

GRAND JURY

EVIDENCE ①

Lawyers, a judge and top level experts from the WHO, United Nations, Royal Navy, US military, CDC & Pfizer reveal evidence of an agenda for world tyranny, executed under the guise of the COVID-19 pandemic



WITH A JUDGE
& 11 LAWYERS
FROM AROUND
THE WORLD

EXPERTS
FROM THE
FOLLOWING
ORGANIZATIONS:



CONTENTS

COGNITIVE DISSONANCE

The challenge of discovering reality

P A G E 3

GRAND JURY

Presenting the evidence for crimes against humanity

P A G E 5

THE CITY OF LONDON

The British elite and their agenda for world domination

P A G E 8

PSYCHOLOGICAL MANIPULATION

Controlling the minds of the population to change their behavior

P A G E 35

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The WHO has been set up to operate as a one world government

P A G E 56

CONCLUSION

Private entities are taking over the world

P A G E 83

RESOURCES

More information about the criminal elite

P A G E 87

GRAND JURY

REVEALING THE AGENDA FOR WORLD DOMINATION



Dr. Reiner Fuellmich is a world-renowned trial lawyer with almost three decades of experience in filing successful lawsuits against large fraudulent corporations like Deutsche Bank, Volkswagen, etc. During the COVID-19 pandemic, Dr. Fuellmich observed apparent criminal practices committed by media and governments worldwide. He founded the *Corona Investigative Committee* and began an extensive investigation, during which he interviewed over 150 experts from all fields of science. Many of these experts are recognized as world leaders in their field of expertise, and some are Nobel Prize recipients.

**Together with other lawyers from around the world,
Dr. Fuellmich has gathered undeniable evidence that this
pandemic is a series of unprecedented crimes against humanity.**

The entities responsible for this global assault on mankind are the same who were responsible for World Wars I and II, as well as many other events such as large-scale financial crises.

Dr. Fuellmich, along with ten international lawyers and a judge, decided to present the evidence for these crimes against humanity to the public during a grand jury proceeding. Among the eyewitnesses are former members of the British Intelligence Services, the UK Royal Navy, the US Marine Corps, the World Health Organization and the United Nations, as well as a former vice-president of Pfizer, a Nobel Prize winner for medicine, and many more high-level experts.

WHAT IS A GRAND JURY?

In serious criminal cases in the U.S., a grand jury is presented with the evidence at hand to convince them that this evidence is sufficient to bring public charges against the defendants. We, the people of the world, are adopting this model to prove to the public, with the help of witnesses, lawyers, a judge and experts from around the world, that we are dealing with crimes against humanity that span the entire globe.

The allegation is that the world's governments have come under the controlling influence of corrupt and criminal power structures, and that these power structures have colluded to stage a pandemic that they have been planning for years.

To this end, they deliberately created mass panic through false statements of fact and a socially engineered psychological operation, whose messages were conveyed through the corporate media. The purpose of this mass panic was to persuade the population to agree to experimental so-called "vaccinations" (which they are not). These injections have been proven to be neither effective nor safe, but extremely dangerous and even lethal (detailed evidence of millions of deaths following these injections can be found in the comprehensive ***Vaccine Death Report***, which can be downloaded here from the **JAOC website: www.jaoc.org.uk**

This investigation serves as a model proceeding to secure indictments against some of the criminally and civilly responsible figureheads of these crimes against humanity. A secondary purpose is to create awareness about the factual collapse of the current hijacked system and its institutions, and, as a consequence, awareness of:

- the necessity of the people themselves *retaking their sovereignty*,
- the necessity of first stopping the threatening measures by *refusing to comply*,
- the necessity of *jump-starting the people's own new systems* of health care, education, economics and judiciary, so that democracy and the rule of law on the basis of our national constitutions will be re-established.

ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION

The purpose of this *Grand Jury Evidence* is to make the most important information revealed by the expert witnesses accessible to as many people as possible. We have focused on those facts that reveal what is really happening in our world, to help the public understand the graveness of the current world crisis.

This document is part one of five *Grand Jury Evidence* sessions. It contains critical information from Grand Jury Day 2, titled *The General Historic and Geopolitical Backdrop to All of This*. This may well be the most important session of the entire Grand Jury proceeding, as it exposes how a masterplan has been developed to achieve total world domination under the guise of health emergencies.

READABILITY

As this *Grand Jury Evidence* is a transcript of the recorded legal proceedings, the content is not always as easy to read as a well written book. Verbal communication can be more chaotic than a carefully written text. I have tried to improve the overall readability as much as possible, but still, it can require a little more effort to go through the entire document. In a culture where intellectual laziness is strongly encouraged on all sides, this may be a challenge for some readers. I want to invite you to press on and don't give up reading, as this is beyond a doubt one of the most important documents of our time, detailing the greatest threat humanity has ever faced.

DEFENDING HUMANITY

The criminal power structures rely entirely on the ignorance of the people. Once the public becomes informed, there is a shift from *unquestioning compliance* to *intelligent resistance*. Therefore, the single most important action we can all take is to inform others. We must especially educate all those who have a position of influence in our communities. Please send this *Grand Jury Evidence*, either in digital or printed form, to school directors and teachers, hospital directors and medical staff, physicians and pharmacists, law enforcement officers, lawyers and judges, pastors, mayors and commissioners, local media editors and journalists. This information really needs to reach all of those in a position of public service.

These members of our societies are unknowingly the minions of the criminals, as they blindly follow orders that directly lead to the death of millions of people, and the permanent damaging of billions of lives.

Once all of our public servants understand what is really going on, they will stop being the extensions of the criminal hands, lest they become consciously complicit.

If we don't stand up and act now, we may forever lose the ability to do so. The *World Economic Forum* along with the *United Nations*, is preparing to install global governance over the flow of information and the internet, and will attempt to forever shut the mouth of all who value the freedom of humanity. *If there ever was a time to act, it is now.*

INFORM THE WORLD

There are three ways this critical information can be distributed, to help save our world from unprecedented tyranny. The first way is by sharing the webpage where the *Grand Jury Evidence* can be freely downloaded, and the proceedings can be viewed.

**Send the following URL by email
and post it on all social media platforms:
<https://www.jaoc.org.uk>**

A second way is by sending a digital copy of the *Grand Jury Evidence* by email. Attach the PDF file to an email and write a short and polite message to the recipient, explaining what this is about. The PDF can be downloaded here: www.jaoc.org.uk .

THE CITY OF LONDON

FIRST SUMMARY

The first two expert witnesses during session 2 of the Grand Jury are a former officer of the British Intelligence Services (partner agency to the US National Security Agency) and a Canadian investigative journalist with strong historical knowledge. They explain the long history of the aim for world dominance by the *British elite*. The British Empire still exists, and includes the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, 19 African countries and the Caribbean, while their influential hand extends into virtually every other nation of the world.

The headquarters of the British elite are in the *City of London*, an area of one square mile, which is the financial center of the world. The City of London isn't governed by the British government, but on the contrary, reigns supreme over it. The City of London has its own courts and police and has never been challenged in its sovereignty and self-government. It rules over the Crown and most of the Earth.

According to the British elite insider witness, who was raised in their boarding schools and universities, these elitists believe they have the right to enslave the rest of humanity, which they consider to be their 'livestock'. In their views, they own the population - body, mind and soul. They created democracy as an illusion to keep the people at peace, while the City of London calls the shots and pulls the strings.

This elite has made several attempts at so-called 'New World Orders', which have all failed. They almost succeeded in reining in the United States, but failed there as well. Now they are using pandemics - and other orchestrated disasters which they have planned - to further their goal of world domination, using psychological techniques to get the world population to blindly obey their every command, under the guise of 'keeping everybody safe'.

Mind control has for a long time been at the heart of their strategy. After three industrial revolutions, a fourth industrial revolution is now emerging that focuses on *owning the minds of the people*. The deeper purpose of the vaccination programs is to edit the genome of humanity, and thus create a new trans-human race that will behave according to the desires of the oligarchs.

EXPERT WITNESS

ALEX THOMSON



Alex Thomson is a former officer of Britain's Signal Intelligence Agency

GCHQ, the partner agency to NSA (National Security Agency, USA).

He was desk officer for the former Soviet Union and a transcriber of intercepted material.

Thomson was part of GCHQ's cross disciplinary team for chemical, biological,

radiological and nuclear threats: CBRN.

As an intelligence officer, Alex learned about the British strategy for world domination. He explains the historic background and the current power structure of the British Empire, and how the COVID-19 pandemic plays a key role in their agenda.

The following is a summary of the most important information revealed by Alex Thomson.

To get all the details, please watch the full session here: www.jaoc.org.uk



The City of London is the financial heart of the British Empire and the dominant power in the world. It has readied itself for that position from roughly 1870. The modern world, the monopolisation, the cartelisation of the world, begins at that time. Everything we do in the investigation of the corruption emanating from British Crown monopolies and City of London money does seem to point back to this period from around 1870, in which there were several revolutions by the British elite.

These revolutions all centered around the containment of productivity and prevention of a growth of intelligence and intellectual property among the native peoples of the British Empire and in competitor nations.

There was a revolution in what you might call **mind space**, which since 2010 has been an explicit term used by the British government's central department, the Cabinet Office.

- A revolution in the *quality of education* offered to British and other Western school children.
- A revolution in the *theft of intellectual property* by the elite.
- A revolution in the *model of healthcare* and free access to it.
- At home, a *constitutional revolution* from the classic British Liberal democracy model.

This has all happened since 1870, and in Britain it was largely complete by the crucial year 1947-1948, when Britain had the unique situation of a *National Health Service*, and was pushing the way towards the military unification of the European continent and the whole of NATO.

Britain was leading the world in reinventing how it managed its population. The center node was and is the City of London, the square mile at the very heart of what is now called Greater London.

The City of London:

- Has a legal status apart from the 32 other London boroughs.
- Its privileges were entrenched as early as Magna Carta 1215.
- Its self-government has never been challenged.
- It has, at many times in its history, had power over the British Crown and, hence, over a large slice of the Earth during the British Empire.

The City of London has control over the Westminster Parliament, notably in the form of an official of the City of London known as the Remembrancer, who sits in the House of Commons, where not even the monarch is allowed to enter, and records *what is being said against financial interests.*

The Cabinet Office is a department which was set up in the early 20th century as the repository of Crown prerogatives. From around 1870, the constitutional revolution has ensured that financiers controlling political parties actually pull believers of Crown prerogatives. Behind the scenes, the model of the government of Britain is still that of an inner sanctum, the Privy Council, which actually governs in the name of The Crown.

It is *only for show* that parliament and government departments are consulted.

OWNING THE MINDS OF HUMANITY

The Georgetown University history academic, Carroll Quigley, former tutor of Bill Clinton, wrote in his book, *Tragedy & Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*, that there have been four industrial revolutions. Yes, that familiar language now coming from the *World Economic Forum* was already being written about in the 1960's by Quigley. The perspective which is being assumed here is that of *who owns the population*, first in Britain and then in the British Empire.

- First revolution: the ownership of land, of agricultural means provides wealth
- Second revolution: mechanical - industrial
- Third revolution: financial capital dominates the world. It's from this period, around 1870 onwards, that the smart money in the City of London realizes that even this bubble is going to burst.

**The most efficient way to own the world in the future
will be to own the minds. That is the fourth industrial revolution.**

Both the British and the German elite were determined to achieve world domination, both industrially and in the mind space.

**The City of London's trading model emphasised the importance
of controlling not only military force or physical assets,
but the minds of people, now known as human resources.
This is why science fiction began speaking
about ownership of man's genetic makeup from this time.**

The City of London and Britain's very wealthy soft power institutions continue to regard that battle for the mind as their top priority for world domination, and they regard health as a subsector of that battle. The British elite regard themselves still as the world's leading power in mind space. The strategy taught in boarding schools, universities and officer training of intelligence agencies is very much the credo of the leading bloodlines of elite families that control the City of London. And it is the modus operandi of the Anglo-American tax-exempt foundations and of the think tanks such as Chatham House, above all - which push the agendas of those bloodlines upon the Western governments.

FOCUS IN WORLD DOMINATION

A key figure from the year 1870 is that of John Ruskin, seemingly an innocuous figure because he was the first professor of art at Oxford; however, he brought in the doctrine that the British elite really had a duty to export its own world view to the rest of the world. And a key student whom he inspired was Cecil Rhodes, who became fabulously wealthy in Southern Africa. Cecil Rhodes wrote secret diaries and formed secret societies. In 1891, after 16 years of planning, his primary secret society was formed, and the Rhodes Scholarships are part of that society. Oxford members of the Rhodes network were the likes of Lord Toynbee and Lord Milner, well-known geo-strategists. In Cambridge were the future Foreign Secretaries, Lord Grey and Lord Esher. In London was the leading journalist at the time, W.T. Stead. Initiates and members of the Executive Committee of Cecil Rhodes were the above-named men, plus Lord Rothschild. After Rhodes' death in 1902, other leading English bloodlines that repeatedly plagued the City of London history, such as the Astors, came into the same circle. The outer circle became known as the Round Table Group, still functioning in the United States and seven other countries, established from 1909 onward. This group regarded the success of the Canadian Federation in 1867 as its leading case study. Canada was effectively politically unified.

In order to prevent there being a spread of different views and different English-speaking democracies in the world, they must instead all be traced back to the City of London's control.

