

fairbewegung.lu



Fräiheet - Allgemengwuel - Individualitéit - Respekt

**FAIR Bewegung**

[www.fairbewegung.lu](http://www.fairbewegung.lu)

[info@fairbewegung.lu](mailto:info@fairbewegung.lu)

[groupejuridique@fairbewegung.lu](mailto:groupejuridique@fairbewegung.lu)

[effetssecondaires@fairbewegung.lu](mailto:effetssecondaires@fairbewegung.lu)



[www.efvv.eu](http://www.efvv.eu)

"The urgency of the moment is to gather our forces towards a common goal, to save the Rule of Law and the associated democratic values in order to block the advance of a world of desocialised, dehumanized, vaccinated, digitized. The chain of health scandals brought to light during this crisis forces us to redouble our vigilance and continue our fight for freedom to choose."

Distinguished Members of the Government

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Deputies

**Subject: Scientific Analysis of the Opinion (dated 14<sup>th</sup> January, 2022) expressed by the Group of Luxembourg Experts on "The Adoption of a Covid-19 Vaccine Mandate"**

Ladies and gentlemen,

The recent opinion of the ad hoc group of Luxembourg experts on the introduction of a vaccination obligation, delivered on 14 January 2022, paves the way for further draconian measures. Our two associations exercise a mission of vigilance with regard to the rights and freedoms of citizens. We wish to clarify the scientific and health arguments on which this opinion is based.

By the present, we have the honor to bring your knowledge a scientific expertise to clear a possible vote or political position on this subject.

An absolutely essential expertise

The obligation to vaccinate, for people over the age of 50 and for all caregivers in the broad sense, is not an insignificant obligation. We would like to recall that, from a legal point of view, the administration of a medicament, especially in the experimental phase, cannot be constrained: any medical examination requires a clear consent. This obligation to vaccinate thus constitutes an infringement of the rights and freedoms of citizens and more particularly an infringement of respect for the physical integrity. For COVID-19 vaccination to be mandatory, it must be based on serious reasons. Is that really the case?

The analysis produced in this Opinion was a duty at the heart of our associative mission at the service of citizens. To this end, we have commissioned Dr. Michel de Lorgeril, an epidemiologist and expert in scientific methodology and the legal framework for authorizations to place medicinal products on the market, and also author of several books on

vaccines. At our request, M. de Lorgeril analyzed the various scientific arguments produced in this opinion.

### Effectiveness is not efficacy

The Opinion of the ad hoc group of Luxembourg experts calls for an extraordinary effectiveness based on retrospective methodological data. However, this type of data is notoriously considered to be of low scientific level. This cannot justify a vaccination obligation.

However, health authorities never issue marketing authorizations on the basis of observation data. Only the demonstration of clinical effectiveness permits the administration of a human health product. This clinical demonstration is unfortunately absent from the opinion.

At no time do the experts appointed by the Government mention the results of randomized clinical trials published by industrialists. Is it because these tests are of such a methodological weakness that they cannot justify the obligation to vaccinate? This expertise will provide you with essential explanations.

### Scientific gaps and methodological biases

If the Government wishes to pass from an authorization or recommendation to an obligation, it should necessarily rely on a solid scientific record, which is apparently not the case. It has only observation data to justify the prevention of forms of illness, in particular hospital data, which are among the most fragile according to the professionals. The real cause of hospitalization or illness is generally not clearly reported in the case description of COVID-positive patients.

Furthermore, the complete lack of analysis of post-vaccine adverse events is a serious and detrimental deadlock. Medical ethics require, in all circumstances, an assessment of the benefit/risk ratio. The experts seem to have deliberately removed this aspect, which is central to judging the relevance of the vaccination obligation.

Thus, the expertise we bring to your attention points to the scientific gaps and methodological biases that make this opinion advocating the obligation to vaccinate as of January 14, 2022 highly questionable.

Through this expertise, we consider that we have provided you with useful and sufficient information to enable you to fully exercise your responsibilities. We are counting on you to reject this opinion, as well as the clearly unjustified vaccination obligation from a scientific, health and legal point of view.

Jean-Pierre Eudier, President EFVV  
The FAIR Movement Committee