

Dec. 15, 2025 Press Conference, Attorney Peter Stassen, Stichting Recht Oprecht [Right to Justice Foundation], with interviews with Foundation chairman Abe Dijkstra and Berber Pieksma

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p85te54FjJU>

Case documents: <https://rechtoprecht.online/>

Video transcript

Dylis Derksen, Mooie Mensen [Beautiful People]

Hi everyone. I'm Dylis Derksen from Mooie Mensen. Someone else is holding the camera. I'm in the car together with Dik, on the way to Leeuwarden. We're going to the courthouse. At 2 o'clock there's a press conference there. Those are the seven people—one has since died—who are bringing a lawsuit against the State and against [Mark] Rutte [former Dutch Prime Minister] and [other defendants], because they were not properly informed beforehand about the Covid vaccine.

New facts have been found, and Attorney [Peter] Stassen—who is the lead lawyer together with Arno van Kessel [no longer associated with the case]—has new evidence and he will give a press conference about it there. We're there and filming, and probably just a lot of other people too. You can also follow all of this through other people via a livestream, but also via Mooie Mensen, or on Facebook or on YouTube.

Attorney Peter Stassen

Thank you. Dear members of the press and those present, I would like to thank you all warmly for coming here to the courthouse square in Leeuwarden.

And as some of you know, the Right to Justice Foundation has invited me to bring the news to the press about the new and crucial evidence in the proceedings that are pending here at the courthouse in Leeuwarden and at the Court of Appeal in Amsterdam.

I know that some of you are real journalists and, via the Stichting Recht Oprecht website (<https://rechtoprecht.online/>), have taken note of my letters to the court of 7 December of this year, have already taken note of the five video messages by Sasha Latypova, Michael Yeadon, Joseph Sansone, Katherine Watt, and Catherine Austin Fitts, using the [download links there](#).

Extensive written expert reports by the first four named were also submitted in both proceedings.

Before I speak about that evidence and its meaning, I first want to discuss with you why this evidence is crucial.

And to put that into words properly, I must first place the proceedings in perspective. A perspective many people are not aware of, but should be.

And to sketch that perspective for you, I will read a quote from the Bible: Romans 1:18,

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of people who suppress the truth by unrighteousness."

And that last part—that is what these proceedings are about.

My clients—and in a broader perspective all of us—are the victims of people who suppress the truth by unrighteousness.

By suppressing the truth, my clients were deceived. Had they not been deceived, they would not have had a COVID-19 injection administered. A COVID-19 injection that, to this day, is being promoted by the suppressors of the truth as a safe and effective vaccine.

The suppression of the truth is carried out by suppressors who are working on a project. And this project of suppressing the truth—and thus suppressing all of us—has a name: The COVID-19 Re-set.

A re-set in which literally everything is reset through deception, and because of which for a number of years now people have openly spoken about a “new normal.”

The COVID-19 injections are and remain crucial for carrying out this project. I say *are and remain* crucial. Because you can see for yourselves that the executors of the COVID-19 project do not stop, and cling to their deceptive narrative of a COVID-19 pandemic and a safe and effective vaccine.

The proceedings I am able to conduct for my clients are, to the best of my knowledge, unique precisely because this perspective—the suppression of the truth via the project COVID-19: The Great Re-set—lies at the foundation of the tort claims on which my clients’ claims in the main proceedings here at the courthouse in Leeuwarden are based.

In the proceedings before the Court of Appeal in Amsterdam—where the appeal concerns ordering an expert hearing in which the experts nominated by my clients are heard in the presence of the judges—this perspective takes the form of an appeal to the European Convention on Human Rights, more specifically the appeal based on the right to a fair trial.

From the pleadings of the opposing parties—so among others the State of the Netherlands, Mark Rutte, Albert Bourla, Diederik Gommers, Marion Koopmans, Jaap van Dissel, and Hugo de Jonge—it is crystal clear that they do not want to hear anything in the courtroom about what is made more than plausible in the experts’ video reports and in their written reports.

Formally, I must remark here that only Bill Gates, on this point, has deferred to the judgment of the court.

Through their stance, however, they all show themselves to be suppressors of the truth. By continuing to speak of a safe and effective COVID-19 vaccine, they leave no doubt about which project they are executing.