This is very contemporary as well, because among the many Rhodes scholars that dominate world politics and push the world towards globalism are Bill Clinton and, from the World Economic Forum, the New Zealand lady professor Ngaire Woods, who this year became very well known for stating at the WEF that the elite can do beautiful things if they come together and if the people of the world simply accept that they are in the lead.

This vision [of Rhodes, for world domination] did not remain just the raving of a particularly wealthy Englishman - the elites nativised themselves in the United States in the so-called Eastern Establishment, the Eastern Seaboard, as the United States became the world's dominant power. The key testimony on this issue is that of Norman Dodd, given shortly before his death in 1982 to G. Edward Griffin, easily found online as Norman Dodd on the tax-exempt foundations. Dodd was the key staffer for B. Carroll Reese, the congressman from East Tennessee who in the 1950's, on behalf of Congress, carried out an investigation into the effect of these tax-exempt foundations in the United States.

These foundations implemented the City of London's and Cecil Rhodes' vision for world domination.

It is not enough to be - by far - the world's greatest military and economic power. If your mind space is still controlled by the unexamined assumption that everyone at the top is paid up to liberty, then a club with self-interest is still going to run the world.


And even in areas such as healthcare, which Britain first socialized in 1948, you're going to find that people wrongly and blithely assume that their best interests are kept at heart.

The offshoot of the City of London in Manhattan - Wall Street - funded both sides of both world wars. Serious academics such as Anthony Sutton at the Hoover Institute of Stanford University in California have written entire books about this, entitled *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* and *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*. There was an entire trail of documents which was recovered by Anthony Sutton. It cost him his tenure at Stanford.

What he found was that both the Soviet Union and the Third Reich were brought into being for the interests of the City of London, and more particularly, its Wall Street end.

Just one example of the total reach of British intelligence in areas which it is not constitutionally able or permitted to have, is that MI5 (Military Intelligence Section 5), even before the Second World War, was vetting who got onto the airwaves of the BBC, who got promoted and who got transferred. This was set up by the bloodlines to further their private aims.

The British Cabinet Office is openly speaking about its control of the world's thinking and the thinking of the British people. They're labeling parts of the brain under the label of MINDSPACE.



Their document says: “Even if people agree with the behavior goal, they may object to the means of accomplishing it. The different MINDSPACE effects will attract different levels of controversy. There are several factors that determine controversy.”

"The goal is therefore to make sure that citizens don't fully realize that their behavior is being changed, or at least how it is being changed."

"Clearly, this opens government up to charges of manipulation. People have a strong dislike of being tricked. This dislike has a psychological grounding, but fundamentally it is an issue of trust in government. A lack of conscious control also has implications for consent and freedom of choice. First, it creates a greater need for citizens to approve the use of the behavior change, perhaps using new forms of Democratic engagement."

In this model, democracy is the highest good that's sold - but the levers for manipulating democracy are in the hands of the cartel.

Reiner Fuellmich: Is it correct that the City of London is the real powerhouse in the UK?

Alex Thomson: Without any doubt. This is something that if you've had my background, you learn at boarding school, let alone at university. And by the time you get into the civil service, there is a lot of eye rolling if you ever suggest that the people of Britain, or any other country in the Commonwealth, have self-determination.

**The City of London is understood
to own the population - body, mind and soul.**

Reiner Fuellmich: Ultimately, it's the control of the people's minds that the City of London really wanted, to further their goal of world domination. Is that correct?

Alex Thomson: Yes.

Reiner Fuellmich: So ultimately what we're seeing is a very powerful institution – City of London – which bridges the Atlantic, because as its fifth column they have Wall Street. Those two powers united are the center of power in this world.

Alex Thomson: There are struggles. For a long time there was the completely non-trivial Cold War, with branches of the aristocracy in the City of London being both pro- and anti-Soviet Union. I could talk for hours just about that. But that is secondary to the determination that there must be only a German block and a Russian block in Eurasia, and that both of these ultimately must be controlled and hemmed in by British or Anglo-American sea power and Anglo-American soft power setting the paradigms for them.

Reiner Fuellmich: Another thing that I wanted to clarify is - you mentioned that it is just a few families who really run the City of London. You mentioned the names of Rothschild and Rhodes and Astor. Is it true that it's just a few families who are trying to dominate the world through the City of London?

Alex Thomson: Yes. I have never found better material than that of a writing duo which is Dutch and German-American. The Dutchman is Robin de Ruiter. His American German co-author is Fritz Springmeier from South Carolina. They have the rather shocking book titled *Bloodlines of the Illuminati*. But their work is solid.

**They consistently show that the City of London,
Manhattan and the European continent, are very much
dominated by a small number of families.**

Often, level 13 is given as the top level of these families. Obviously, there are levels below that. The French, for example, often spoke about “les 200 familles,” the 200 bloodlines, that run the deep state. But the senior ones terrorize the junior ones, and the highest you can get up to before you disappear into nebulous claims of Satan running the world (which ultimately, I believe he does)...

... the highest level you can get up to is a level at which Central European Germanic bloodlines have an uneasy truce with British Isles bloodlines, most of whom are now based in the United States.

Reiner Fuellmich: And one of the major means through which these very few families are trying to dominate the rest of the world, seems to be through mind space, which sounds like mind control. Does that mean through psychological operations?

Alex Thomson: Very much so. No nation got into the game of psychological operations earlier than Britain. As soon as there were formal intelligence agencies in Britain in the Edwardian era, just before the First World War, it was a major concentration. But they borrowed a lot of their insights from Vienna and from Germany, which were leading in the psychological space at the time.

This is a transnational interest in both the Anglo and the Germanic areas of world domination at the time, for using the tricks of mind space.

And these were largely perfected when America had unchallenged Germany after 1945, using a lot of the Third Reich and Soviet minds who were actually brought over to the United States surreptitiously during Operation Paperclip. Mind control has been regarded - since the days of Edward Bernays and Freud - as the most powerful way of controlling action in the real world.

If you have that power, you control people who are more numerous, more intelligent and stronger than yourself.

OWNING THE PEOPLE

Reiner Fuellmich: Did I hear correctly that you used the term livestock? Is that really the view that these people have of the rest of the world?

Alex Thomson: It is explicitly the view, certainly in the 1990's when I was at a senior British boarding school - this term was used by the grandsons of City of London seniors. They used the word 'livestock' to describe the British population.

**They are considered cattle
and do not deserve a place in the world,
other than under the direction of the British elite.**

Dexter L-J. Ryneveldt: So, you will agree that financial dominance is at the core of the Covid-19 pandemic?

Alex Thomson: Yes, I would, and I would qualify it very slightly by reminding you that in Carroll Quigley's summary of the Anglo-American elite establishment's worldview, he points out that the ownership of financial assets is already outdated by the 1960s. And he knows that the great brains, not necessarily the good brains, a century prior to him already saw this coming.

**They regard the real wealth as human minds and health,
and the ability to alter and copyright, in time, the human being
into a new model that would behave as expected.**

Ana Garner: You mention copyrighting the human mind, copyrighting even the genetics. Do you feel that there is a link between the current so-called vaccines – the shots from Pfizer, Moderna, Janssen, AstraZeneca – and this goal of copyrighting the humans?

Alex Thomson: I very strongly believe that. I'm not medically or biotechnologically qualified to explain how much truth there may be in this, but I've seen time and again that where there is hype and where there is a pseudo theological belief among the elite in Britain and America that you can achieve a certain aim by pulling a certain trick - such as by editing a gene and stamping a copyright on the human body - that is enough motivation in and of itself to fuel a serious attempt to go that way.

The very heart of it is the idea that genetic editing will allow the copyrighting of the number of souls and bodies in humanity that are affected, so that they're no longer under the Creator.

EXPERT WITNESS

MATTHEW EHRET



Matthew J.L. Ehret is a journalist, lecturer

and founder of the Canadian Patriot Review and the Rising Tide Foundation.

He is an author with Strategic Culture, The Duran, Fort Russ, LA Review of Books - China Channel, and has also been published on Asia Times, Global Times, Oriental Review, Sott, and Zero Hedge.

He has authored three volumes of the book series
"Untold History of Canada".

The following is a summary of the most important information revealed by Matthew Ehret.

I will first deal with the present situation, just to get across what is the British hand in global affairs today. The first thing is a video of about a minute and a half.

"I, Justin P.J. Trudeau, do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada, her heirs and successors, so help me God."

"I, Justin P.J. Trudeau, do solemnly and sincerely swear that I shall be a true and faithful servant to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, as a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada. I will in all things to be treated, debated and resolved in Privy Council, faithfully, honestly and truly declare my mind and my opinion. I shall keep secret all matters committed and revealed to me in this capacity, or that she'll be secretly treated of in council. Generally, in all things I shall do as a faithful and true servant ought to do for Her Majesty, so help me God."

That is confusing for some people who saw this in 2017. Not what you would expect a so-called *democratic head of state* to be doing, when he was declaring his oath of office *after an election*. But then again, Trudeau is not really the head of state. He's a member of the Privy Council office, which you have to be if you're going to be in a cabinet position, in government or in the opposition.

**The actual head of state is the Governor General,
that older gentleman standing next to him
who is the appointee carrying out the emanation
of the powers and authority of The Crown
to give royal assent to any law that becomes law in Canada.**

You have Lieutenant Governors, a position in every single province. You have a Privy Council office. You have this whole weird Byzantine structure *above the apparent public aspect of our so-called democracy* in this monarchy of the north, which is, again, very confusing for a lot of people. What is this anomalous thing and what is it a part of internationally? How did it come into being? Canada is, after all, a part of the British Commonwealth. This is something that was set up in the late 1930s in preparation of the transformation of the British Empire's outward image.

It is widely believed that the British Empire disappeared after World War II, that it let its territories go free, and that now, the Empire is the big, bad American Empire. That's the mythology that's been passed down to us. The real power that controlled the fifth column inside of the United States, which has always been there since 1776, has always been in London. It never disappeared.

**No empire of this sort ever just willfully gives liberty.
Liberty is something you fight for.**

A 2016 report called *The New Colonialism*, by a non-profit organization that conducted audits on the British interest, states: “101 companies listed on the London Stock Exchange – most of them British – have mining operations in 37 sub-Saharan African countries. They collectively control over \$1 trillion worth of Africa’s most valuable resources. The UK government has used its power and influence to ensure that British mining companies have access to Africa’s raw materials. This was the case during the colonial period, and it is still the case today.”

There is also a strange, little-known organization called the Crown Agents, which is affiliated with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation as well as the World Bank. It was set up in 1833 as an emanation of The Crown. It’s not part of the government. It doesn’t come from the consent of the governed. Its authority comes from the singular sovereign, The Crown, as a hereditary institution.




AREAS OF WORK



It was set up as a branch of the British Colonial Office to manage infrastructure – hard and soft – of the international colonies of the Empire. Accordingly, Crown Agents has been managing the health infrastructure, including covid protocols, of Eastern Europe, especially in Ukraine. It also manages many African countries, including South Sudan and Myanmar. And it deals with governance. It helps these countries adapt their governing mechanisms according to World Bank and IMF standards. *That's just one aspect in terms of the maintenance of the shadow Empire.*

An important point about this Commonwealth / City of London-managed system is that the Cayman Islands and offshore banking is at the center of it. Internationally, you have 24% of the financial services moving through a lot of British-controlled Cayman Islands, Caribbean, and other offshore tax havens.

But also, within these havens is the center of global drug money laundering and terrorist financing. People think drugs are a natural plague of our society; that terrorism is just a natural thing that happens. No, this is very artificial. These are created diseases that are geopolitical in nature - they are not even religious in nature. They are cultivated from the top.



Above is a U.S. Senate report conducted over a long period by recently deceased senator Carl Levin, on U.S. vulnerabilities to money laundering, drugs, and terrorist financing: the HSBC case history.

It was discovered that HSBC was the number one offshore account money laundering bank in the world.

It was set up in 1865 to enforce or manage the opium trade in order to destroy China. HSBC was found guilty and slapped on the wrist with a certain fine of \$1.9 billion. They were allowed to appoint their own auditor to sit there for five years. *And they're still doing what they do.* They have a huge stake in Air Canada. Anyone who takes a plane to Canada will see HSBC signs everywhere. That is a huge piece of infrastructure - as part of the 'silver triangle' - that's been underway for the whole of the 20th century.

Also above, we have a picture of the Queen at Coutts. That's the Queen's personal bank, which in 2012 was also found guilty of drug money laundering. It paid its own little \$10 million fine, and the bad publicity resulted in the bank's offshore accounts (that were conducting the laundering) being sold off to the Royal Bank of Canada, *which currently conducts the same operations.*

As well, Africa has \$177 billion of debt holding it hostage; meanwhile about \$944 billion of revenue from the extraction of wealth sits in British offshore accounts. So it is not a debtor nation, but a predator nation en masse.

**The City of London is a separate entity.
Even the UK government can't really do much legally to stop it.
They have their own courts, their own police.**

I didn't even talk about dodgy dossiers being created by British intelligence that justified the bombing of Iraq and Libya. I didn't talk about the dodgy Syrian dossiers of chemical weapons that were never actually proven to be used by Assad, but that had been used to justify sanctions - and the regime change that has been attempted now for seven years. *But all I have to say is that the British hand is everywhere.* Even in the course of the dodgy dossiers that tried to place Putin as the big bad guy controlling Trump. And also, the question of Rhodes Scholars - people like Strobe Talbott, who came in with Clinton and have been running Brookings for a very long time. This has also been behind *Russia Gate*, with many other Rhodes Scholars currently managing the Biden administration, like Jake Sullivan, Susan Rice and Eric Lander. The *sciences* are Rhodes Scholars. They're just everywhere.

