Dec. 21, 2025.

Katherine Watt responses to questions presented by Michael Nevradakis, reporter, Childrens Health Defense

Links and attachments:

- St. Benedict Memo (Katherine Watt) - https://rechtoprecht.online/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/2025.09.10-St.-Benedict-Memo-Final-KW-1.pdf
- Cover Letter (Katherine Watt) - https://rechtoprecht.online/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Final-Cover-letter-KW_Geredigeerd.pdf
- Transcript, July 9, 2025 hearing, District Court of Leeuwarden, NL, English translation
- Transcript, Sept. 5, 2025 video statement, Katherine Watt
- Transcript, Dec. 15, 2025 Press Conference, Attorney Peter Stassen, Right to Justice Foundation chairman Abe Dijkstra, English translation
- Transcript, Dec. 15, 2025 Interview of Attorney Peter Stassen by Djamila le Pair, English

What prompted you to become an expert witness in this case?

See St. Benedict Memo, p. 4, paragraph 1:

> "I study US and international law surrounding communicable disease control, pandemic preparedness and response, biological product and vaccine manufacturing and biological agents. In January 2025, attorneys representing Dutch plaintiffs invited me to participate as a witness in a civil case before the District Court of Northern Netherlands at Leeuwarden...In March 2025, the attorneys submitted a petition for provisional evidence, including a list of questions on which the plaintiffs sought my testimony."

See St. Benedict Memo, pp. 8-9, Background

> "After learning about the World Health Organization International Health Regulations, 2005 edition, in January 2022, including provisions requiring "adjustment of domestic legislative and administrative arrangements," I assembled an outline of relevant US federal laws enacted by the US Congress and US Presidents... [legalizing] introduction of unidentified, unstandardized, and unregulated products into interstate and international commerce...
>
> ...Claims by Pfizer and by the US Department of Justice [made through documents filed in *Jackson v. Pfizer, et al*] led me to further investigate the history of how Congress enacted US federal laws governing biological product manufacturing, distribution and use under emergency conditions...[and]...I learned that in 1902, Congress had established the same legal conditions for routine, systematic introduction into interstate commerce and use of unidentified, unstandardized, unregulated biological products..."

As an expert witness, what do you plan to testify?

See St. Benedict Memo, pp. 5-7, Questions presented and brief answers

I plan to testify on the following subjects:

- legal frameworks governing development, manufacture, labeling, distribution and use of viruses and vaccines under US law;
- legal frameworks governing research, development, transfer and use of biological and bacteriological weapons under US law;
- the bases on which viruses, vaccines, gene therapies and other biological products are distinguished from biological and bacteriological weapons under US law;
- the non-existence of legal requirements for scientifically validated materials and methods to be used in support of statements as to safety and efficacy for viruses, vaccines, gene therapies, and other biological products;
- the relationship between US-FDA regulatory functions and decisions regarding international commerce in viruses, vaccines, gene therapies and other biological products, and
- the regulatory agencies of other countries, particularly in Europe; and
- whether the individuals who ordered, purchased and administered Covid-19 (mRNA) injections participated in war crimes and/or acts of genocide.

Why is this important?

See Sept. 5, 2025 video statement by Katherine Watt, p. 2, paragraphs 8-9:

> "...criminal prosecutions of war crimes, and civil litigation against developers and manufacturers of vaccines, have both been rendered impossible, by law, to enable the past, present and continued future deployment of intentionally harmful products to intentionally harm recipients.
>
> Cases such as the present case brought by plaintiffs can help to publicly expose the long-known and intentional harmfulness of vaccine products and vaccination acts, and to bring about the end of all vaccine manufacturing and all vaccination programs..."

The more people understand the false foundations on which communicable disease control, pandemic preparedness and response, and vaccination programs are built -- legislative misconduct, scientific and medical misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct and judicial misconduct -- the more parents and pediatricians will stop all vaccination of babies and children, and the more adults will stop taking all vaccines.

Why is it important that you have the opportunity to present your testimony in court instead of in a written statement?

See July 9, 2025 hearing transcripts, statements by Attorney Peter Stassen at p. 7, first paragraph"

The request for a hearing of experts

> "concerns an examination under oath, in which all parties can put questions to the proposed experts and respondents are given the opportunity to have a counter-expertise conducted. Such a process, which may be assumed will crystallize into two diametrically opposed camps of experts who must each give and substantiate their expert opinions under oath—such a process has simply never taken place."

p. 7, last paragraph:

> "A one-sided written statement from the proposed experts is, for all these reasons, not weighty enough for applicants to assess their legal position. Such a one-sided statement simply does not have the weight and evidentiary force of an expert-witness opinion produced in a careful legal process with the possibility of adversarial testing."

p. 8, paragraphs 4-5

> "The hard truth will prove to be that respondents are co-perpetrators of mass murder of the Dutch population, or at least are accessories to it, and that they have deceived and mistreated the entire Dutch population and murdered many well-meaning people who placed their trust in them. If the State et al. truly embraced the truth and wanted to combat disinformation, they would have no choice but to support this request.
>
> This risk to respondents—that nothing remains of the preferred reality—is obviously the real reason why respondents oppose my clients' request. If the preferred reality is pierced, respondents' liability is established and it is over and done with them as suppressors and deniers of the truth."

I agree with Stassen: in-court testimony offers opportunities for adversarial evidentiary testing that written statements do not provide.

My legal research disclosed, among other things, that the laws creating the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program, and their precursor programs were written to ensure that vaccine design-defect litigation, manufacturing-defect litigation and vaccine-injury litigation is not, and has never been, conducted through adversarial, public proceedings addressing the physico-chemical composition and physiological effects of vaccine container contents.

Claims made by defendants on the subjects of virology, epidemiology, vaccine design, vaccine manufacturing quality control, and vaccine manufacturing regulation, cannot credibly withstand cross-examination informed by the knowledge obtained over the last five years by the plaintiffs' nominated experts and other investigators who may be called to testify in this or other cases in the future about the scientific and legal misconduct underlying virology, epidemiology and vaccination.

In the "post-COVID" period, why does this case remain important?

I disagree with characterization that the present is a "post-Covid" period, because I do not believe "Covid" is or was a pandemic and pandemic-response event. The events that occurred under the "Covid" term were and are the most recent in a long series of campaigns comprising a societal reorganization project ["Great Re-set"] carried out through (among other programs) fabricated, false communicable disease and pandemic threat designations, and false responses to these false threats centered on vaccination campaigns.

This case is important because it represents the fullest formal expression to date, written and filed in a juridical context, of how communicable disease, pandemic and vaccination deceptions have been conducted historically, how the deception methods are used to falsify "Covid" threats and induce public compliance with response measures, and how the same deceptive individuals, institutions and methods will be used to project false narratives about future threats and future countermeasures, vaccines and biological products.

What have been the reactions to your recent video produced in connection with this case (and which has been making the rounds online)?

No comment

Is there anything else you would like to add, not covered by the above?

The St. Benedict Memo, and four subject-matter collections of my work

- Legal history of biological product non-regulation;
- PREP Act, public health emergency and EUA countermeasure law;
- Communicable disease control, quarantine and habeas corpus law;
- Biological agents, vaccines and biological and chemical warfare law

are available at Bailiwick News Archives on Wordpress - https://bailiwicknewsarchives.wordpress.com/ - for anyone who wants to use the material for education of family and friends, and for civil litigation, criminal prosecution and legislative reform campaigns.