An aside: everything I have said so far is really nothing more than a concise summary of what was written in the court documents at my clients’ instruction.

The experts whom my clients, through the evidence submitted, allow to speak to the judges are not only very knowledgeable, but above all faithful to what is true. Their evidence is therefore before the court—before this [Leeuwarden] court and the [Amsterdam] Court of Appeal.

And they can no longer ignore it and will now have to listen to what has been said and written, with hundreds of sources cited that substantiate their positions.

But what now appears from the evidence submitted to this court and the Court of Appeal?

First: COVID-19 injections are indistinguishable from a bioweapon. Let that sink in: a bioweapon deployed against all populations worldwide.

Two: the COVID-19 injections were deployed as emergency measures—Emergency Use Authorization countermeasures—in the framework of Operation Warp Speed, and therefore have a legal status that nullifies enforcement of pharmaceutical regulation and consumer protection by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States.

Because of the globally coordinated development, approval, deployment, and mutual recognition arrangements between the American Food and Drug Administration and the European EMA, the European Medicines Agency, the deception, about the true nature of the COVID-19 injections as regulatory-free emergency measures, continues to this day.

“Emergency measures” is a military term. And then we are talking about measures against the consequences of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear attacks. Those fall under military national-security law, not under civilian public-health law.

Mutual recognition agreements are agreements about—as the name says—mutual recognition. And the deception lies in the fact that what formally entered Europe from the United States as an emergency measure is being promoted in Europe by the executors of the COVID-19 project as a vaccine.

Three: COVID-19 injections provide no health benefit whatsoever.

[4.] COVID-19 injections are not safe and not effective.

Five: COVID-19 injections, according to their design—by design—have the goal of causing the harm that is described in the leaflet and reports as side effects.

The hundreds of side effects, including sudden death, heart failure, cancer, and the most terrible disease, were intended as such by the designers and producers of the COVID-19 injections.

Six: there is indeed a worldwide Great Reset underway. Part of this Great Reset is the build-out of a system for depopulation, by means including reducing people’s fertility and life expectancy and completing a system for total control.

The COVID-19 injections are an important part of this project, COVID-19 reset. It is a military project in the execution of which NATO plays an important role. Mark Rutte is therefore still an executor of that same project, COVID-19 Great Re-set.

Seven: in the proceedings before the District Court and the Court of Appeal there is now more than enough factual evidence for you to form your own judgment about the correctness of these conclusions.

This factual evidence is being suppressed unjustly worldwide.

And here, in particular, a task lies with you as the press to expose this injustice. The evidence for these conclusions forms part of the proceedings through the submitted video reports or video messages and reports—again, here at the District Court in Leeuwarden and at the Court of Appeal in Amsterdam.

The judges handling the cases will have to do something with it in the context of the facts alleged by my clients. This places an immensely great task and responsibility on them.

In both proceedings, oral hearings will take place next year, and the dates for those hearings are currently being planned. I therefore advise you all to follow these proceedings closely.

As the chairman of the Recht Oprecht Foundation has already informed you, your financial support is of great importance in order to be able to keep conducting these proceedings.

But perhaps even more important: anyone can conduct a proceeding like this in the Netherlands or elsewhere in the world. The publication of all procedural documents on the website of the Recht Oprecht Foundation is a helping hand for all lawyers and clients who want to stand up against the suppression of the truth.

Anyone may take note of those documents and use them for his or her own proceeding, so that more and more can be done against the suppression of the truth.

My clients are very grateful to the experts for their complete, honest, and voluntary commitment. Nothing was demanded by the experts. Money was never even discussed with them, which proves what exceptionally kind hearts these highly knowledgeable and respectable people have.

I was also asked to make a final remark, and that was that the videos from the experts have been uploaded, and from now on they are on [YouTube on a channel of the \[Stichting Recht Oprecht\] Foundation](#).

And now it is time for questions from the press.

...

Question

Yes, I have a question specifically about the judgment I read...I read in the judgment that all those defendants, that the judge decided that they also have to present themselves here in person. Did I understand that correctly, or—

Stassen

No, the starting point is still that a party in civil proceedings can be represented by his lawyer. It can indeed be an explicit wish that a party also appears personally. And it can be that if a party fails to do so, the judge can connect certain consequences to that. But I didn't read in the judgment the remark that these parties are obliged to appear. So you should not see it that way.

