkFns (CBG public report 970th meeting)*
- *"During routine signal detection activities, a signal of immune thrombocytopenia (ITP) was identified by EMA, based on 63 cases retrieved from EudraVigilance. " https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/minutes/minutes-prac-meeting-8-11-march-2021_en.pdf*
- *"Scope: signal of myocarditis and pericarditis" https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/minutes/minutes-prac-meeting-7-10-june-2021_en.pdf*
- *"a signal of erythema multiforme was identified, based on 72 cases retrieved from EudraVigilance. "https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/minutes/minutes-prac-meeting-5-8-july-2021_en.pdf*
- *"a signal of autoimmune hepatitis (AIH) was identified by EMA, based on thirteen cases, that are supportive and well-documented in the literature. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/minutes/minutes-prac-meeting-29-november-2-december-2021_en.pdf*
- *"Scope: Signal of heavy menstrual bleeding "https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/minutes/minutes-prac-meeting-24-27-october-2022_en.pdf*

Question 2

Do you acknowledge that the injections against COVID-19 have never been tested for their ability to stop virus transmission? If not, why not? If yes, how do you assess the concerns expressed in the letter regarding this?

Answer 2

For a detailed explanation on this subject, please refer to the answer to written questions by Member Van Haga (Van Haga Group) dated 12 October 2022.[2]

Response/follow-up to answer 2

None

Question 3

Do you acknowledge that COVID-19 injections resulted in an unprecedented number of reported side effects, as well as deaths? If not, why not? If yes, how do you assess the concerns expressed in the letter regarding this?

Answer 3

For a detailed explanation of the number of reported adverse reactions, please refer to the answers to written questions by Member Van Haga dated 25 July 2022.[3] There is broad scientific consensus that the COVID-19 vaccines protect well against serious illness and death.

Response/follow-up questions to answer 3

The number of adverse reactions received at Lareb is almost 20x higher than expected. Under all conceivable circumstances, at least, this cannot be attributed to extra media coverage of the possible side effects. Many are unaware of the possible side effects and/or do not know the way to Lareb.

- *"Currently, this estimate is assumed.*
  Additional reports vaccines: 15,000, of which 600 are serious."
  https://voorwaarheid.nl/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/2022-03-09-Tuchtklacht-Pels-Rijcken-bijlage-2-WOB-Draaiboek-LAREB-Veiligheidsbewaking-Corona-pandemie-mei-2020.pdf

- *Group 2: Total number of complaints added together: 299,960"*
  "Latest status on the website of adverse reaction centre LAREB (Landelijke Registratie en Evaluatie Bijwerkingen): https://www.lareb.nl/bijwerkingen-coronavaccins (up to 8 September 2024)"
  https://voorwaarheid.nl/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/20240908-Overzicht-LAREB-cijfers.pdf

Normally, and especially now that there is no pandemic or emergency, a drug that has such an extremely poor safety profile is withdrawn. Why not in the case of the COVID-19 injections?

Question 4
Do you acknowledge that analyses by multiple, independent scientists indicate variable and excessive amounts of residual plasmid DNA in Pfizer's and Moderna's products, which should never have ended up in marketed vials? If not, why not? If yes, how do you assess the concerns expressed in the letter in this regard?

Answer 4
I do not subscribe to these analyses. For a detailed explanation, see the answers to written questions by Member Van Haga dated 17 April[4] and 3 October 2023.[5] I also refer to the response given by the Australian *Therapeutic Goods Administration* (TGA) following reports on this issue.[6]

Response/follow-up questions to answer 4

- OCABR reports confirm the presence of DNA in the mRNA injections.
  https://voorwaarheid.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/foi-3390-11.pdf
  https://voorwaarheid.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/125742_S2_M3_32p5_batch-analyses.pdf
- The EMA is aware of the discussion on the presence of the SV40 promoter sequences in the mRNA injections.

From: [redacted]@ema.europa.eu>
Date: October 12, 2023 at 1:27:02 PM EDT
To [redacted]@fda.hhs.gov, "Smith, Dean (HC/SC)" <dean.smith@hc-sc.gc.ca>, [redacted]@fda.hhs.gov
Subject: SV40 Comirnaty

Dear All

We are going to discuss the matter of SV40 with Pfizer/Biontech as well as these alleged high level of DNA in vaccines coming from these external parties

Have you taken any action? What would be your perspective?