THE CITY OF LONDON OWNS CANADA

The Privy Council Office of Canada (unlike the United States Constitution or Declaration of Independence) was founded in 1867. The original conference with our Founding Fathers was not something that was a part of a fight for freedom, unlike the U.S. These were all British loyalists and anti-republicans, such as our Founding Father Johnny McDonald. He was an Aryan complete Race Patriot, who wanted an Aryan Canada, and who said: *British I was born, and British I will die*. He was a filthy, immoral scumbag. And these are the people celebrated as our sacred cows that we're supposed to honor in Canada.

Unlike the U.S. founding documents, the Canadian founding document says literally: "Whereas the Provinces of Canada have expressed their Desire to be federally united in One Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom and of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in Principle to that of the United Kingdom [Which is itself a bit of a fraud since the UK doesn't really have a constitution, so it's sort of a mirroring of a shadow]. And whereas such a Union would conduce to the Welfare of the Provinces and promote the interests of the British Empire."

**Canada was created to promote
the interests of the British Empire.**

The point that the British were afraid of, was that Canada had pro-linking statesmen in positions of leadership who were fighting to create an independent country at that time. So this was seen as a vital territory that had to be kept under the control of the British Foreign Office. Lincoln's allies were ousted from power and it was kept as a wedge between the danger of a US-Russia collaboration.

One Lincoln admirer, Wilford Laurier, actually made it to Prime Minister and was leading Canada to independence, but was then ousted by British powers. Two years later, he wrote to his close ally, O.D. Skelton: "Canada is now governed by a junta sitting in London, known as "The Round Table", with ramifications in Toronto, in Winnipeg, in Victoria with Tories [that's Conservatives] and Grits [that's Liberals] receiving their ideas from London and insidiously forcing them on their respective parties."

One of the problems was that they needed the power of the United States behind them, and that's always been the objective of the Cecil Rhodes design. Lord Lothian, who was a leading Round Tabler at the time (he was the ambassador to the United States), had written about the problem of the American psyche that had to be dealt with: "There is a fundamentally different

concept in regard to the question between Great Britain and the United States as to the necessity of civilized control over politically backward peoples... the inhabitants of Africa and parts of Asia have proved unable to govern themselves... yet America not only has no conception of this aspect of the problem but has been led to believe that the assumption of this kind of responsibility is iniquitous imperialism.”

Americans "don't get that there's a white man's burden that they have to impose because they are scientifically better than the darker skinned people". They have to morally and scientifically impose an Anglo-American control over the backward peoples. They just don't get it. And that was a problem.

FAILED NEW WORLD ORDERS

There have been several attempts at new world orders. What we're seeing today is not a new thing. In 1919, you had the creation of Chatham House; you had the creation of the Versailles and the League of Nations, all orchestrated by Lord Milner, who at this time was a leading figure controlling British foreign policy along with many other Round Tablers.

The idea of the League of Nations was to lead a collective security pact, Article 10 - to get rid of national sovereignty over economics and military affairs and effectively create a one world government.

This was also part of the Imperial Federation, similar to the European Union - this was what they wanted for the world - that failed. Why did it fail? Because people in Canada resisted, the lorry Liberals resisted, Irish Free State movements resisted, and people like Warren Harding (who was assassinated) resisted. You had nationalists who resisted and didn't succumb to this pressure at the time.

They tried again. In 1933 there was the International Bankers Conference in London, centered around the Bank of International Settlements and the Bank of England. Sixty-six nations had been a part of it, all with the design that the Great Depression would be solved by moving sovereignty economically from nation states into officially essential bankers' codery under the Bank of England. And the only reason for its failure after six months was that Franklin Roosevelt pulled the US delegations out of all participation. It all just fell apart.

Then there was another attempt in 1944. John Maynard Keynes was assigned this time to represent the British Empire at the Bretton Woods Conference, with the idea of a currency run by the Bank of England called “the Bancor,” an international exchange rate that would effectively be a one world currency. This was backed with the idea of Americans (who had come out of World War II as the only unbroken country) being the battering ram or the enforcers of an Anglo-American reconquering of the nations of the world. Many of these nations had fought during the war, and many had ideas of independence and freedom alive in their hearts. This was not acceptable.

I want to insert here a sharp quote from Franklin Roosevelt:

“They who seek to establish systems of government based on the regimentation of all human beings by a handful of individual rulers call this a 'new order'. It is not new, and it is not order.”
- Franklin Roosevelt.

The book *As He Saw It* was written in 1946 by Roosevelt’s son and his personal assistant Elliot Roosevelt. It documents a lot of the battles between Roosevelt versus the Churchill gang that were always trying to pull the U.S. into a Brotherhood of Control – à la Cecil Rhodes, à la Five Eyes – which was already what was creeping up and happening from the Black Chamber being transformed into the NSA in 1930, which became integrated more and more into the British Five Eyes thing.

Roosevelt was told to clean out the OSS (Office of Strategic Services), which was like a British Foreign office. But there were still a lot of Patriots and nationalists embedded in American intelligence within the OSS who were problematic for those trying to take control, who had pretty much occupied most of the State Department by this time.

You’ll find that many great Patriots of the United States either died or had their careers annihilated.

You have Enrico Mattei, the Italian industrialist. You have Dag Hammarskjöld, the Secretary General of the UN, who had a grand program to end imperialism and promote industrial development in a variety of countries, especially in South Africa. Charles de Gaulle had avoided 30 assassination attempts. John F. Kennedy and Patrice Lumumba. I didn’t put everybody on here who was either assassinated or overthrown in CIA-MI6-directed coups. But this was a

period of looking for cooperation & win-wins. That's why JFK offered the Russians the ability to work with the United States on a joint space program. So that would be something to break us away, to liberate us from this mathematical balance-of-terror way of governance.

After the age of assassinations, the focus has always been to take back control of the United States.

Kissinger is a key figure in much of this. In January, 1971, the Inter-Alpha Group of banks was created under the blueprint of Lord Jacob Rothschild. The Inter-Alpha Group was set up in each of the focused European countries to advance a new doctrine of deregulation, centralizing power away from nation states, especially in Europe, and moving it into the private supranational coterie of corporate and financial interests above national authorities.

Many of these Inter-Alpha banks were tied to financial activities supporting fascism's rise, whether Franco, Mussolini or Hitler.

In the same month, the World Economic Forum was founded by one of Kissinger's prodigies, Klaus Schwab. One of the co-founders was Maurice Strong, a Canadian oligarch who was picked by the Rockefellers and who also was a co-founder of the Canadian Club of Rome. Another co-founder was Prince Philip, the guy who's often quoted as wanting to reincarnate as a deadly virus to solve the world's overpopulation problem.

On August 15, 1971, Kissinger and Schultz, running the Nixon administration, orchestrated the removal of the dollar from the gold reserve. Without speculation, it was difficult to conduct economic warfare against nations trying to develop their infrastructure and their industrial base, which has always been, even going back to the 19th century, a tool used by the Empire to keep nations destabilized. So, the fixed exchange rate had to go. It guaranteed too much stability. By floating the dollar, they created the desired chaos.

Under President Carter, the Trilateral Commission took over. Nearly every member of Carter's cabinet was a member of the Trilateral Commission. People like Paul Volcker, who became the Fed chair, called for a controlled disintegration of the U.S. economy in 1979, wherein interest rates were raised to 20% or more for two years, *destroying small and medium-sized businesses and only leaving these behemoth multinational companies able to survive and thrive*, and gobble up companies under mergers and acquisitions.

Henry Kissinger described how he preferred the Churchill way of thinking about geopolitics over the Roosevelt idea. Total admission; no attempt to hide it. They just admit it. They just assume that we're too dumb to put words and actions together.

Lord Jacob Rothschild delivered a speech in 1983 in which he referred to the breakdown of the division of bank activities between commercial, investment, trust and insurance. All of these had formerly, under Roosevelt, been designed in separate compartments so you couldn't speculate with people's savings. Rothschild sought to remove this system and replace with universal banking that does everything. Then came the cancerous tumor called derivatives (\$2 trillion by 1992), creating worldwide debt enslavement, followed by the dissolution of the Soviet Union the same year. The end of history is being celebrated.

George Bush states in 1990 at the opening of the Kuwait War:

"We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order – when we are successful – and we will be – we have a real chance at this new world order."

The separation of US commercial banking from speculation was broken down by Clinton - Rhodes Scholar, the last act in office. And then from that point forward came the ushering in of just the biggest cancer of derivatives, going from \$2 trillion in 1992 to \$70 trillion in 1999 - by that point, overlapping the U.S. global GDP. Yet all the banks are "too big to fail", or so they would have us believe, so we have to bail them out. And so, by 2007, when the next collapse hit, there was \$708 trillion of derivatives weighing down the system, far outweighing the \$15 trillion of the U.S. GDP.

A real economy only works if you have the financial side always servicing and improving upon the real side – manufacturing, infrastructure, science. If finance isn't servicing those, it's a bubble that will pop. That's why the bubble that was created today was a planned disintegration and was always designed for 1971 to disintegrate. The question is, when would be the pinprick? The pinprick has happened.

Reiner Fuellmich: Thank you, Matthew. Let me just verify that I understand you correctly. The main point is that the British Empire has never ceased to exist. It is still there. Colonialism is still

existing, except it's existing under a different name. It has never stopped trying to pull the United States back in, but for some reason, it hasn't really been successful.

Is the deep state that part of the country that tries to reintroduce the United States into the Anglo-American system and into the City of London, basically?

Matthew Ehret: I have no problem with what you just said.

Reiner Fuellmich: One final question. The power of the City of London, combined with its fifth column, Wall Street. Is it really true? Did I understand correctly that all that money, all that power was capable of starting World War I and World War II, with these financial behemoths financing both sides?

Matthew Ehret: Oh, yeah, absolutely.

Reiner Fuellmich: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that I didn't misunderstand you. And finally, anyone who can start two world wars probably has no problem creating diseases like terrorism and drug trade. So that, in essence, was started by this financial behemoth City of London, plus Wall Street.

Matthew Ehret: I conducted an interview with Alex Krainer, based on a wonderful trilogy he wrote on the original British design for a new world order under people like Lord Halifax, the appeasers of Britain, who were people like Neville Chamberlain, who were part of an operation which all the way up until 1939-1940 still wanted to have an Anglo-American fascist alliance with Hitler and Mussolini and others, to manage the world as a new world order and be enforcers of a eugenics policy of population control under a scientifically managed society from the top. That was a design all the way up until the ouster of Neville Chamberlain. Hitler had become a Frankenstein monster that was no longer behaving according to its commands, and had bigger ambitions to be at the head of the helm, instead of a secondary enforcer for the will of a banking class. So, they had to change strategy and abort that plan.

The oligarchy has screwed up a lot. They're not as powerful as they want us to believe, which is an intimidation of the mind. Every time you look at what they're trying – what they're trying to do today is not new – they've tried many times, and usually it blows up in their face and undermines them. Then they have to reorganize and try something new.

Reiner Fuellmich: I do understand now why Vera Sharav, a Holocaust survivor, says that she can't believe that she's fighting the same people and the same structures again that she fought 75 years ago, because it looks as though what happened then is happening again.

Dexter L-J. Ryneveldt: Thanks so much for your evidence. You mentioned right at the onset of the statement of evidence that you've given, that you're talking about natural law. As we all know, the substantive law that we are using in this grand jury is natural law. So, I would like to find out from you, based on all the research that you've done, how important is natural law for humanity's survival? And most importantly, how is it related to constitutional law? Thank you.

Matthew Ehret: Dexter, that's an amazing question. That's a very good question. In my understanding, all of world history has been shaped by a battle between either artificial law [or natural law]. I mean, mankind is the only species that we know of that creates and improves upon the laws of the systems that we self-organize around. Animals are ordained by their genetics, by their environment and their wiring to be what they are, and that's great. But human beings are uniquely able to craft conceptions and apply those conceptions to manage our own existence. And then identify problems with the so-called invisible metaphysical machine of statecraft and improve upon them. But upon what standard do we improve? Upon what standard do we judge our man-made laws to say, "Okay, this one squares with something that is designed by God" and which ones are out of whack, out of harmony, that we have to correct, that are illegitimate or, as Thomas Cleas would say, forms of violence.

If a law can actually deprive you of your innate ability to express your life, liberty, happiness, creative powers - if that's what a law is doing, it's not a law, it's a form of violence. It does not have to be respected.

The Founding Fathers were very sensitive to the fact that there is a higher law. It's not even separate from scientific law. That's why Benjamin Franklin was also a scientist who discovered principles of electricity that he shared. But in his mind, his discoveries of the laws of electricity were not separated from the metaphysical moral laws that became the foundation of his life's effort to create a republic of self-governance, premised on the inalienable rights of the individual and not the hereditary institutions that had governed society for thousands of years. That was the first time it was done.

