



'Any truth which is too big to be seen, is probably smaller than you can see it'. Ann anonymous 19th century Dutch poet.

www.wirsinduberal.de

Robert A. Verlinden, Candidate Number 17 of the former Blanco List www.lijst14.nl Van Speykstraat 87-89 – 3014 VE Rotterdam (NL). E-mail: burgersinactie@hotmail.com



OPEN/REGISTERED LETTER

European Commission
Mr. José Manuel Barroso/President
General Sekretariat
B-1049 Brüssel
Belgium
2009.

Rotterdam, 30th November

Dear President Barroso,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 25th November 2009, ref: JLS/F3/JNA/mb D (2009)18099, in the enclosed attachment (Enclosure 1) from your spokesman Joaquim NUNES DE ALMEIDA. Why is the **'EU security'** answering my question regarding the fundamental rights (1848) and other issues and not you or your department?

Please remember, we owe our fundamental rights to The Year of the European Revolutions 1848, starting in Germany. Do we need another year of revolution, but now for the ratification of our fundamental rights?

Without respect for the fundamental rights¹ we are falling back in time far before the France Revolution (1789). Please note very carefully, nobody in Europe wants to trapped back into the system of the invisible politic powers of the European Kings, Queens and nobility called: **'He who pays the piper calls the tune'**.

Indeed in your letter you confirm implicit that the fundamental rights were taken out of the EU Lisbon Treaty 2006 as I wrote to you on October 11th. You wrote: Quote *'Durch die Rechtsprechung es Europäischen Gerichtshof ist die Kommission in ihren Arbeiten und Politiken an die Einhaltung der allgemeinen Grundrechte gebunden'* Ende Quote. Free translation: *'it is the jurisdiction of the European Court which the European Commission linked in its work and politics to the respect of general fundamental rights'*. All do respect, this is absolutely wrong. First of all, the criteria of the three fundamental rights are not general! Fundamental rights are the right institutions on which the subsequent legal or later laws are based². That means without the fundamental rights no government, law or court can exist with legitimacy.

The criteria of the fundamental rights are the right to unite, congregate and voting in politic and social institutions. All the arguments and facts from the members, coming from the

¹Quote: "CHAPTER 3: JUDICIAL COOPERATION IN CIVIL MATTERS Article 65.2.f the elimination of obstacles to the proper functioning of civil proceedings, if necessary by promoting the compatibility of the rules on civil procedure applicable in the Member States; **End quote.** a) why if necessary? b) What are the criteria of 'if necessary'? c) Why 'if necessary' if we know that al the laws are based on the fundamental rights?

²Quote: 'De Grondrechten zijn de rechtsinstellingen waarop het overige of latere recht steunt. (Van Dale) Ende quote.

dialogue in the meeting of the association, are representing the exemplary decision. We call this 'the exemplary acts of authority'. Apart from the decision of the members in the institutions with a direct interest, 'the exemplary acts of authority' automatically generate *informed consent* for other people. Only based on these exemplary acts of authority, that means the fundamental right, the representatives of the European parliament can debate about the decisions from the institutes, for instant abolish laws like the Actio Popularis, Nemo Tenetur or add new laws like Tetras Politica, Codex Alimentarius for the introduction of gmo's in the environment etcetera.

Without 'exemplary acts of authority' a democratic debate by representatives in Brussels and jurisdiction in the European Courts is impossible.

To prove that the European Court Strasbourg works without the criteria of the fundamental rights is the fact that the citizens in England make protests against the mandatory taking of **DNA** from human beings. Not only in the UK there are protests to taking DNA but also in the Netherlands as well as protests to the mandatory collection of fingerprints, as I wrote you in my letter of the 11th October 2009. As you remember this make our life very unsafe! That is the reason that we are absolutely against this. The Dutch are already talking about the '*new empire*' with numbers tattooed on the arms.