Many thanks and happy to discuss

Best
[redacted]

Classified as confidential by the European Medicines Agency

Source: https://scoopsmcgoo.substack.com/p/should-the-sequence-have-been-disclosedhttps://scoopsmcgoo.substack.com/p/should-the-sequence-have-been-disclosed
To ignore this would be a criminal act. The EEA can only function properly when transparency is the norm.

- Ulrike Kämmerer has shown in her recent publication that SV40 is present in the residual DNA in the mRNA injections.
  BioNTech RNA-Based COVID-19 Injections Contain Large Amounts Of Residual DNA Including An SV40 Promoter/Enhancer Sequence - Science, Public Health Policy and the Law
- Sandeep Chakraborty also confirms the presence of SV40 sequences and the possibility of integration.
  https://osf.io/preprints/osf/hzyn3
- McKernan was the first to publish his findings on this as early as April 2023.
  https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369967228_Sequencing_of_bivalent_Moderna_and_Pfizer_mRNA_vaccines_reveals_nanogram_to_microgram_quantities_of_expression_vector_dsDNA_per_dose

Does the prime minister agree that the OCABR reports confirm the presence of DNA in the mRNA injection fluid?
Does the minister also agree that multiple peer-reviewed studies have shown that the amount of DNA exceeds the limit set by EMA?
Does the minister also agree that sequences similar to SV40 have been found?

Question 5
Are you prepared to immediately end the use of modified mRNA injections against COVID-19, as well as initiate a recall of these products? If not, why not?

Answer 5
No, see my response to question 1.

Response/follow-up question to answer 5

Since you are not prepared to stop the mRNA injection campaign, but are aware of the safety risks, DNA contamination and batch-dependency of side effects, are you also prepared to take personal and ministerial responsibility for the personal injury and possible criminal offences involved here?

Question 6
Are you willing to commission an independent and transparent investigation into the compliance, method of approval and use of the mRNA injections? If not, why not?
Answer 6
The safety of COVID-19 vaccines has been extensively researched and assessed by several independent scientific bodies, including the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the Health Council. I see
no reason to commission additional research into the method of approval and use of COVID-19 vaccines.

Response/follow-up question to answer 6

Since you do not want to investigate, should we take this as an attempt to maintain a plausible deniability?

Intentionally not doing research when the law requires it, is a tort. That research needs to be done also stems from the type of injection that is wrongly not classified as gene therapy or GMO. That this is very emphatically the case is now no longer a discussion but an observation.

The CAT reports published on the EMA website 2-4 Dec 2020 and 15-17 March 2021 very clearly state that the vector injections (AstraZeneca and Janssen) are GMO, and also that because of the production method used for the mRNA, namely using a genetically modified bacterium E. coli, the mRNA should also be considered GMO.

- *"7.4.5. Regulatory status of Ribonucleic acid (RNA) products CAT: Marcos Timón, Violaine Closson-Carella, Egbert Flory, Hans Ovelgönne Scope: reflection on the consequences for ATMPs of the Commission's feedback on the regulatory status of RNA products in the context of vaccines against COVID-19 Action: for discussion Further to a discussion in July 2020 (see CAT minutes of the July CAT meeting, point 7.4.2), a brainstorming meeting took place (between CAT secretariat and CAT members) to reflect upon the consequence for the ATMP field of the Commission's feedback on a question from EMA on the status of RNA vaccines that are prepared fully synthetically. Feedback from the brainstorming meeting was provided. For the moment, messenger RNAs (mRNA) are produced biosynthetically (transcribed in vitro for a DNA template) and fulfil the definition of a GTMP: such long chain mRNAs cannot yet be produced via chemical synthesis. However, when this becomes possible, the regulatory status of such synthetic RNAs need to be considered, as it should be avoided to have similar products being covered by different legal frameworks. In the field of genome editing, some settings (i.e. in vivo genome editing based on the administration of the nuclease (enzyme) and a synthetic guide RNA) are currently not covered by the definition of a GTMP:* ***this should***

be kept in mind if the GTMP definition would be opened for revision (see 7.5.2)."
https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/minutes/minutes-cat-meeting-2-4-december-2020_en.pdf