Again, in his world, it was two sides of the same thing. Real science is not mathematical description or trying to impose a formula onto the universe and expect the universe to abide by it. It's about tuning our own creative reason in harmony with that universe that is always going

to be more discoverable. And every time we transmit those new eureka's in any domain to our fellow mankind and then apply it to the productive process, the universe responds by giving us greater standards of living. Right? We can sustain more people at a higher standard of life than we could have if we didn't have electricity, if we didn't have knowledge of fire, as when we were living like cattle in caves.

**If we abide by those certain principles
as Benjamin Franklin and others understood,
we will have greater emancipation.
The Empire, the oligarchical system of a hereditary elite,
will lose its places to put its claws - like the parasite that it is -
into the host. It won't have much to grab onto and will lose
its power and will self-implode, as we're seeing right now.**

Alex Thomson: What we are now seeing in the jurisdictions of the United Kingdom, is that the court systems in all of these realms, which are basically common law, are starting to arrogate to themselves, at judicial level, the power to decide mens rea. They are further ahead than any common law or civil law jurisdiction in our repeated findings now, in asserting that even if there is a jury there for show (and they seem to be trying to get rid of them now under the spurious claim that international treaty requirements require them to dwindle the use of juries) – that they reserve the right to determine what was in the mind of the perpetrator. And very often now, it's a drafting which comes from the tax-exempt foundations, such as the Carnegie Foundation that I spoke about earlier, via the House of Commons library telling the legislators in Britain (which then will lead other countries in the same way), that there is an ersatz version of the public good or the public welfare now, which is called collective well-being or collective welfare. That's what the foundations were doing all through the 20th century, creating enemies for that very purpose. And now the courts are saying, if you have offended against society, then there is no redress - you are guilty. And that is the furthest towards getting rid of natural law that I've seen anywhere. It has gone further than any European totalitarian state or any international court.

**It's now coming through at the British national level
through legislation, ultimately from the thinktanks -
the abolition of the concept that natural law
decides whether you're guilty or not.**

Reiner Fuellmich: Is it possible that, not only in Europe but also in the United States, there is a movement that, having understood what is going on, is trying to distance themselves? I'm talking about the United States trying to distance themselves from the Europeans and in particular from

the City of London, because “we are simply buried under debt, and we carry too much dead weight with us”? I’m saying this in layman’s terms. What do you think, Alex and Matthew?

Alex Thomson: For my part, absolutely. And in the recent testimony I gave to you, I spoke about that, that...

**...there is a large belt of heartland America
that has woken up to this and now sees what they regard as
an Anglo or an Anglo-European problem steering them.
And I think that they are getting heartily sick
of it all because of the amount of treason involved.**

Just as codicil to Matt’s testimony about 1971 when the financial coup was pulled off. One of the indications that the Americans were being used as hapless pawns in this is that that very year, Kissinger is said to have told that the military, by which he largely meant the U.S. military, were brute, dumb beasts, sent to do other biddings. And in that same year, being the new Secretary of State under the incoming Nixon administration, he got a Massachusetts-based manufacturer - the only manufacturer in the world that could produce precision ball bearings: Bryant Chucking Grinder – to supply the ball bearings to the Soviet Union to allow them to develop multiple independent re-entry vehicle warheads. I know that one well from James Bush, one of our extra testimonials this evening, who was personally involved in the American side of that.

**The amount of treason involved is such that,
where the United States had even a military or an economic lead,
the cabal we’re talking about deliberately abolished that.**

Matthew Ehret: There are fifth columns in Russia, and every country has its own fifth columns. They’ve got their own battles between legitimate forces who represent these cultures versus these other parasitical penetrations. I would say in Eurasia, you actually have had more serious pushback in a serious way to the point that there is a genuine alternative strategy that has been deployed outside of the framework of the cage of NATO - which is imploding, and was always designed to implode. And I think you’ve got forces within the United States – I see it more currently on the state level – that don’t want to go down with the sinking ship. There are forces all over Europe. Unfortunately, the federal executive branches of most of the transatlantic governments have been in large measure captured, not always entirely, but at a depressing level. So, I’m not an expert in geopolitical planning, but I do hope that the creative forces are able to utilize the self-contradictions and insanity of the Empire to their benefit, since again, this Empire, once it succeeds, can only destroy itself as well.

**I do see that there are people that want to have a future,
that want to survive, and that are organically organizing.
I just think they need to sharpen up their game plan
of what they understand the world to be.**

Because a lot of people still think - especially in America - a lot of the Patriots who don't like The Great Reset tend to have fallen for certain traps that have given them a narrative – it's the Cold War narrative – that the real enemy behind everything is not the British Empire. It's not the oligarchy, it's not that. It's the Chinese communists that want to destroy your freedoms - that's who's behind everything. A lot of people fall into that, and I think that to the degree that they hold onto those Cold War narratives, they're going to self-sabotage their overarching desires to have a successful battle against this oligarchical thing.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MANIPULATION

S E C O N D S U M M A R Y

In the second session of day 2 of the Grand Jury, we listen to Brian Gerrish, a former UK Royal Navy officer, specialized in the tracking of submarines, who is currently an investigative journalist and senior editor of the UK Column. He is joined by one of their expert researchers, Debbie Evans, who was a government advisor at the Department of Health for the UK.

They reveal documents evidencing something of great concern: the governments are using applied psychology and hypnosis to create fear and anxiety in the population, with the goal of changing their behavior. Specifically during the covid pandemic, this has been used extensively.

These experts also reveal how the National Health Service has been infiltrated by financial 'change agents', who shift the focus from *patients* to *profit*. This was also done using psychological manipulation, that transformed the mindset of the NHS employees.

The evidence shows how the entire health system worldwide has been strategically infiltrated and transformed, to become a carousel for financial oligarchs to further enrich themselves and gain complete power over the population, not only in the UK, but in nations around the world.

Actual medical care has been replaced with 'mantras'. For example, when unvaccinated covid patients enter the hospital, the mantra 'covid unvaccinated death pathway' is activated, meaning that these unvaccinated people will receive treatment which leads to their death.

The concept of *Mental Hygiene* was developed, promoting the idea that only people who submit to the mindsets of the financial criminal elite are considered mentally healthy, while those who disagree must be silenced and, if possible, eradicated.

**A criminal political system that uses applied psychology
has been unleashed on the public and the healthcare workers
to change their thinking and behavior.
This is exactly what also happened in Nazi Germany.**

EXPERT WITNESS

B R I A N G E R R I S H



Brian's first career was as a British Royal Navy officer,
specializing in anti-submarine warfare. When he left the Navy in 1993, he discovered
that all is not as it seems within society in the UK. As a result of tracking fraud
and corruption in his own city and other major UK cities, he started to look
at organizations which he could see were controlling events.

Currently, Brian heads the UK Column, producing news three times a week.

It is because of both his previous military experience and his experience in the civilian world, including analysis through the UK Column, that Brian is able to give his testimony.



Our initial speakers have described the founding, the start-up and the growth of an organization of gangsters. We've heard about the history. We've learned something of the people, their networks, their modus operandi. We've had evidence of world events that show us that these groups are operating.

If we look at how gangsters were dealt with and brought down in the past, we know that they were judged by looking at their crimes, by collecting evidence of their crimes, whether it was murder, drug running or prostitution. There had to be real evidence of the crime, there had to be intent, there had to be named persons involved in those crimes. It was only when the evidence was brought forward that they could be brought into court and subsequently found guilty, or at least brought before the law and ultimately serve their time.

For our jury, which is a world audience, the first two speakers have done a great job of showing us that there's a conspiracy, there's a group of gangsters that are operating, and that they've got huge power and wealth.

Their aim is world dominance.

They want to control everything: society, raw materials, methods of production, people, politics.

Their crimes are oppression, slavery, poverty, hunger, human trafficking, death.

Now we have a very important major world event happening, and that is the so-called COVID-19 pandemic followed by a vaccination program. The overwhelming evidence is showing that these gangsters are killing people. We are here as a court of law to talk about the crime. What is the

crime? The crime is death. People have died as a result of their created wars; now we're seeing people dying as a result of the introduction of a pandemic, how that pandemic was handled, and how it is being "treated" with a vaccination program.

Alex talked about how they want to control our minds - how they want "civilized control over politically backward people." And that latter quote absolutely shows the arrogance of these gangsters, because they believe that any opinion they hold is the correct opinion, the correct value, and anybody who challenges them is a lesser being whom they want to remove from their field of operations. They would like these people to go away and die.

MIND CONTROL

Alongside the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent vaccination program, there is a battle for our minds by an applied political psychological attack. I have a couple of papers with me. The first one is entitled *Mental Health*. The subtitle is *Strategic Planning for Mental Health*. It was by a certain J.R. Reese, dated October 1940. At the start of the Second World War, we had a group of people who were later to become very powerful within the World Health Organization, discussing how they were going to implement what they called 'mental hygiene in the new society'.

They said they were going to infiltrate social organizations, attack the professions, infiltrate social activities and professional societies, and unleash a long-term plan of propaganda.


I'm going to reinforce that 1940 paper by another paper entitled *Psychiatry*. It's part of the *Journal of the Biology and Pathology of Interpersonal Relations*. It's dated February, 1946, and it's talking about the re-establishment of the peacetime society. The author is a certain G.B. Chisholm. It's talking about the use of the psychiatric system to implement this program of mental hygiene.

'Mental hygiene' implies that you're not fit to be a human being unless you adopt the views and values of these gangsters.

When I began to research what was happening in the UK from a point of view of crime and fraud, threats and bullying at the local level, I quickly established, to my astonishment, that there was a charity called Common Purpose that was acting in a very political way in creating future leaders. These people were installing themselves in UK cities, effectively taking control of politics within those cities. Within a few years, that organization was operating overseas in countries like

Germany, Holland, India and Australia, where they were recruiting people in those countries to bring them into an agenda of change agents, to change the way we think and conduct our business in society.

This organization was started in about 1985, because of one particular lady - the chief executive at the time, Julia Middleton - coming back from America saying she'd learned some amazing things about how to change society. Common Purpose was able to get going with funding from major banks that, aside from Deutsche Bank, were never disclosed. Common Purpose was a key example of an organization you couldn't track. You couldn't see the documents, you couldn't see the people, and you couldn't see that it was unleashing a plan to change our society without the average member of the public understanding this. I'd like to bring you back to the MINDSPACE document.



The British Cabinet Office worked for a long time with psychologists to learn how to change the way people think and behave - without them understanding that this is happening.

Slide 3: minutes of the SPI-B, which is part of the British government's wise scientist group, SAGE, who were commenting on how we should be "fighting Covid." SPI-B was a team of specialists, including behavioral specialists, who were going to use applied psychology to get people to adhere to the British government's policy on Covid-19.

UK Government SAGE / SPI_B Covid Team Minutes

Options for increasing adherence to social distancing measures

22nd March 2020

Question addressed

What are the options for increasing adherence to the social distancing measures?

This paper addresses the two social distancing measures that are seen as most important at present:

1. General social distancing by everyone
2. Shielding for vulnerable people for at least 12 weeks.

The methodology for evaluating the options is given in Appendix A.

The options set out below are not mutually exclusive. In fact, there is evidence that greatest behaviour change impact is achieved by interventions that operate at many levels simultaneously and consistently (1). There are nine broad ways of achieving behaviour change: Education, Persuasion, Incentivisation, Coercion, Enablement, Training, Restriction, Environmental restructuring, and Modelling (2, 3). We have focused on those that are most relevant for this task and where there is evidence to draw on.

1. General social distancing by everyone

Government guidance (4)

Everyone should try to follow the following measures in much as is practicable:

1. Avoid contact with someone who is displaying symptoms of coronavirus (COVID-19). These symptoms include high temperature (fever) and continuous cough.
2. Avoid non-essential use of public transport when possible.
3. Work from home, where possible. Your employer should support you to do this. Please refer to employer guidance for more information.
4. Avoid large and small gatherings in public spaces, noting that pubs, restaurants, leisure centres and similar venues are currently shut as infections spread easily in closed spaces where people gather together.
5. Avoid gatherings with friends and family. Keep in touch using remote technology such as phone, internet, and social media.
6. Use telephone or online services to contact your GP or other essential services.
7. Use telephone advice to follow the above measures in much as you can and to significantly limit your face-to-face interactions with friends and family, if possible, particularly if you are over 70, have an underlying health condition, are pregnant.

Options (See Appendix B for summary of option evaluations)

Education

1. **Specificity:** The guidance currently lacks clarity and specificity with regards to recommended behaviours. For example, instead of the phrase "try to", it should just say "do". Phrases such as "as much as is practicable", "non-essential", "significantly limit", and "gather" are open to wide differences in interpretation. This can lead to confusion about exactly what people are being required to do (e.g. gathering outside or going for walks). Guidance now needs to be reformulated to be behaviourally specific; who needs to do what (precisely) and why (explain the rationale) and communicated through channels that provide personalised advice and account for individual circumstances including SMS messaging and an interactive website (5-7).

Persuasion

2. **Perceived threat:** A substantial number of people still do not feel sufficiently personally threatened, it could be that they are reassured by the low death rate in their demographic group (8). Although levels of concern may be rising (9). Having a good understanding of the risk has been found to be positively associated with adoption of COVID-19 social distancing measures in Hong Kong (10). **The perceived level of personal threat needs to be increased amongst those who are complacent, using hard-hitting emotional messaging.**

Evaluation of options for increasing social distancing

Page 1

emotional messaging. To be effective this must also empower people to take to reduce the threat (11).