The European Council of Human Right in Staatsburg decided last week that it is allowed to store the **DNA** for a maximum of 6 years³. Sorry, this decision is not founded on our fundamental rights, because mandatory taking of DNA is in contrary of our right on **NEMO TENETUR**⁴. Please remember in analogy of the practice of the tortures in Guantánamo Bay in 1937 Hitler also begun to ignore, our rights on **NEMO TENETUR**

The European Councils: Apart from the Dutch distrust in Brussels is the other question arising, can we trust the European councils in Strasbourg and Luxembourg? The answer is no! We can't trust anybody. This was proved by Jesus. Remember, when Jesus was hanging on the crucifix, he was asking his father to help him without results, as you know. Moreover, the most of the European citizens, except the pope *cum suis*, without a public room in the media, see the crucifix as a symbol of torture as well as physically as mentality. With other words in an emancipated democratic system we need respect for the fundamental rights. Nothing more nothing less. There is no other way!

Apart from above mentioned case about **DNA** in Great Britain I did not get answers on my prejudicial questions in the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg regarding the doubts

³ Citaat: 'Groot-Brittanie gaat dna gegevens van onschuldige personen niet langer vasthouden dan zes jaar' einde citaat. NRC 12/11/09.

⁴ No one is bound to arm an opponent against himself, meaning that a defendant is not obligated to in any way assist the prosecutor to his own detriment

about the independency of the highest private court of our queen in the Netherland the *Council of State* 'De Raad van State'.⁵ The same is happen with my questions from April 2009 tot European Court of Human Right in Strasbourg about the abolishing of the fundamental rights, in the controlling institute SKAL for the criteria of organic food of the private trade mark EKO⁶, and many other institutes⁷ including the silent abolition of the *actio popularis*⁸, as I wrote to the Bundeskanzlerin Angela Merkel, in here function as EU chairwomen, in 2007. ([Enclosure: 2](#)).

Without respect for the fundamental rights the way is open for populism like all the talks about the war, included Afghanistan, safety, camera's, terrorism, the Codex Alimentarius, etcetera. Also the new law ***tetras politica***, that's the 4th legal power ***ict***, necessary for the Codex Alimentarius and telecom prepared by the "Dutch top women", the former servant of our queen Beatrix⁹, the new Euro commissioner for ***ICT and Telecom***, Neelie Kroes, means, without fundamental rights, washing time and money. It makes the citizens of Europe restless and ready for a new revolution. Everybody knows that the goals of the war in Afghanistan are the poppy (opium) as I the former UN Secretary – General Mr. Kofi Anna on the 31st August 2008 wrote. ([Enclosure 3](#)) After genetically manipulation of this organism the benefit is for the invisible political powers, the huge shareholders of the Pharmacia. Nobody on this globe wants food and medicines ruled by the new Codex Alimentarius, the new fascism of the 21st century. Was this one of the many reasons that the elections in the Netherlands were manipulated in 2006?¹⁰

Based on the above mentioned arguments and facts I would like to request to respect the fundamental rights and to change CHAPTER 3 'JUDICIAL COOPERATION IN CIVIL MATTERS Article 65.2.f: 'into: "the elimination of obstacles to the proper functioning of civil proceedings, of the rules on civil procedure applicable only following the criteria of the fundamental rights of all European citizens from the political and social institutions in all the European member states".

I would like to repeat what I already previously wrote to you: without respect for the fundamental rights the EU treaty is not valid'. Without fundamental rights there is also no any judicial and social basis on Brussels laws and political decisions.

⁵ Case number Luxembourg: 815976 NL/ RvS 200702756/1 prejudicial questions C-360/08 Greenpeace and the foundation for the Prevention of Abuse of Genetic Manipulation (VoMiGEN) VoMiGEN Greenpeace

⁶ The first time confirmed by letter by the servant of the crown, Minister Gerda Verburg, on 14 th June 2007. .

⁷ My letter of the 31st January 2009 to the members of the First Room (!e KAMER) in Government.

⁸ Case number Strasbourg 363609/09 Verlinden against the democratic Kingdom of the Netherlands.

⁹ CIVIS MUNDI/ april 2009 'Burgerschapsproblematiek opnieuw ter discussie' S.W.Couwenberg. Citaat: 'Vandaar dat Nederland de enige democratie is waar die soevereiniteit nog steeds niet in de grondwet erkend is, afgezien dan van de Staatsregelingvoor het Bataafse volk van 1798. Maar nadien is dat uit alle daaropvolgende grondwetten verdwenen' Ministers blijven zich dienovereenkomstig nog altijd presenteren als dienaren van de Kroon en niet van het volk'. Het is derhalve geen wonder dat activering van politieke betrokkenheid en participatie van het volk hier zo lang geen voedingsbodem vond. Onze lange traditie van politieke apathie is daardoor opnieuw bevestigd.