- "*7.4.2. Product information for medicinal products that contain or consist of modified viruses*
  Scope: Product information for medicinal products that contain or consist of modified viruses: learning from recent cases. Action: for discussion In the light of the current experience with GMO-based vaccines, it was proposed to enlarge the group involved in the interplay between the Pharma and GMO authorities to discuss GMO topics for all medicines (so far the focus was mainly on GTMPs)."
  https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/minutes/minutes-cat-meeting-17-18-march-2021_en.pdf
- The European Court ruled on this in 2018; Case C-528/16.
  "Article 2(2) of Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 March 2001 on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms and repealing Council Directive 90/220/EEC must be interpreted as meaning that organisms obtained by means of techniques/methods of mutagenesis constitute genetically modified organisms within the meaning of that provision"
  https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=oj:JOC_2018_328_R_0005

The above leaves no room for interpretation whether the COVID-19 injections, both vector and mRNA injections, are GMO or not.

Question
Can you provide the Chamber with scientific evidence that irrefutably supports the claim, that there is absolutely no risk of harm to human DNA? If not, why not?

Answer 7
Due to the lack of appropriate excipients (enzymes), both the mRNA and any bits of plasmid DNA that may have been left behind in the vaccine cannot enter the nucleus of the body cells, where the DNA is located. Thus, the vaccines cannot penetrate human DNA change. For further explanation, please refer to the letter to your Chamber dated 6 March 2023.[7]

Response/follow-up questions to answer 7
Since there are now several publications on the integration of RNA into DNA or DNA into DNA, we wonder where does the belief the enzymes are missing come from?

- As early as 2021, the SARS-CoV-2 sequence was identified as having the potential for integration: https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2105968118
- https://www.authorea.com/users/455597/articles/584039-potential-mechanisms-for-human-genome-integration-of-genetic-code-from-sars-cov-2-mrna-vaccination?commit=e407053f40c87c1e8896632e71e49360ccbc411b
- https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35723296/
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359256485_Intracellular_Reverse_Transcription_of_COVID-19_mRNA_Vaccine_In_Vitro_in_Human_Cell

So the fact that mRNA can integrate into DNA is not in dispute.

How can the prime minister be so sure that this is not the case with these experimental gene therapy injections? Has any research been done on this?
Can the prime minister share that specific research?

Question 8
Can you answer these questions separately?

Answer 8
Yes.

Additional questions

Furthermore, we have the following additional questions for the prime minister.

Question 1
The existence of batch-dependent side effects is no longer in doubt, as there are several peer-reviewed publications that have demonstrated this phenomenon:

- https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/eci.13998 m.b.a. Danish data.
- https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/eci.14102 supplementary letter.
- https://www.mdpi.com/1648-9144/60/8/1343 m.b.a. Swedish data.
- https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/eci.14271 m.b.a. Czech data.
- https://publichealthpolicyjournal.com/batch-dependent-safety-of-the-bnt162b2-mrna-covid-19-vaccine-in-the-united-states/ regarding data from the US.

Is the prime minister aware of these studies?
How does the prime minister view the confirmation of batch-dependent side effects?

Question 2
Several manufacturers in the Netherlands also produced batches. RIVM conducted OCABR analysis for all these batches, including those used outside the Netherlands.
https://voorwaarheid.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/foi-3390-11.pdf
https://voorwaarheid.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/125742_S2_M3_32p5_batch-analyses.pdf

Is the prime minister willing to release the OCABR reports? This also with a view to DNA contamination, as the OCABR analyses contain standard RNA and DNA measurements.

Question 3
EU regulations 2020/1043 (GMO exception) and 2021/756 (gene therapy exception) are contrary to the TFEU and are therefore null and void. Consequently, the marketing authorisations issued by the EC on 21 December 2020 for Pfizer and on 6 January 2021 for Moderna are unlawful.

Will you instruct the CBG and the IGJ to immediately seize all illegal drugs and stop their use by, for example, suspending the licence for Dutch territory?