3. **Responsibility to others:** There seems to be insufficient understanding about people's role in transmitting the infection to others. This messaging around the low level of risk to most people and talk of immunity. **Messaging needs to emphasise and explain the duty to protect others.**
4. **Positive messaging around actions:** People need to see self-protective actions as a confident that they will be effective. Individuals also need to understand that the capacity of the health care system, which in turn will be increased by reducing the rise in infections now. **Messaging about actions need to be framed positively in terms of protecting oneself and the community, and increase confidence that they will be effective (14).**
5. **Tailoring:** Some people will be more persuaded by appeals to play by the rules, some by duty to the community, and some to personal risk (13). All these different approaches are needed. The messaging also needs to take account of the realities of different people's lives. **Messaging needs to take account of the different motivational levers and circumstances of different people (15).**

Incentivisation

6. **Social approval:** Social approval can be a powerful source of reward. Not only can this be provided directly by highlighting examples of good practice and providing strong social encouragement and approval in communications; members of the community can be encouraged to provide it to each other. This can have a beneficial spill-over effect of promoting social cohesion (15). **Communication strategies should provide social approval for desired behaviours and promote social approval within the community.**

Coercion

7. **Compulsion:** Experience with UK enforcement legislation such as compulsory seat belt use suggests that, with adequate preparation, rapid change can be achieved (16). Some other countries have introduced mandatory self-isolation on a wide scale without evidence of major public unrest and a large majority of the UK's population appear to be supportive of more coercive measures. For example, 64% adults in Great Britain said they would support putting London under a 'lock down' (17). However, data from Italy and South Korea suggest that for aggressive protective measures to be effective, special attention should be devoted to those population groups that are more at risk (18). In addition, communities need to be engaged to minimise risk of negative effects. Consideration should be given to enacting legislation, with community involvement, to compel key social distancing measures.
8. **Social disapproval:** Social disapproval from one's community can play an important role in preventing anti-social behaviour or discouraging failure to enact pro-social behaviour (15). However, this needs to be carefully managed to avoid victimisation, scapegoating and misdirected criticism. It needs to be accompanied by clear messaging and promotion of strong collective identity. Consideration should be given to use of social disapproval but with a strong caveat around unwanted negative consequences.

Enablement

9. **Community resourcing:** People are being asked to give up valued activities and access to resources for an extended period. These need to be compensated for by ensuring that people have access to opportunities for social contact and rewarding activities that can be undertaken in the home, and to resources such as food. **Adequately resourced community infrastructure and mobilisation needs to be developed rapidly and with coverage across all communities (6, 15).**
10. **Reducing inequity:** Adherence to these measures is likely to be undermined by perceived inequity in their impact on different sections of the population, especially those who are already disadvantaged, e.g. those in rented accommodation and those working in precarious employment, data downloads etc. by 'responsibility deals' or government

Evaluation of options for increasing social distancing

MODEL PROCEEDING

And what I draw people's attention to are really two paragraphs: one is at the bottom of the left-hand page where it says, "the perceived level of personal threat needs to be increased amongst the complacent, using the hard-hitting emotional messaging."

Here is a government team advocating the use of applied psychology in order to make people fearful.

Paragraph 7 talks about coercion in which it says, "consideration should be given to the use of social disapproval, but with a strong caveat around unwanted negative consequences." What they're talking about is using people to police each other. But the caveats that they introduced to this, were because they recognized that this psychological technology could unleash violence in communities. That psychology was sold initially to America and Australia. Look at what is happening in Australia in relation to covid lockdown now. But ultimately, the technology was sold off worldwide.

World governments use this applied behavioral psychology to change people's views, values, behavior - and they simply do not know this has been unleashed on them.

Slide 4: This document is entitled *Behavioral Insights Applied to Policy: Germany, Country Overview*. This is an EU document which is effectively boasting of how applied behavioral

psychology can be used to change community public political opinion. And it's giving a whole list of German organizations, which I'm sure will be much more significant to the panel than to me. But a lot of them are universities and research organizations. This document is effectively simple proof that these political psychology techniques have certainly been spread throughout Europe.

Behavioural Insights Applied to Policy
GERMANY
Country Overview

Last updated: 3 June 2016

This country overview complements the 'Behavioural Insights Applied to Policy – European Report 2016'.

Are you aware of **any new or missing information?**
 If so, please [provide us here](#) with your contribution!

1. Who

Institutions that apply behavioural insights to policy

Public institutions

German Department of the Environment	Unit Policy Planning, Basic Issues and Special Tasks, German Federal Chancellery
Institute for Employment Research of the Federal Employment Agency (IAB)	

Research institutions

AWI-Lab, Heidelberg	Experimentallabor des Lehrstuhls, Kiel
Business and Economic Research Laboratory (BaER-Lab), Paderborn	Institut für Wirtschaftstheorie und Operations Research (WIOR), Karlsruhe
Chair of Applied Research in Economics, Konstanz	Jena Laboratory for Experimental Economics
Cologne Laboratory of Economic Research	Laboratorium für Experimentelle Wirtschaftsforschung (BonnEconLab), Bonn
DICELab for Experimental Economics, Düsseldorf	Laboratory for Economic and Accounting Research (LEAR), Osnabrück
Essen Laboratory for Experimental Economics (ELFE)	Laboratory for Experimental Economics (eLab), Erfurt
Experimental Economics at Clausthal University of Technology (ExECUTE), Clausthal-Zellerfeld	Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences
Experimental Lab of the Institute of Entrepreneurial Studies, Berlin	Magdeburg Laboratory for experimental Economics (MaXLab), Magdeburg
Experimental lab, Oldenburg	Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin
Experimental Laboratory of the University of Hamburg	

Joint Research Centre

Let me now jump to the subject of COVID-19 and vaccine effects. In the United Kingdom, we have the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency, the MHRA. That organization supposedly is tasked with keeping the public safe with regards to pharmaceutical products and

vaccines. And as part of the vaccination program in UK, they've been collecting data on vaccine adverse reactions, the Yellow Card system. Their own statistics say that there have been nearly one and a half million adverse effects from vaccines, and there have been close to 2,000 deaths. They believe it's likely that only 10% of the vaccine adverse effects that have actually occurred have indeed been logged. So, of course, that takes the number of deaths from 2,000 to 20,000. What is interesting when you do this, is that we're now starting to see vaccine deaths outstrip the dangers of COVID-19.

**The MHRA, as a Government Department,
is perfectly prepared to use the same skills
in applied psychology that the British government
has boasted they can use to mislead the public
and change their behavior.**

When we approach the MHRA with the question, "Where is your quantitative risk assessment to show that the vaccine adverse reactions are not related to the vaccinations themselves?", the MHRA stalls, fails to answer, or produces very confusing replies. The MHRA has not conducted a quantitative risk assessment into the adverse effects of vaccinations.

The MHRA, who holds the duty of protecting the public from dangerous pharmaceutical products, knows that people are dying as a result of the vaccination campaign. The British government certainly knows that, but is prepared to use psychology in every single verbal, written and media response around the dangers of covid and the vaccine policy. The whole of the control of COVID-19 policy and the so-called healthcare policy around COVID-19 and vaccinations has been carried out by the British Cabinet Office - who have an embedded applied behavioral psychology team with them. So, we know what they're capable of. They're boasting of it in their own document. And ultimately, we're seeing the real evidence of people suffering and dying.

If we follow this trail on, we come to how the system works - in the UK, at least - where we're seeing a form of medical fascism between government and the global pharmaceutical industry, working alongside universities and charities within what has been named the golden triangle in the UK.

EXPERT WITNESS
DEBBIE EVANS

I'm a retired state registered nurse. I was a government advisor at the Department of Health for the UK government for five years. And I'm a medical researcher. Brian led us very nicely there into what we call in the UK, Loxbridge Triangle, the Golden University, or the Golden University Triangle. See the following screenshot of a map of the UK showing the locations of Oxford, Cambridge and London in the triangle.



Cambridge is the highest digital tech center in the UK. It's ranked twelfth in the European Digital Index, and it's known as Silicon Fen. It has a huge biomedical campus on site, containing:

- Papworth Hospital, specialized in heart and lungs
- Addenbrooke's Hospital, specialized in donated organs and transplants
- Plans for a cancer research hospital
- Medical Research Council Cancer Research UK
- The Anne McLaren Regenerative Laboratory
- The NHS Blood Transfusion Center
- AstraZeneca headquarters
- GlaxoSmithKline

Cancer Research UK, which is meant to be a charity, would appear not to be a charity at all. Professor Robert West is a consultant for Cancer Research UK and he's also on the SPI-B team, *the behavior team* that Brian was just talking about, with regards to SAGE. Professor Robert West's wife, Professor Susan Michie, is the *head of the behavioral insights team* at the Cabinet Office.

She's a lifelong communist and has designed the behavior change wheel, which was rolled out into many countries. The behavioral insights team appear to be global now.

Oxford is the UK's first smart city using sensors and big tech innovation. It's meant to be the digital capital of Europe and it's been named by Tech Nation, attracting \$2.1 billion worth of investments. The UK government has announced it is investing \$5.5 billion into infrastructure around the Golden Triangle. Also attached to the Golden Triangle is the Russell Group: 24 universities that work very closely alongside the Golden Triangle Universities and receive a lot of funding.

The MHRA in the UK would like to become the *global regulator*. On their board sits Raj Long, who is the deputy director for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. She specializes in safety and pharmacovigilance and is also the chief scientist for Microsoft.

There are conflicts of interest with regards to the ministers of the British government. Some of the ministers' interests are into the Big Four audit companies, KPMG, Microsoft, Deloitte, AstraZeneca, Goldman Sachs and the European Investment Bank.

A lot of our UK ministers have conflicts of interest within those areas.

Deloitte, Ernst Young, KPMG and Price Waterhouse Coopers take up 67% of global accounting. All four are based in London. *Deloitte has been central to the test and trace effort*. Lord Bethell, who has now resigned, had a company that was purely for lobbying on behalf of Deloitte for bids. It's very concerning to think of what could be coming up in the future, when you see all these people intertwined with one another.

Cancer UK is funded by many pharmaceutical companies. It is the research and development center for AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, and Bill and Melinda Gates. But also advising cancer research is Professor Robert West, who is Professor Susan Michie's husband, the head of a

behavioral insights team funded by Pfizer and by Cancer Research UK, who are also right in the middle of the Cambridge bio medical campus.

The UK government published a vaccine hesitancy guidance with interventions on 27 September 2019 - before Wuhan.

SPARS Pandemic 2025-2028 was a futuristic scenario from the John Hopkins Center [in 2017] on what would happen if a coronavirus infected the world.

It tells you on a month-to-month basis, what you can expect from the media, what you can expect from pharmaceutical companies, what you can expect from governments with regards to lockdowns, with regards to testing and with regards to antibiotics and antibiotic resistance.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MANIPULATION

Ana Garner: I would like to ask questions to each of you, please, pertaining to the psychological manipulation that's been going on. Ms. Evans, you mentioned that you had been a government advisor to the Department of Health. And this is very pertinent here, because I feel that this has been going on in the United States extensively. As an advisor to the Public Health Department, have you been aware that they use the behavioral psychological techniques that Mr. Gerrish discussed as a way of enforcing their agenda of coercion and social isolation? Coercion of people undergoing experimental medical interventions? Have you noticed that that is part of their modus operandi, shall we say?

Gerrish: As part of research that the UK Column did, one of the areas that we were very interested in was training within our National Health Service by a certain charity, selecting future leaders. This charity was Common Purpose. We saw manipulation of people and their values by this particular organization and it morphed into a specific sector of the NHS called NHS Leaders. These supposedly were fast-tracked people who were going to lead the NHS into even better healthcare.

As these leaders with their newly acquired values were unleashed, the management style in the NHS became increasingly domineering and bullying. The ideas became less and less about the care and treatment of people who were ill or injured,

and it became much more about the importance of profits and money within the NHS. It was apparent that the psychology of people was being manipulated.

We have upon the UK Column website an article which is entitled *Towards a Million Change Agents*. That was the title of a paper written by an NHS Common Purpose trained individual who said that the NHS, in order to reach a future utopia, was going to need a million change agents. This means people who are going to disrupt the performance of the NHS in order to get it to transition, to transform it into what was supposedly to be a world class health provision.

An example of applied psychology in the NHS during the Covid crisis, is that mantras were introduced. Nurses and doctors started to follow mantras instead of medical decisions. A highly qualified doctor told us that when an unvaccinated covid patient came in, the mantra was: "Covid unvaccinated death pathway, covid unvaccinated death pathway."

If a person was labelled as having covid, and they were unvaccinated, the only result of their healthcare treatment was the death pathway.

These mantras have been driven through the NHS to the extent that doctors told us: "They cannot discuss genuine government figures on vaccine adverse reactions, because the person simply turns away, refuses to talk to them or becomes very aggressive." They are witnessing cognitive dissonance in individuals, which is the result of their mental values being rebranded.

We are certainly seeing the application of psychology in many areas in the NHS, and its overall effect is a degradation of healthcare treatment to the extent that people are being killed, when they could have survived quite happily, had they been given the right treatment.

Ana Garner: This psychological operation, by definition, seems to be very subtle and below most people's level of awareness that they are being manipulated. If that's the case, do you have any opinion about how those people can be reached in a way that can wake them up? I hear about the psychological dissonance and that sort of thing, the cognitive dissonance. Is there a way in which these people can be encouraged to see what's really happening, make them aware that they are being manipulated?