Question

You said something just now...you said that Bill Gates, in this case, was the only one that respected the judge's decision. How exactly does that work?

Stassen

I made that remark in the explanation that none of the defendant parties—opposing parties—want to hear anything from these experts in the courtroom. You know, we had a hearing here at the District Court in Leeuwarden where the request was handled to hear these experts, right? That is a separate petition procedure.

And in that procedure, the lawyer for Bill Gates, Mr, Heemskerk, did not say: "I oppose this claim." He said: "I defer to the judgment of the court."

And given those formal legal positions, it would not be correct if I did not mention that that "deference" did take place. Translated into ordinary language: Bill Gates says, "I'll wait for the judge's decision," and he did not say, "I oppose the request to hear experts."

Question

Is it possible to explain in simple terms how you are going to ensure that judges—who initially say, "we don't want to hear this evidence from the five experts"—how you will manage to, well, basically force them to look at it?

Stassen

That doesn't go along in the normal procedure, but they still have to look into it.

What has happened is indeed that in two proceedings — both the main case here at the District Court in Leeuwarden and also the petition procedure initially here at this court [and now at Amsterdam Court of Appeals] — we asked that these experts be allowed to speak.

And as you have seen, in the petition procedure, the request was rejected, and in the main case, at least up to now, the court has indicated that it does not place value on that.

But that does not affect the right of a party—and that is also the starting point with expert evidence—to present that expert evidence to the court itself.

And that is exactly what we did by submitting the video statements addressed to the court, and we also have the written expert reports.

So we have made use of our right to bring the expert evidence to the judge ourselves, and not to wait for permission to be allowed to bring it into the proceedings with the help of the court.

Question

You've been there since—well, what is it? This month, I think, or last month. No, officially only since—because former colleague Arno van Kessel, everyone probably knows the story, has been removed as a lawyer. What consequences does that have for you? Are you going to pull the cart alone? I don't know—you always hold back a bit, I understand. But it must affect you personally too, I imagine.

Stassen

Yes, I always refrain from comments when it concerns the case of Arno van Kessel. He has his own lawyer. I am not handling that case. And of course I am interested and follow it and have my thoughts and feelings about it. But I do not comment on it substantively.

What certainly is not the case is that I stand alone. You can see that. There are many people around me here today who support me tremendously. We also have the Right to Justice Foundation, with a board that does everything to facilitate this. So “feeling alone” is certainly not a feeling I have. I feel very strengthened by that.

And yes, I will indeed continue this case basically alone. It is also a combination of a team together with the Recht Oprecht Foundation and a number of volunteers, and a number of people in my own surroundings who support me—something that works. And if it works, you shouldn't “repair” it. So that is the reason why, for now at least, it continues in this setting.

Question

But it is a huge case. You did it with van Kessel. Is that doable then?

Stassen

Yes, that is doable. Absolutely.

Question

Without having an extra lawyer as a back-up?

Stassen

Yes—absolutely. I don't have to do it alone, as far as I'm concerned.

For those who want to read [my statement], I also have it on paper with me. I also have it in English, in case it's interesting for the English press.

Questions

On what timeline can we really expect a start of the substantive handling of this whole case?

Stassen

Good question. The substantive case will mainly be here at the District Court in Leeuwarden; that is the main proceedings. The court has requested available dates for scheduling the oral hearing up to and including October—meaning October next year [2026].

So yes, somewhere between March and October a date will be planned. And then we will have an oral hearing.

And if you have been able to read a bit in the judgment you mentioned, the court's first signal in that judgment—if you read between the lines—was that it wouldn't have to be an overly extensive hearing, but was more intended to let the clients speak, which of course is always important too.

But that judgment is, in that respect, overtaken by the evidence—the very seriously-conducted evidence that we conveyed on 7 December with a letter to the court [District Court in Leeuwarden] and also to the Court of Appeal [in Amsterdam].

And you can also read in those letters [submitted with the evidence] that I indicated that, now that this evidence is available, there must of course be a great deal of room for debate. A legal process exists for conducting a legal debate. So I am curious to see how the court handles that.

