

(..)in crashing obviousness lies objectivity.  
Dennett, Daniel Clement. Consciousness Explained. 1991.

The Hague, September 3<sup>rd</sup> 2019

Dear Dr. Whitaker,

At the relevant trial a researcher of the NFI declared:

*"Op de achterzijde van de blouse bevonden zich een grote, waterige vlek die bloed bevatte en een aantal kleinere, oplichtende vlekken. De achterzijde van de blouse is niet bemonsterd, omdat op de van de plaats delict gemaakte foto's te zien is dat het slachtoffer een vest droeg en de achterzijde van de blouse dus mogelijk bedekt is geweest tijdens het delict."*

This translates as:

*"At the back side of the blouse, there is a large aqueous residue, containing blood and there are several smaller spots, emitting light. The back side of the blouse was not sampled, because crime scene photographs show the victim wearing a cardigan, so the back side of the blouse was possibly covered during the crime."*

So, the NFI searched for stains of several of specifications at locations, there were suspected to be crime related, but omitted locations, that were not considered to be crime related.

A clearer infringement of the scientific method is hardly imaginable. But there were several occasions to put things straight. During the 2003/4 trial, only 20 samples were taken. In 2006/7 the NFI made another attempt, taking about 100 new samples. Several samples were taken from the aqueous residue aforementioned (showing DNA of the victim), but none from the little light emitting spots!

I am almost sure, you were not confronted with this statement from the minutes of the trial. I was.

So I made a thorough study of the DNA results, considering the possibility, that the DNA was left during a conversation of the condemned with the later victim, only dozens of hours before the crime took place. It is in the appendix (along with a Dutch version).

The moment to introduce myself arrived.

From 1964 to 1971, I studied chemistry (organic and physical chemical), receiving a master degree. I lectured chemistry at the secondary school, later including informatics, which I studied at Open University and even forensics, as the curriculum of secondary school education was expanded. Philosophy of Science was an item too. During my study in chemistry, much attention was given to analytical methods, so I am sensible to the shortcomings of capillary electrophoresis, as used in forensic DNA analyses.

Based on all of this, I undertook an analysis of the DNA evidence starting from the hypothesis that the condemned did not commit the crime. It is in the appendix. It is quite a read, but the main theme is in chapter 7. I had good expectation that my analysis would attract the interest of the Attorney General, responsible for the ongoing procedure, as he was made aware of my efforts to draw attention to the faulty establishment of the PMI and the faulty analysis of a mobile conversation, that took place prior to the crime. But I am afraid, he is not rushing to results.

I hope you will find reason to comment on my findings.

Yours sincerely,

demo