Gerrish: First of all, we need to concentrate on the people who are clearly not affected, in order to spread the warning message of what's happening. We need to be targeting the professions of psychology and psychiatry to say that this is *the abuse of those particular professions*.

People who have been subjected to this form of reframing or mind manipulation are victims, and therefore they need to be treated in a very gentle and reassuring way.

Because if we come at them in a very blunt way to try and make them see the truth, the result is that either they become very hostile – with cognitive dissonance – or possibly they're going to become mentally unwell as a result of the immense assault on their value system.

Can I just say to you that it is very significant that in all the documentation about the British government's use of applied psychology to get its political agenda enacted, there is absolutely no assessment as to what the adverse effects of such psychology may be on people who perhaps have underlying mental health issues, anxiety, or depression. And indeed, in cases where people have undiagnosed mental health conditions - so they're not even aware that they've got a problem - when this psychology is used on them, it can do immense damage. And I believe it is no coincidence that the official statistics in the UK now show that the lockdown policy has caused a huge surge in suicides and mental illness, particularly and tragically amongst young people.

But again, we can demonstrate that the UK government is hiding or manipulating the data sets that show this, or they're using applied psychology in the way they present those data sets to the public, in order to further mislead the public.

**This is the nature of the beast:
a criminal political system that uses applied psychology
to change the way the public thinks.
A very dangerous weapon in the hands of these elitists.**

This is easily evidenced. I've put up a key document in which the SPI-B was boasting how they need to make people more fearful, more anxious. There are many other documents, and I also demonstrated that applied behavioral psychology has now been deployed within Germany. And also in France, as one of Sarkozy's personal teams, a gentleman called Oliver Willier, had meetings in the UK, facilitated by the Franco-British Council in 2010, to discuss how French

neurological and psychological experts are going to work with the British in order to develop these applied psychological techniques.

The evidence trail is there.

When you know what you're looking for, it's obvious.

But my goodness, this is the most dangerous thing I believe we have ever seen. If you have propaganda and political manipulation such as the type within Nazi Germany, it could be seen in many ways: the parades, the banners, the lights, the rhetoric, the posters. But what we've got unleashed on us now is *a subliminal attack on our minds*. And until we bring the full light to this, it's going to be very, very difficult for us to take the lid off of what these people are doing through their Covid and vaccination attack on people.

Each of the pharmaceutical companies has access to this psychological weapon. Each of the legal companies. Everywhere we see charities, industry, or public bodies working with the British government, we know that the use of the psychology is spread between them.

A well-qualified psychologist said to me, "Brian, the thing to remember is that people who are intelligent and have highly questioning minds can be more susceptible to the use of hypnosis, reframing, and applied psychology than somebody who is less intelligent and has less of an enquiring mind." It is very wrong if anybody thinks, "Well, I'm a bright person, I'm intelligent, I'm highly qualified. This wouldn't affect me." On the contrary, you may be more vulnerable.

Evans: I will add there that the NHS professionals that I'm speaking to are completely confused. They're having a cascade of information every single day. Things are changing. They don't know. I am seeing NHS professionals doing things that would be completely alien to them. "I'm giving respiratory depressants to respiratory patients." It's just alien to what we have been taught. So people are frightened. And I would echo what Brian said:

When people are starting to wake up, they are scared; they don't know what's happening. They need us to reassure them. Because at the moment, the agenda is confusion, chaos and crisis.

Going back to what Brian said just now about Deloitte and about the Big Four. I mean, for anybody that doesn't know Deloitte - they've written papers on the future of the City of London; the clinical trials; their past CEO is now a board member of Pfizer; they're involved in the NHS and they're involved in corporate intelligence, as are the other three. And clearly, when Brian was mentioning the SPARS Pandemic exercise - that goes hand in hand with Operation Clade X and Crimson Contagion. Clade X was held by the Johns Hopkins University in 2018, simulating 900 million deaths. And Crimson Contagion, another exercise as well - that went on during the Trump reign for a response to another pandemic, an ongoing pandemic of flu. So all of this has been well documented.

Then there is the patent for the Covid testing by the Rothschilds, which again, everything that we can see within that patent in the main paper, we're seeing being rolled out now, including biosensors. Many people have spoken about RFID chips, but not many people are speaking about the advent of biosensors and how biosensors don't need the internet. You can have them in your clothes, on the sole of your shoes, they can be in your food. And biosensors seem to be the way things are going, to the point that there is a biosensor institute here in the UK, in Bristol, and the MHRA have actually approved one of the biosensors because people will now have biosensors in their cars, on their laptops, etc., and their biometric data will be fed back. All your biometric data – are you fit to drive the train, are you fit to drive a coach, are you fit to do anything? Your biometric data will be stored, and it's happening now.

Gerrish:

What we are seeing is a political system integrated with global commercial companies - pharmaceutical companies unleashing an agenda which has been to test vaccines on a population without any care for the damaged and the dying. Where are they going? They're going for manipulation of our genes. There's no question about it.

All the data we're seeing now shows it is the UK that says it is going to take the world lead in putting this agenda together. The UK – and I'll qualify that and say – I believe this would ultimately be driven by the City of London. But all the UK documents say we will take the world lead. And this is the same UK that has unleashed this malicious applied psychology to change the way our cognitive processes work. It's a very dangerous combination.

Evans: My final point is that the unique selling point for the United Kingdom is the National Health Service. There is no way to opt out of it. So, from the moment you're conceived and the pregnant mom had a scan, there's data on that particular human being until the day it dies, there's no way of opting out of the NHS. So NHS data is very precious and it's completely unique to the rest of the world.

Thomson: The military is involved. There's a 77th Regiment, a 13 Signals Brigade. There are entirely new British government security agencies - the so-called Health Security Agency and the Joint Biosecurity Center. All these are new since my time. And the buck stops with this Cabinet Office.

All the good studies of the Cabinet Office will show you that the leading committees there have a direct line to the City of London. They represent elite corporate will. There is no democratic control, and even the personal Crown, the monarch, is not involved.

So, I don't know whether that was shown on screen a moment ago or not, but people can also easily find it as one of the main UK Column graphics - 'Cabinet Office Censorship Network', I believe we call it in one version.

Reiner Fuellmich: What we're dealing with is a British system of psychiatric manipulation which has been sold worldwide, more or less. We have the City of London again aiming for world control. Is that why the Common Purpose people are creating their own future leaders? Is that a special position apart from the Young Global Leaders program?

Gerrish: Well, as with these things, the attack comes in from parallel directions. So, I would strongly suggest that many people within this network will have no idea of what the wider objective is. In the time I was really researching in detail, somebody would be recruited locally and asked to join. It wasn't as if people were going to Common Purpose to join Common Purpose. They sorted out the people they wanted. And the agenda was clearly to train that future leader to work with other common future leaders.

This is why it is so significant when you see Common Purpose now operating, for example, very strongly in India. Former Prime Minister David Cameron was part of the team promoting Common Purpose in India. So Common Purpose is one of the routes by which people are being recruited and reframed. The World Economic Forum's Young Global Leaders would be another route via

which probably more powerful people are recruited and reframed to bring them in line with what their new role is.

So Common Purpose was particularly operating at a low public level in the first instance, but as time went on, from 1985, it was clear to see that they were involved with the big global corporates much more strongly, and then from there they've gone to their world status. But what are they doing? They're selecting people. Egos are being stroked, because somebody is suggesting they're going to become a very important future leader.

**The World Economic Forum calls them 'global leaders',
and these people are being put together
in order to change the world.**

EXPERT WITNESS

JAMES BUSH



James Bush was a lieutenant-colonel in the US Marine Corps for 20 years.

He then worked as an engineer for Honeywell Corporation,
as a launch guidance engineer for the Shell program.

James was the engineering officer and manager for
the North Colorado Medical Center, for the Infectious Disease Research Center
of Colorado State University, and for the Center for Disease Control

Vector Born Research Facility, Fort Collins, Colorado.

While serving as a vial safety officer for the Rocky Mountain West, James was invited to attend a program called Dark Winter in Oklahoma City in June of 2001.



Dark Winter was developed as a program by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Johns Hopkins Center and the ANSER Institute for Homeland Security. This was in 2001, and some of the most key people in the government and the defense of the United States of America took their time off to go to Oklahoma City and ask the question "what happens if we get hit by smallpox?". Smallpox is now clearly defined by every organization - the World Health Organization, the CDC, FEMA - everyone there, because it has a fatality rate of 33%, as opposed to the coronavirus, which is maybe 0.12%. So they were using a true pandemic disease to see what would happen. The people who participated were Sam Nunn, playing the role of President; Frank Keating, the governor of Oklahoma; the National Security Advisor to the United States, David Gergen; the CIA Director of the US, R. James Woolsey; the Secretary of Defense, John White; the Chairman of the US Military; the Joint Chief of Staff, General John Tilelli; the Secretary of State of the United States, Frank Wisner; the Secretary of Health & Human Services, Margaret Hamburg; Attorney General George Terwilliger; the Director of FEMA, Jerry Hauer; and the Director of the FBI, William Sessions.

The question was what would happen if a local biological weapon attack would hit America with a contagious pathogen? The government's response would pose an enormous challenge to civil liberties.

In the beginning documentation, some of the first terms were civil liberties and what they were going to take away during this event.

~ James Bush then talks about Event 201, a similar exercise in October 2019 about a coronavirus pandemic, which happened very shortly after, in the exact manner as was discussed. ~

How can they possibly put together a meeting with the most important people on the East Coast, in New York City on October 28 - and all of a sudden, less than a month later, we have now a coronavirus coming out of the Wuhan Province? And I will tell you, I have managed these facilities, I have managed one of the largest in the country, in Colorado State University.

**These viruses don't accidentally get out.
You can *take* them out. When I worked there,
I could walk out any day with yersinia pestis,
with HIV, with tuberculosis, all kinds of coronaviruses.**

Anyway, the question still remains:

**How come you get up in the morning
and you listen to one radio station or TV station,
and they all say exactly the same thing?
Did you all know about Operation Mockingbird?**

Operation Mockingbird is a CIA program that was created after World War II, and it is still operational today. The CIA creates the dialogue and works with all the media systems in the world. My daughter is a military intelligence officer with the US Army, serving for 12 years. She is a major selected for lieutenant-colonel. I showed this to her, and she said "Yes, that is what they are doing, and they are doing it now."

Operation Mockingbird

Operation Mockingbird was a CIA program that enlisted more than 400 American journalists, as well as journalists around the world, to manipulate public opinion by spreading propaganda or what we call it today, fake news.

In an era of “fake news” and revelations of Facebook sharing user information to outside sources in an apparent attempt to influence voters for elections, the veracity of what we see in the media is more crucial than ever.

But, is this a new phenomenon?

The CIA’s Love Affair With Manipulating News

As far back as the end of World War II, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has played a major role in news media here in the U.S. as well as in foreign nations, exerting considerable influence over what the public sees, hears and reads on a regular basis.

Operation Mockingbird was an alleged large-scale program within the CIA to manipulate news media for propaganda purposes. The program is thought to have been born out of the CIA’s forefather, the Office for Strategic Services (OSS), which existed from 1942 to 1947.

During World War II, Operation Mockingbird had established a network of journalists and psychological warfare experts, operating primarily in the European theatre.

BIO-WEAPON RESEARCH

When I started managing the infectious disease research centers, both of them in Fort Collins about 14 years ago, there were 25 to 27 bio safety level 3 and 4 laboratories in the world. It is now 2022, and this is directly from the CDC's website. I compared it to other websites as well. And this is the distribution of bio safety level 4 laboratories around the world. Australia has 4. Germany has 4, India has 3, the UK has 6, and the US has 15. When I started in this business, there were 3. And the bio safety level 3s are the ones that work on diseases like coronavirus, the things that are not extraordinarily capable bioweapons, but BSL3s are the testbeds for the 4s. Several smaller countries have 1 or 2 BSL3s.

The United States of America has over 200 BSL3 labs inside the Continental US. So, the BSL3 and 4 in the USA equals 215 total bioweapons research facilities. They call them normal research, but I can tell you it is not true.

When I managed the facilities in Colorado, we did tests to find out if people could get out of a building with a select agent.

A select agent can be genetically modified to make it into a weapon of mass destruction.

That's why they call them select agents. But at that time, we did tests. We had US Army Corps engineers, US Army, and people from the FBI come in, and the local department fire workers or police. And we did tests to see if someone could get out of our facility. *If someone wanted to go out with that material, it couldn't be stopped.* Of those laboratories that I just showed the numbers for - what they are working on, as far as I am concerned, is a bio-weapons program.

What they are working on is basically the ability to modify other forms of injections to control and to kill the general population.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

T H I R D S U M M A R Y

The next two expert witnesses are Dr. Silvia Behrendt and Dr. Astrid Stuckelberger, who held leading positions in the World Health Organization and the United Nations. They reveal how the WHO has strategically infiltrated all the nations of the world with the purpose of abolishing democracy and imposing its own tyranny on all members of humanity. The WHO has its own 'constitution', a word carefully chosen with the purpose of replacing the constitutions of the nations. The Member States - which is literally every nation of the world - are bound to unquestioning obedience to whatever the WHO says, effectively making it a one world government, operating entirely outside of national constitutions and any kind of democracy.