Question

If I hear it like this, it can all take a very long time. Meanwhile, when we open the news channels, we are already being warned about the next one—today I read about the Black Plague that is supposedly coming again, and all sorts of other things.

But I assume one of the goals of this whole procedure is also to prevent something like that from happening again in the future. If this process takes years and we get another pandemic next year, will this have any effect?

Stassen

Well, look: this procedure is in the first instance in the interest of my clients to obtain justice, but that is really justice for all of us and for the damage that has been done to them in this project I spoke about.

And that, truth-finding—the word truth has come up a lot—is essential.

And this process continues: it has begun, and it does not go away.

And anyone can, in this process or in their own process—and they may use everything that has been discussed here, to fight for that truth.

Ultimately it is both a legal process and a spiritual struggle. For that truth, it will have to be litigated legally and fought for spiritually.

That process continues. So what you observe is that on one side things continue, right? It is also something project-based. I think I laid that out very clearly.

On the other side are those who turn against the suppressors of the truth and keep bringing that truth to light, also via the institutions that exist for that purpose.

A very important principle we have in this constitutional state is that the administration of justice is public.

That is of course very important. That is why we are standing in front of this [court] building to bring this message: it must be completely public.

And only -- the sharing of information with people who also want to know the truth — I think that is the only thing that can ultimately make us free.

I agree with you that it is not realistic to assume there will be a quick solution. But we all have to contribute our piece, and I do that, facilitated by the foundation, for my clients.

Question

Is there anything to say about when we can expect a ruling in this case? Months, years, maybe much longer?

Stassen

Ultimately, of course, control lies with the judges and not with me. So I have to remain modest about that.

But I will do what is necessary to ensure that, with the oral hearing that will be scheduled, it does not end there. I would not find that the procedural debate has been conducted sufficiently if these experts have not been able to speak in person before the judges and give an explanation.

The judges will decide, after the oral hearing, whether they are ready to render an interim judgment. Then there's something else to follow, or a final judgment. In the very fastest case, a final judgment could be decided, though I think that would not be a correct decision. We have to wait and see.

In any case, I think I have a clear story to tell. And I also have serious people behind me and with me to bring what is necessary into the spotlight and ensure that the debate that must be conducted is actually conducted.

But in principle, after an oral hearing, a judgment can in any case be rendered. So that's how you can plan, roughly.

Question

Yes. You have to do it properly, right. This weekend—or at least Saturday—there was widespread news about those fake medicines that were sold by those two guys as sleeping pills, and dozens of people died from them. And that's big in the news. Whereas with the damage from the vaccinations, it runs into the thousands. Is there no way to put more pressure on it so that, because of that, maybe your case—what I also call *my* case—comes more into the news?

Stassen

Well, you see, the foundation has at least gotten involved to organize this press conference. There will also be a follow-up on the social media front. Work is being done on that with the videos that have been made. There will also be a compilation video, a promotional video. That will all be used. This press conference is also being recorded. So yes, what the foundation can do to ask attention for this case—work is really being done on that.

Question

Well, thank you. But I think a lot of attention is paid to that [sleeping pill deaths], while that is also very bad, right—more than 10 people died. Whereas here it's thousands of people, and no attention is paid to it.

Stassen

What you observe has to do with how the press works. We have, of course, also argued in the case files about the control [of information] that is part of the execution of this project—that is a necessity. And I think we can simply see around us that that control exists. And that is also what we show in this procedure.

...

Abe Dijkstra, Chairman of Right to Justice Foundation

I very much want applause for this courageous lawyer, Peter Stassen...

And I also want to thank the board of Recht Oprecht. They never let me down. Fantastic. Thank you.

And if you look at how, a huge amount of work has been done by the board. The entire press was written to, people—they really did a lot of work, the board. And you see only a few people from the press, and that is the free press.

Yes, that says a lot. That says a lot about the “public media.” And maybe I’m not allowed to say it, but I’ll say it anyway.

Maybe you should stop following the media—the “public media.” Stop with the newspapers. Stop with TV. Stop with the radio, and look at the alternative press. Right—the “Other Newspaper” [*De Andere Krant*] is there for you.

Yes, if I call [Ido Dijkstra, *De Andere Krant*], you always make time for us, right. How great is that? How great is that?

You can help us a lot. Videos will come out of this and people have recorded it. Share it as widely as possible with family, acquaintances, your network. Do it as widely as possible.