For additional information, see below.

- EU Regulation 2020/1043 specifically circumvents the safety procedures to develop AND use these GMO products. However, this regulation is found to violate the TFEU (pseudo EU constitution), namely Article 114, and more importantly Article 168, Article 191 and Article 193.

  "Conclusion. As none of the legal bases on which the Regulation relies (Article 168(4)(c) and Article 114 TFEU) are applicable, it can be concluded, for the time being, that the Regulation is null and void in principle due to the lack of an (applicable) legal basis.58 As indicated above, the assessment on the possible nullity of a measure is reserved to the Court of Justice of the European Union. Whether the Court will actually, where appropriate, annul the Regulation and, if so, what consequences it will then attach to its judgment, cannot of course be indicated with complete certainty (see also below, section 3.4)."
  https://cogem.net/app/uploads/2022/12/CGM-2022-05-Veerkrachtig-biotechnologiebeleid.pdf

- Since the EU legal exemption for GMO injections is invalid, all safety measures must be followed, but this has not been done. The marketing authorisations violate EU regulations 2001/18 & 2009/41, COVID-19 injections are therefore illegal on the market.

- As we read in the CAT minutes of 2-4 December 2020, mRNA injections are gene therapy medicinal products according to the EMA.
  The expert group that tried to circumvent this conflict used a special procedure in which non-legislative regulations can be drafted by experts, this was published in EU 2021/756. The limitation lies in Articles 290 and 291 of the TFEU, it cannot be a legislative regulation under any circumstances. For delegated act 2021/756, regulation 2019/5 used.

  "As a consequence of the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon, the powers conferred on the Commission under Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 should be aligned to Articles 290 and 291 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). In order to supplement or amend certain non-essential elements of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004"
  https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2019/5/oj/eng

- *"(Non-legislative acts)"*
  *"Modifications of those vaccines may include changes to the **coding sequence**"*
  *"or coding sequence or combination of serotypes, strains, antigens or **coding sequences**;"*
  *"replacement or addition of a serotype, strain, antigen or **coding sequence** or combination of serotypes, strains, antigens or coding sequences for a human coronavirus vaccine"*
  *"variations related to the replacement or addition of a serotype, strain, antigen or **coding sequence** or combination of serotypes, strains, antigens or coding sequences for a human coronavirus vaccine."*
  https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32021R0756

- Procedure delegated act:
  https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/en/procedure-file?reference=2021/2616(DEA)

- Timetable delegated act
  https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/regdel/#/delegatedActs/1677

- The draft version of 19 February 2021 did not contain the words "coding sequence", but the version adopted on 24 March 2021 did contain these words several times, rendering EU Regulation 2021/756 null and void as it violates Articles 290 and 291 TFEU.
  "2. Discussion on the draft delegated act amending Commission Regulation (EC) No 1234/2008 concerning the examination of variations to the terms of marketing authorisations for medicinal products for human use."
  https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/expert-groups-register/screen/meetings/consult?lang=en&meetingId=24156&fromExpertGroups=2858
  It is clear that the expert group went beyond its remit and changed the terms of marketing authorisations.

  On 9 March 2021, Pascal Canfin was added to this expert group, but Mr Canfin has no expertise in the field and is a politician and confidant of President Macron. Canfin was a member of the European Parliament at the time he was added to the expert group.
  https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/96711/PASCAL_CANFIN/home

Sincerely,

W.C. Engel
Stichting VoorWaarheid
Representative NORTHGroup for the Netherlands

References in the response to the parliamentary questions

[1] Annex privately transmitted
[2] *Appendix Acts II2022/23*, no
[3] *Appendix Acts II* 2021/22, no 3796
[4] *Appendix Acts II* 2022/23, no 2862
[5] *Appendix Acts II* 2023/24, no. 475
[6] *Therapeutic Goods Administration*(18 October 2024). "Addressing misinformation about excessive DNA in the mRNA vaccines". https://www.tga.gov.au/news/media-releases/addressing-misinformation-about-excessive-dna-mrna-vaccines
[7] *Parliamentary Papers II* 2022/23, 25 295, no