All this is done under the guise of 'healthcare'. International Health Regulations (referred to as IHR) were invented in order to pave the way for this worldwide tyranny. All they need to submit the world to their fingertips of control, is a method to declare a 'public health emergency of international concern', which can easily be done with fraudulent diagnostics. Dr. Behrendt reveals how there was no covid pandemic until a flawed PCR test was introduced that suddenly increased the so-called 'cases' 14-fold.

These WHO whistleblowers also expose how this totalitarian worldwide health system is entirely controlled by private corporations and private individuals, who use their vast financial resources to impose their own plans on the whole of humanity. For example, in 2012, at the World Health Assembly, Bill Gates was declared as the leader of the global vaccine action plan 2012-2020, although he has no medical qualifications whatsoever, and according to his own words, is only into vaccines because of the astronomical financial gains. Gates also became the main financier of the WHO, effectively controlling it, which means the entire world is ruled by Bill Gates. Of course, Gates is in turn submitted to other, higher up financial entities, who use him to submit the world to their tyranny.

**What these WHO and United Nations whistleblowers expose
is that private entities have created a worldwide system that allows them
to use the excuse of 'health emergencies of international concern'
to rob humanity of all rights and freedoms, and to implement a totalitarian regime,
controlled by a financial oligarchy.**

EXPERT WITNESS
DR. SILVIA BEHRENDT



**Austrian lawyer, currently director of the Global Health Responsibility Agency (GHRA)
and former legal consultant to IHR Secretariat at the World Health Organization.**

Dr. Silvia Behrendt received her PhD from the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, on the topic of the International Health Regulations and the Executive Authority of the World Health Organization during public health emergencies of international concern.

She was a visiting researcher at Georgetown Law, under Professor Gostin, funded by the Swiss National Fund. Later, she collaborated with the International Health Regulations Secretariat in Geneva at the World Health Organization and conducted WHO country missions for the purpose of national implementation of the International Health Regulations.



EXPERT WITNESS

DR. ASTRID STUCKELBERGER



Dr Astrid Stuckelberger has been a scientist, researcher and teacher for 25 years at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Geneva and Lausanne (Switzerland).

She also gives lectures and is an invited professor in academic training throughout the world.

She has worked with WHO on International Health Regulation (IHR) and public health emergency management between 2009 and 2013, and created a Summer School on Global Health and Human Rights at the University, addressing WHO, IHR and United Nations health-related policies and global management.

Publications: 12 books and over 180 publications, from scientific articles to policy papers for the UN, EU or governments.



Silvia Behrendt: Mr. Bush was speaking about financial, political and security issues, particularly under the paradigm of bioterrorism, that provide evidence that *there is a path that led to the current COVID -19 pandemic*. I would like to focus the attention to the fact that we are currently not confronted with a medical endemic response.

Most of the criticism raised by the scientists and doctors center around the issue that, from a pure medical perspective, all health measures recommended and required by national health authorities or the WHO are actually contrary to the epidemiological and medical state of the art.

And this is so on purpose, I contend, because the underlying concept used for COVID-19 does not follow established scientific principles, but rather a different ideology which is framed as “global health security” - and means to *treat health as a national security issue*, requiring national and global states of exceptions to deal with it.

Therefore, I consider it crucial to provide a short, historic analysis of this concept in order to understand why the current global health crisis we face *is not about medical science and health* in the common sense that we would expect.

Medical aims have progressively been replaced with political aims. This started in the context of emerging infectious diseases in the early 1990s, and originated actually from the US. Within a short period of time, WHO institutionalized this new approach by the rapid setup of an entirely new division called Emerging and Other Communicable Diseases. And, interestingly, they didn't engage the staff of the Communicable Disease Control Department at that time.

This policy confirmed that the new paradigm shift from lowering the incidence of *regional* endemic diseases was to the sole focus on preventing the *international spread* in real time, and most preferably within a 24-hour time frame.

There was a need for a technocratic apparatus of surveillance networks that were capable to deal with these new threats.

So consequently, in 2001, there was a resolution of the Votels Assembly that's already inserted this notable concept and called for the first time to find a definition for a public health emergency of international concern, for the purpose of revising the outdated sanitary laws called

International Health Regulations, because nobody was interested in sanitary laws at that time. The problem was they had a very narrow scope and applicability only for yellow fever, black fever and cholera. So at the same time, particularly in the US, bioterrorist scenario planning – we’ve already heard a lot about it – within the military and at the academic level, with the most prominent exercises like Dark Winter, was launched.

And, interestingly, all those events “went real” shortly afterward.

What is also very interesting – and we did not hear – is that not only the exercises were held, which turned into reality, but also the legislation in the US was prepared to *curtail civil liberties* for the fight against bioterrorism from 1990 onwards. This undertaking was started by the CDC and eventually finalized by professors from Georgetown University like Professor Gostin, together with Johns Hopkins University, and it was called the *Model State Emergency Health Powers Act*.

This Model Act was sharply criticized at that time in the US for transforming governors into dictators, but was used over many States eventually.

So the most important milestone in the revision process of the International Health Regulations, which is an international treaty, was the outbreak of the severe acute respiratory syndrome, abbreviated as SARS as we all know, in 2002, which was accompanied by an alerted media attention that was not proportionate to the threat of the disease, which was remarkably low.

In addition, there was a quasi-consensus among scientists that the novel SARS outbreak could have had a bioterrorist potential. This *political bioterrorist framing* of the SARS outbreak led to the agreement of the international community that the old sanitary laws needed to be rewritten to include bioterrorism, without naming this goal officially at the WHO. This came under the paradigm of an open all-hazards approach, which means that not only various sources of risks are included, but also that any intentional release would come under the paradigm of the WHO, and that the IHR needed to be revised.

So the legal dimension of the global health security concept was eventually successfully integrated into International Health Regulations in 2005 and thus, the US model of public health emergencies was exported to the international community and is now merged into national constitutions which have never had such constitutional emergency provisions.

Then the outdated IHR provisions of disease containment were replaced to include pathogens that pose a threat to national security and require an emergency regime that enabled the irrigation of legal standards not only in terms of medical safety regulations, but also in terms of fundamental standards, freedoms and civil rights.

According to this new paradigm, endemic diseases which count for the most death do not fall under the attention of this global set of rules – which are now the standard procedure for pandemics – but only newly identified pathogens without medical treatment that therefore require an emergency licensing, as the substances are all unlicensed.

In addition, the importance of diagnostics emerged under the global health security ideology as a new priority issue because the threat needs to be identified as “threatening prior to devastating effects” according to this ideology.

**The availability of diagnostics is labeled
as a necessary requirement for pandemic
preparedness and response.**

Moreover, under the threat of bioterrorism, the establishment of laboratories was boosted throughout the world, as Mr. Bush already explained to us. Because biological weapons are defined as weapons of mass destruction and constitute a crime under international law, the only legal pathway to lawfully undertake research and medical treatment is called “biodefense”, which takes place in laboratories, as we learned.

I would like to remind that all SARS coronaviruses come under the US Category C of potential bioterror agents and are also classified under the expert regime of the EU for dual use. That refers to the potential of civil and military use.

I hope now that the picture becomes a bit clearer via some historic knowledge that’s needed to understand why WHO and the global community do not address SARS-CoV-2 in accordance with the state of the art of medical knowledge ...

**...but rather fight the virus as a threat to the nation
in an unproportional manner, with military instead of medical terminology,
referred to as medical and non-medical countermeasures.
And throughout all health ministries in the world, new departments
are established called National Health Security departments.**

As a second step, I would like to explain in more detail *why the small number of atypical pneumonia cases of Wuhan in late 2019 and in the first days of 2020 were reported to WHO and soon ended up as a public health emergency of international concern, and shortly thereafter as a pandemic.*

This is all due to the International Health Regulations and the revision thereof. Also, the International Health Regulations, referred to as IHR, include an all-hazards approach. Some pathogens, like any novel strain of an influenza subtype or any SARS coronavirus, are still prioritized and have to be reported within a 24-hour time limit to WHO.

The identification of this novel virus was possible because China has a very tight screening regime for respiratory diseases since the SARS outbreak in 2002. As such, it was possible for China to identify this novel pathogen. As early as the 1st of January, WHO requested more information about the outbreak due to information by Taiwan. On the 3rd of January, China officially notified WHO of a cluster of 44 patients, of which eleven were severely ill with pneumonia of unknown etiology after the WHO (interruption) --

Reiner Fuellmich: That does not sound like a pandemic.

Silvia Behrendt: Yeah, that's true... so this politicization and interest of WHO at this very early stage, on the 1st of January, when *only 44 people had this atypical pneumonia* and 11 people suffered severely from this atypical pneumonia, is indeed an interesting aspect that should lead to some precautions about how the entire crisis started.

There were no deaths reported and no international cases, and the potential of human-to-human transmission was not assessed at that time.

In the meantime, the novel virus was identified as the SARS coronavirus. So this means the identification of this new virus fell under the International Health Regulations that formally required an automated official report. The WHO and the Director General are obliged to constitute an Emergency Committee under the IHR, once such an official notification has been received.

Then – now it's becoming interesting – at the same time, Professor Drosten and others worked in Germany intensely to deliver to WHO a diagnostic test assay via the PCR method for this novel virus. And Professor Drosten was also the lead author in 2003, when the novel SARS coronavirus was identified, and has since been nominated as a WHO expert.

His first protocol was officially delivered to WHO on the 13th of January 2020, which implied that he had, of course, worked prior to the state of submission, and the WHO immediately dispatched his first protocol of this assay to its member States. Later, this assay was revised and finally published in the Eurosurveillance journal on the 23rd of January.

He also contributed to the WHO interim guidance dated on the 10th of January, and this interim guidance was published as a part of a comprehensive package of about ten guidance documents of the WHO for countries, covering topics related to the management of an outbreak of the new coronavirus disease. So on the 10th of January, WHO had a comprehensive package already published.

Reiner Fuellmich: At that time, when there were literally no cases except for the 44 cases?

Silvia Behrendt: Yes. And these were becoming official. And it normally takes a very long time at the WHO to get something published, because it has to be cleared.

Importantly, as any SARS coronavirus requires an official notification under the IHR, the Director General had to convene a COVID-19 Emergency Committee as a legal obligation under IHR. You can find, on the WHO website, the experts who are on this committee, and you can find their CVs there. This Emergency Committee advises the Director General in the proclamation of whether a public health emergency of international concern exists, which is an executive authority of the Director General in accordance with the legal principles set out under the IHR.

The first meeting was held on the 13th of January, in which the experts found no agreement as to whether a PHEIC (Public Health Emergency of International Concern) existed or not. And they agreed that there was no international spread of the novel coronavirus outbreak, which was due to only 17 deaths and 557 confirmed cases on the 13th of January. So they had an idea and said: "In ten days we will again meet and assess the current situation of new cases." That happened on the 22nd of January. During those ten days, the cases increased 14 times, to 7,711 confirmed and even 12,167 suspected cases.

Reiner Fuellmich:

So, what had happened is that Drosten had delivered his test kit to the World Health Organization [on Jan. 13], and through the use of his new test - all of a sudden [in 10 days] - we had 14 times the number of cases that existed before we used his test.

Silvia Behrendt: That's what the documents say.

Reiner Fuellmich: What this boils down to is that the cases that they needed in order to declare a public health emergency of international concern came into existence because of the test. Is that correct?

Silvia Behrendt: At least they needed the international transmission, and they had to diagnose it. And without a diagnostic test, it's not possible. So the only one who gave this test assay is referenced in the document as Drosten. That's what the documents say.

Reiner Fuellmich:

**Had it not been for his test, the WHO ten days later
would still have maybe 500 cases, but not 14 times that many?**

Silvia Behrendt: If there is no test, you cannot qualify it as the new virus. That's the problem. The most important thing everybody should know is that the proclamation of a public health emergency of international concern is *connected to vaccine manufacturing*. That's actually the most important thing any legal person or anybody should know. It's not the pandemic. There is no legal consequence if WHO proclaims or defines a pandemic. That's just interesting for the media. But the public health emergency is connected to the *regulatory pathway for emergency use authorization*.

Reiner Fuellmich:

**Without a public health emergency of international concern,
there cannot be any use of untested drugs like vaccines?**

Silvia Behrendt: Right. Because all secondary laws – like the EU, the FDA, the US – they use the same concept of the public health emergency also proclaimed by the WHO.

Virginie de Araujo Recchia: I would like to confirm with you that Mr. Bill Gates put pressure on the WHO to declare a pandemic, and that we know that Charité Berlin, which is linked with Drosten, has developed these tests with the financing of Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Wellcome Trust.

Astrid Stuckelberger: There is really a plan since 1999, that you can see chronologically. GAVI, the Vaccine Alliance, and UNICEF joined the United Nations with the World Bank and the WHO. This happened through financing of the International Financing Facility for Immunization. At the same time in 2006, GAVI began to be a global alliance in Switzerland as a foundation. So they registered in 2006, at the same time as they did a tripartite agreement between World Bank, WHO and GAVI to get financing from the Member States. That was the first step. Then in 2009, Bill Gates registered as an international organization of a new type in Switzerland.

We have a press release signed by the Swiss government that shows that it was created specifically for Bill Gates - this international organization with total immunity. You cannot do anything. You cannot even take him to tribunal. They do their own tribunal if they have any sort of disagreement.