And I also want to take a small jab at the “public media.” They are not present here. But if you look internationally at how large the interest is, then apparently we have to rely on people from abroad. Look at Germany contacting us, England, Canada, Switzerland. It is truly unbelievable that our own mainstream media shows itself like this and so clearly shows that they are not there for us.

Driven by money—they get 800 million in subsidies. Yes, then apparently you do what the government wants.

That’s why I also have respect for the people who stick their neck out, who share it on social media and on LinkedIn and so on.

So my request to you is: keep supporting us. Share it as widely as possible.

And in response to the question about how long it can take: it can take a long time. I’m also an old cyclist, and I always got going once I was well warmed up. And I always said: “We’re like a diesel, right.” This man [Peter Stassen], the board—we’re like a diesel. Once you get warm, you keep running. So we will not give up. Thank you.

Abe Dijkstra

I think you can find the addresses [for those imprisoned in the Netherlands] somewhere, but it would be very nice if you sent Marcel and all those people who are still locked up a Christmas card. And at Christmas, think of these people and maybe light an extra candle. Thank you.

...

Dilys Derksen

I'm Dilys Derksen from Mooie Mensen and I'm standing next to Berber Pieksma, the general practitioner who has done a lot during the corona period to stand up for freedom, for health, and so on.

You're here now for Arno—or not for Arno van Kessel, but for the Right to Justice Foundation, right?

And we just saw Mr. Stassen, who explained that Covid is basically a bioweapon. And I thought: you're standing here—why are you here? That's actually the first question.

Berber Pieksma

First of all, we are all standing here now to support Peter Stassen—who is the only one left after Arno has effectively been taken out in the [allegations of participation in] terrorist...cell — to support Peter Stassen and the foundation Recht Oprecht and to support the victims of the COVID scam.

And you can see that it is necessary that all of us show ourselves, because from the press there are only two people: the free press, Djamila [le Pair] and [Ikschap].

And the mainstream—we now call that the regular. We are going to rename it the “crooked press.” They are not here. No—the “straight press,” as always, is these two. Wonderful. Truly, I have praise for them—how well they are always there.

So it is mainly in support now, because it is becoming clear that the true story is being completely ignored. Yes—by the crooked press...And besides that, I am of course here for—Helena is also here—the wife of Arno van Kessel.

And Arno has of course been taken out, and in fact this process we're talking about was set up by Arno. It was essentially built by Arno from start to finish, in a very beautiful, brilliant way. So the corruption has now effectively taken Arno out.

Dilys Derksen

Yes, that's true...

That was actually the only question I wanted to ask. But do you know the answer? You don't have to give it, right. But he said: basically corona—vaccination against corona—is a bioweapon.

Berber Pieksma

A bioweapon, has been proven for a long time.

Dilys Derksen

But can you summarize again why it is a bioweapon?

Berber Pieksma

Because it was developed under NATO by the DARPA [US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency]. The American army developed it, and that is all provable.

Dilys Derksen

Yes, but you know what I think? Why the regular mainstream media is not here—the “crooked media”—because I think that it is almost unbelievable for ordinary people, right? For all those people who were vaccinated against corona, who all had themselves injected because they did it for someone else—they simply can't live there anymore. If this really were a bioweapon do you think they would?

Berber Pieksma

It has of course gone exactly the way they wanted. It's been running for five years now. So with all our efforts we have not succeeded in reaching a very large audience. So their tactic—very cunning—is effective for their goal.

And for the record: those journalists don't understand. Look, “ordinary people”—what are ordinary people? Everyone is ordinary. But if it's not your field of expertise and you're not very interested and you're living your life, then you put it aside. You increasingly get it harder because of all the idiocy, the nitrogen measures, right—you know it all.

Then you start thinking. Then you look and go: “Hey, how idiotic, actually.”

But a journalist's profession is to be curious and ask questions and keep searching. They are not doing their job. If you don't look beyond the end of your nose, you don't deserve the name “journalist.”

Dilys Derksen

No, that's how it is. And you don't have to let yourself be led by a narrative, right. Because that “bioweapon” thing might possibly come across like a conspiracy theory, but then it really *is* the case.