¹⁰ Case number Strasbourg: 35911/09 Election in the Netherlands in 2006 manipulated. Verlinden wants his caution bag!

For my own and the general interest I am looking forward to your answer.
Are you prepared to respect the fundamental rights and to influence changing
chapter 3 JUDICIAL COOPERATION IN CIVIL MATTERS Article 65.2.f?
Your servant to serve the general interest. * Yours faithfully

Robert A. Verlinden. Candidate number 17 of the former Blanco list www.lijst14.nl¹¹

* In honour of veteran resistance fighters, love of the earth and the world, there is a podium for servants in the making to serve the interest of the common good, without giving priority to their own issues.

Enclosure:

- 1) Letter from Europese Commission. Genrela direction for Justiz, Freedom and security. Direction F: security. Signed by Joaquim Nunes de Almeida. Reference: JLS/F3/JNA/mb D (2009) 18099.
- 2) Copy letter of our registered letter 18th June 2007 to Bundeskanzlerin Angela Merkel, in here function as EU chairwomen, in 2007.
- 3) Copy letter, handed out in Wageningen 31st August 2008 to Mr. Kofi Annan *cum suis*.



¹¹ A young brave journalist, Marlies van Leeuwen was able to pass the censure of the editor in chief of the 'Algemeen Dagblad' (General Daily) and made known on 21st January 2009, for the first time, that the elections of 22 November 2006 in the Netherlands were 'stolen'. See the article: 'Lijst 14 eist geld terug'. http://www.ad.nl/rotterdam/stad/2935743/Lijst_14_eist_geld_terug_na_mislukte_verkiezing.html
History: www.lijst14.nl: The former list 14 was a Blanco list with 17 candidate representatives of the people, a political movement created by alarmed citizens. That means no name above the list; so we refer to this political manoeuvre as a Blanco list. 17 candidates on these list (party) joined the elections of November 22, 2006. It was unique in Dutch parliamentary history. Initiator and coordinator was Robert A. Verlinden, candidate number 17 of www.lijst14.nl. Despite of this fact, the independent media did not write about this unique political movement and did not write about the individual candidates. At the very last moment, three weeks before the election on the November 1st, 2006 the government informed the initiator and coordinator of List 14 that they would not get political commercials on Radio and TV because of certain unknown rules of the Media law. This law state that only political parties who are registered as an association in the register of the Kiesraad receive the right for political commercials, free of charge. List 14 was not an association but a Blanco list with independent candidates. After getting, the obliged support, only by arguments in the 19 election districts, as an unknown movement and after paying a caution fee of 11.250 Euro, the official election institute, the Kiesraad, registered this Blanco list as number 14. Perhaps coincidentally or not, but number 14 is the same number as the famous shirt number of the world-famous football player Johan Crujff.
Nobody included under the civil servants of the Kiesraad was informed, previously, about these, in our view, discriminating Media rules. Just two days later on the 3rd of November 2006, the former minister Nicolaï decided to make the election with distance voting possible. Of course he did know that every citizen has the right to object to these ministerial decisions within 6 weeks. That did happen. Only de Raad van State, the private court of the queen, did not agree with the arguments and refuse. Court case number Raad van State: 200608427/1/H2. The computers prepared for distance voting, as they said, registered for 'Lijst 14' only 2181 votes. Citizens in Leeuwarden in the North of the Netherlands could not believe that and wanted to check the formal voting list (processen-verbaal). Then they found out it was not possible because all the voting list had been destroyed. Now, more than two years later, the coordinator of List 14 is standing for the Raad van State and wants minimal a full restitution of the caution. Court case Raad van State number: 200804861/1/H2. Information: A.A.E. Jansen, tel. 0031 70 4264365. Owed to the courage of the brave journalist Marlies van Leeuwen everybody in Europe and the world can see and convince themselves by asking questions that the election in the Netherlands at 22 November 2006 were 'stolen'. That means that it is proven that in the democratic Kingdom of the Netherlands there is no political room for citizens. This is contrary to The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Information number Kiesraad: 0031 70 4266266 Mrs. Mr. Hoorweg, reference number: 2007- 0000048803.