Then as a journalist you also have to try to dig into it and go for it, to get that truth on the table. And apparently they do not do that—except for the people here, Djamila and *De Andere Krant*.

Berber Pieksma

Well, that's what it's all about here ultimately.

Dilys Derksen

Yes. Well, thank you.

Dilys Derksen

I'm standing next to Abe Dijkstra and he's from Right to Justice Foundation, and we are now in front of the courthouse in Leeuwarden.

And I wanted to ask you a few questions...

You sent around that this press conference was happening, right? And you said: well, let's send a lot of people here. Well, fortunately there were a lot of people. How do you feel about it?

Abe Dijkstra, Chairman, Stichting Recht Oprecht

Well, there should of course have been many more people, right. You can see that. It's still not on everyone's minds.

I think maybe people have it too good—I don't know. Or they think: "Well, it will pass me by."

Some people also think that it's basically over, right. They think: "Well, we had the vaccinations and COVID is over."

But you now see what a number of awake doctors warned us about: it's a long-term thing. It's a stealth engine, really. Doctors say that from 1 to 7 years, you can still just die. That you can become seriously ill — brain diseases, spontaneous heart failure, name it all.

But I also see it in my own circle. People who suddenly get very seriously ill, become serious heart patients, or have, a new word, "turbo cancer," but also people who suddenly die. Young people under the age of 60. And that really hurts.

Dilys Derksen

Yes. And is that why you're with the Right to Justice Foundation?

Abe Dijkstra

Yes, they asked me. I didn't push myself in. They asked me, and at a certain point I did it because I knew that there were a number of good people in it. Then I said: "OK, I'll participate."

Dilys Derksen

Since when have you been involved then?

Abe Dijkstra

I was involved a bit before my amputation. I said: "Guys, it doesn't work anymore." And then it went pretty well. I'm reasonably well, so to speak. Good therapy.

Dilys Derksen

Yes, you're standing again.

Abe Dijkstra

I have some pain. I do have pain now, but that's fine. That's just pushing through.

So yes, I think I can do it again now. They asked me again: "please, do you want to come and take the lead?" So yes, they appointed me as chairman.

Dilys Derksen

So you're chairman now. Since when is that?

Abe Dijkstra

Well, since—again—yes, three quarters of a year already. Yes.

Dilys Derksen

OK. It makes sense that I didn't know, right?

Abe Dijkstra

Yes, that makes sense. And I don't go out so much. I mostly work behind the scenes; we do a lot.

But above all, Peter Stassen needs the necessary attention and we must all support him, and we do a lot behind the scenes.

Dilys Derksen

And if we donate—because you just said to donate—when we donate to Right to Justice Foundation, what are we actually donating to?

Abe Dijkstra

You're basically donating to make the legal fees possible. Because in the Netherlands a lawyer has to be paid. If you don't do it pro bono, it's the end of the case. So we simply have to pay the lawyer.

And also, for example, we served Bill Gates with a summons—well, that cost €12,000.

Yes, the foundation has to pay that, and that's all "tens-euros work" for us, right. And we're fighting a very powerful entity: the State of the Netherlands. Yes, that just pays [law firm representing the State of the Netherlands] Pels Rijcken. Pels Rijcken: 45 million last year, right.

Dilys Derksen

Wow.

Abe Dijkstra

And we have to fight that. So yes, sometimes they call it David versus Goliath, but David did win. So we just have to hope the universe keeps supporting us positively in that too, and that people slowly but surely wake up.

Dilys Derksen

So people should go to <https://rechttoprecht.online/>

Abe Dijkstra

And then you get a donation button and you can donate whatever you want. And I would find it very nice if people support us en masse.

Dilys Derksen

That would be nice. Because those seven people who are bringing those lawsuits against the State and Bill Gates and so on are actually funded by the Right to Justice Foundation. The lawyer is funded by those people.

Abe Dijkstra

Yes. The Right to Justice Foundation facilitates the lawsuit against, among others, the State of the Netherlands, Mark Rutte, and that sort of people.

Dilys Derksen

And those people—because they couldn't—right, the seven of them have to bring those lawsuits together against the State, but now it becomes six unfortunately.

Abe Dijkstra

Yes, six. One has died unfortunately. And one of the plaintiffs is also very seriously ill. So I hope he stays alive. But it's going very badly. Very badly.

Dilys Derksen

But those are all people who have had COVID vaccinations, and then one or two or three, or I don't know how many, right?

Abe Dijkstra

Yes, and often also that they felt forced to be able to practice a profession. And then they took it. A lot of people did that.

Dilys Derksen

By the way, because you've been saying the whole time that many people are dying. On LinkedIn we follow each other anyway, right. And on LinkedIn you constantly see posts of people who were on LinkedIn, and then by their wife or girlfriend —

Abe Dijkstra

Often men, I see —an obituary is made: “sadly he has died suddenly,” “just gone,” so to speak. And there are many of those. Those are not normal numbers. It's very many. And what this man just said: that in a certain situation 10 people died, and with us it's thousands—worldwide millions—and nobody pays attention to it.

I also think it's courageous of Peter Stassen that he dares to say: “It is blatant genocide. It is not vaccination.”

And also, if you look: please follow it, also when that film comes out—that video with the five expert witnesses. They each have about 10 minutes speaking time and they also say exactly where the problem lies, so to speak. What kind of junk was in that vaccination.

Please spread that widely too if you want, in your big network and also on your own site. And I hope people really start thinking about it.

Dilys Derksen

Very briefly about yourself, right, because you just said amputation. I had you on Mooie Mensen. I'll definitely share that link again. But back then nothing was wrong with you. That amputation has nothing to do with the COVID injection.

Abe Dijkstra

No, because I'm obviously vaccination-free. No—probably it did come from the extreme police violence I had [during 2020 protests] at Malieveld [The Hague]. Yes, really. Yes, two people say it does have a causal connection with each other.

Because I was hit so hard on my thighs. Because I wanted to stand up for a woman who was hyperventilating, and then I was immediately—bam—again.

And I had never had anything. I'd never been to a doctor. I'm just a healthy, physically strong guy and athlete. Cyclist. Always active.

Yes, but anyway—fortunately I'm still alive.

Dilys Derksen

But how did it happen then? Were your arteries damaged?

Abe Dijkstra

No, there was a clot in the hollow of the knee, and they thought: "With surgery we'll fix it." Only I had so much bleeding. Two times they put in a new tube, hoping that the wall between the tube that was in there and the skin wall would become thinner, that almost no blood would flow through it—but unfortunately that failed. And in the third operation he said: "I have to stop, otherwise you'll bleed to death." And then I came to—yes, then I came to the third surgery. It lasted 6 hours. And then they indeed said: "Yes, we had to stop the operation and your leg has to come off." That was hard. And then it still had to happen.

Dilys Derksen

So you could say goodbye to your leg.

Abe Dijkstra

I did that too. Yes.

Dilys Derksen

How did you do that?

Abe Dijkstra

Well, with my left—my left good leg—touching the whole cold foot. The foot is ice cold. It's just ice cold; it feels like a block of ice. I really did still touch the other foot with that foot and talked to myself and said goodbye and also thanked it.

Yes, it sounds woo-woo. I did do it: I thanked it for the good years I could be there for everyone. I... [unclear phrasing in transcript] So it was a hard joke. But I didn't have much time to think. Within 2.5 days I had four operations and my leg was off. That's how fast it goes.

Dilys Derksen

Yes. And how can you stand like this now?

Abe Dijkstra

Well, I have a prosthesis.

Dilys Derksen

So all the way from your—your thigh?

Abe Dijkstra

No, the knee. The knee is gone. Yes, the knee is gone. So I'm missing two very important joints, right: the foot and the knee.

Dilys Derksen

So you've had to learn to walk all over again.

Abe Dijkstra

Yes. Rehabilitation—thankfully, hard but fortunate.

Dilys Derksen

Yes. Fortunately. It's nice that I also know that about you again. I already knew it a bit, but I thought: who knows, maybe more people are curious.

Abe Dijkstra

And he doesn't give up, and then you know it, right?

Dilys Derksen

No, that's true.

And very nice that you've joined Right to Justice Foundation.

[[Stichting Recht Oprecht](#) online], you said. And there we can all donate, because then we can continue with the lawsuit against the State and against that Pels Rijcken [law firm] 45 million.

Thank you, Abe Dijkstra, for your story.

Abe Dijkstra

Yes, thank you. Good to see you again. Thank you.