From then on, he started a 'Vaccine Decade 2010-2020', and we have the documents of the WHO as to how they created that. We did the IHR implementation, because you had to teach and train the countries to be prepared. The first round began in 2009 and finished in 2012. We received this from Georgetown University, Pretoria University, and I was with University of Geneva. At that time we got funds again from Japan, but then suddenly it stopped. They said there were no more funds.

The reason was that in 2012, at the World Health Assembly, they placed Bill Gates as the leader of the global vaccine action plan. From then on, he was in the driver's seat, and it's mentioned that GAVI is the leader of most of what is happening concerning vaccines. And it's not only children, like UNICEF, anymore - it's the whole world. That's enough proof that there is a plan.

Note from the editor: It should alert all of us that a man with *no medical education whatsoever* was put in charge of vaccinating the entire world population. Furthermore, Bill Gates has clearly stated publicly that "entering the vaccine industry was the best business decision I ever made". He multiplied his fortune from 10 billion dollars to 200 billion by dealing vaccines. The fact that he refers to vaccines as 'the best buy' shows his financial motivation.

Source: <https://www.cnbc.com/2019/01/23/bill-gates-turns-10-billion-into-200-billion-worth-of-economic-benefit.html>

Just after finishing Event 201, in which Gates, the World Economic Forum and Johns Hopkins University practiced for the COVID-19 outbreak - three months before it occurred exactly as they had announced - Gates posted on Twitter the following telling message:

"What's next for our foundation? I'm particularly excited about what the next year could mean for one of the best buys in global health: vaccines."

Following is a screenshot I made of his statement. Again, he wrote this shortly after Event 201, in which they rehearsed for the outbreak and discussed how vaccines would be the only answer. However, under Gates' tweet, the comments of the public show an interesting development in terms of their awareness.



Astrid Stuckelberger: And it keeps on. I mean, he is in the SAGE group, the Strategic Expert Advisory Group. They prepared, even in 2016, an assessment report of this 2012-2020 Global

Vaccine Action Plan, GVAP. And in 2016, they were very upset because they had not vaccinated the whole world. And they wouldn't take any excuse with vaccination, and they don't talk about experimental or validated, it's all the vaccine of course. In 2016, you can really see that they're not happy. Mr. GAVI Global is saying that we really have to make an effort. So, they made a program called the Accelerator Program of Vaccines.

Reiner Fuellmich: Who received diplomatic immunity in 2009? Was it GAVI or was it the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation? Or was it Bill Gates personally? Or all of them?

Astrid Stuckelberger: It's the GAVI Alliance Foundation. But they took away the name "Foundation" and in the agreement, it's really GAVI, the Global Alliance for Vaccination. I can find the exact term in my paper, but it really concerns him, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. What I'm finding out more and more is the financial mechanism of funding or receiving funds for a program. I found out again that the Swiss government (Swiss Medic, the FDA of Switzerland) had signed an agreement to provide to Bill and Melinda Gates for his program \$900,000 over three years, from 2020 to 2023, so \$300,000 every year.

So I'm suspecting that when we take a model like Switzerland, or like Silvia said about mechanics between the national and international regulation, it's been applied like a model everywhere in the world - so that the law on epidemics of a national country is binding to International Health Regulations.

Even the Constitution of Switzerland has a little line they have added - without asking us - which says that international law supersedes national law in health matters.

Then you can see that in the law of epidemics that was passed in 2016, there is a law of emergency that now says to probably every country that they will obey the International Health Regulation.

If a PHEIC (Public Health Emergency of International Concern) is declared, every country has to immediately trigger the mechanics of obeying.

That's why around March 16, the whole world locked down. This is incomprehensible, even according to the International Health Regulation. According to SARS-CoV-1, it never happened like this - ever, that suddenly the virus was everywhere. It's also what's happening with Omicron. It starts in South Africa and the next day it's all over the world.

Reiner Fuellmich: Is there any democratic legitimacy to these International Health Regulations? Has anyone who invented these International Health Regulations been voted into some office?

**Is there any democratic legitimacy to this?
Or is it just a private enterprise by people
who control the World Health Organization?**

Astrid Stuckelberger: When we were teaching and training about the International Health Regulations, this was the question that came in very often: how come this is binding to Member States? The answer was extraordinary, which will explain to you how important it is to look at this new pandemic treaty now. It's that the WHO is, for the moment, the only United Nations agency who has a constitution.

**WHO Constitution Article 21(19), 21a and 2,
are binding Member States directly
if they adopt the International Health Regulations.
So they don't need to go through the whole procedure of a treaty.
That's why it's very dangerous.
This WHO Constitution is like it was planned
to supersede all constitutions of the world.
Because why would you use the word "constitution"?**

And the answers of the lawyers from WHO were always, "Oh, we have adopted it at the General Assembly of 2005, under the WHO Constitution, Article 21a and Article 2".

Reiner Fuellmich: Yeah, but those people who created the International Health Regulations have not been voted into their positions, so they have no authority. Or is there any connection between the Member States *people* (not their governments) and these International Health Regulations, or is there only the Constitution which they themselves invented?

Astrid Stuckelberger: Well, let me explain the mechanics of the United Nations – and it's with all the big agencies like the International Labor Office, the ITU telecommunication, for the refugee. Every year you have a world assembly, like an NGO. A world health assembly every year takes place in the United Nations in Geneva in May, the third week of May, where all Member States have their little seat and they are all together and they have an agenda and they decide about the agenda of the world together.

But normally, if there is a big decision, they are just children of the United Nations General Assembly. So, they should go up to the General Assembly and it has to get the blessing of the Secretary General, which is the head of the United Nations, which should give a blessing to WHO. I don't see this in the case of International Health Regulations, if that's a clue.

Silvia Behrendt: Well, I'd just add to this that the International Health Regulations regime is a very interesting one because it's an international treaty that dates back to the sanitary conventions of 1850. So it's one of the oldest international legal regimes which were taken over to WHO and which were recognized under the WHO constitution. They already had in mind that they wanted to have a regulatory fast track regime. So they had this regulatory process that says that under the regulations for sanitary, which are now pandemic laws you can refer to, you have the Member States that need to opt out or not opt in. So, by the resolution that has passed, the international treaty has to enter into force in the Member State, unless it has opted out on purpose. So it's the reverse process of international law. And that's a very unique thing. I think no other international organization has this capacity.

It's democratic because it was an intergovernmental negotiation process. And the interesting thing is that only because of the emergence of SARS, they had this new ideology adapted - of the "global health security" idea that it's not the endemic diseases that are devastating to the people, but only new diseases that have no medical treatment.

So they inserted this new concept in the old laws that were already existent at WHO and existent in the world. They adopted this totally new ideology. And that's the very striking thing we have now. And it's passed as a resolution. And it is interesting that it's an international treaty and WHO is not a party - it's only bound by the resolution. Whereas, with other international treaties - like the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control - the WHO is a signatory. So that's an international law, not a treaty.

Reiner Fuellmich: I still don't understand. I don't see any connection between myself, my countrymen and these International Health Regulations.

Silvia Behrendt: That's a problem with all international law.

Reiner Fuellmich: Well, not really. I think this is quite unique.

Silvia Behrendt: Member States gave their consent in 2005. They all said they wanted to have this new kind of rules for international law, and now they are obliged to implement it nationally. Or since 2007, when it entered into force, they are obliged to implement it. And for example, Austria, I'm from Austria - we have no emergency clause in our Constitution, and we did not

adopt our sanitary laws, our epidemiology laws. There is no clause of emergency, and you still have the same regime.

So that's what I always say. Whatever legal regime and whatever constitution countries have, obviously the system can impact any country, any constitutional system and any legal regime. It's possible with or without emergency clauses. They apply emergency rules.

Astrid Stuckelberger: It's the same with the Millennium Development Goals and Sustainable Development Goals, which seem to match 2000 to 2015 and 2015 to 2030.

**They're doing a whole mechanism around this,
and it becomes more and more obscure.
And it is more and more obscure how much we, as citizens,
really decide. We don't decide anything anymore
because it becomes so complex and obscure.**

Reiner Fuellmich: We definitely have to take our sovereignty back. That is the conclusion that I draw from this, because even if the EU wants to come up with a new law, for example, they can decide that they want to introduce these laws, but unless the Member States ratify it in their own countries, it doesn't become law in their countries. So this is quite surprising to me, and I think to many lawyers who should know about these things as well. This is very disturbing.

Silvia Behrendt: And in the EU they have created this HERA agency, which is the same, but probably much more coercive. And that's a huge, huge problem.

**They have no authority in health matters,
but they still pretend to have it,
and still create the agencies and instruct us,
without democratic processes.**

Reiner Fuellmich: HERA stands for Health Emergency Response Agency, right?

Silvia Behrendt: Yes.

Reiner Fuellmich: And isn't there a rumor that if our national Member State governments in the EU collapse, then they're going to take over - and under the EU Commission, there will be a kind of a mini world government. Does that sound plausible?

Silvia Behrendt: I have no idea, but I'm sure they would love to.

Astrid Stuckelberger: Yeah, that's the idea of this pandemic treaty.

Because this pandemic treaty has articles at the end saying that, with the constitution of the WHO, we don't need any other constitution as Member States.

Not only do they diminish the power of Member States, but they have invited a lot of non-state actors – NGOs, GAVI, intergovernmental, etc. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation might be an NGO, and then they can make different things. The Rockefeller Foundation, I've met them in the WHO, they come and sit in meetings, and they are NGO - we don't know what they are.

So the non-state actors are also invited in this new treaty, which would take over literally, through the WHO Constitution - a world constitution – because of a “pandemic.”

Reiner Fuellmich:

So ultimately what we're looking at is private associations, private individuals even, taking over our national governments through the World Health Organization, using health as a crowbar to do whatever they want.

Astrid Stuckelberger: Yeah, we could say that. You can see it through the public/private financing partnership, because GAVI and private partners have started to invade and interfere with the whole United Nations. I actually looked into this because I was called to organize for Switzerland to join the whole United Nations Open Days for two days. I learned a lot about an organization that nobody hears about, which is really a private entity called the UN Global Compact.

The United Nations Global Compact is only private sector. And they can, for example, finance - I mean, it's open to partnerships.

Silvia Behrendt: Also, the implementation of the International Health Regulations is very strange because it's done by termed external evaluations undertaken by the Global Health Security Agenda. And if you look at the website of the Global Health Security Agenda, it says it has a *private consortium*, and you don't know - you have no information as to which private consortium this is. But you know that these external evaluators go to Germany, and to every country. It's even on the website of the RKE (Richardson Kontogouris Emerson, LLP), applauding how great it is.

But they don't say it's implemented by private entities.

You don't know.

I don't want to have laws implemented by private entities.

That's absolutely undemocratic. And they're very proud of it.

Very proud of it.

Reiner Fuellmich: That's bizarre.

Virginie de Araujo Recchia: If I understand well, there are private advisers who're working also with the WHO, like McKenzie, [censure] - they are an arm of the Bill Gates Foundation also?

Astrid Stuckelberger: Yeah, it's a good question. I've actually looked for the link between McKenzie and the WHO, because we know that they are creating the communication. And I think they have been putting it under something they're setting up now - an intergovernmental panel. What is the exact title? Intergovernmental Negotiating Network or something like that. [Intergovernmental Negotiating Body (INB)] This just happened at the executive board. So it is a bit worrying because I think that all those communication agencies are buried into that. It's not just one.

Viviane Fischer: So what is this treaty adding to the situation that we have right now?

Silvia Behrendt: Well, the treaty is very mystical. I just heard the former legal counsel of WHO speaking about it. It's available on the internet. And it's very political. Probably the fiercest proponent is Charles Michel. He suggested that the European Union wants this treaty; that the US is kind of a poster. They made a proposal that IHR should be strengthened.

So the problem will be a due-track world, because if they are rushing into a treaty, only a small number of signatories will sign. And the IHR is a universally acknowledged tool. And we did not mention that it does actually have good aspects in it which are neglected and infringed:

the IHR has a human rights implementation clause, which is not respected and absolutely violated.

So there were compromised deals at the end when they passed through the resolution. But it's just that they are not mentioned, and nobody gets a court that would find a violation of this.

So the problem is that what they would like to do is to have an upstream and a downstream pharmaceutical industry, probably. Because the scope of the treaty is not even clear. The only thing is that there's a lot of communication about it.

The Director General is a very huge proponent of this treaty because he's very political, in a way. And it's very strange what kind of intentions are behind that.

And it's called "for preparedness and response." So what we know is that they have invented a new procedure which is also problematic. It's called the WHO Emergency Use Authorization.

That allows Big Pharma to go to the WHO and say, "We're inventing a new pharmaceutical or new diagnostic set for this public health emergency. We would like you to put it on your list". And then the WHO puts it on their list, with a disclaimer saying that there's no warranty and no endorsement by the WHO, and if somebody dies, it's not the WHO's fault - it's only a list.

And then GAVI takes this list and says, "Oh, we can export this to the entire world. Even if we don't have stringent and very competent medical authorities. We have this listing from the WHO, and now we can contribute it to the goal." That's what they do in the treaties of GAVI and this vaccine alliance, this COVAX facility is called the third pillar of this ACT accelerator.

They probably would like to find better regulatory ways for it to become a normal process that Big Pharma goes to an international organization. But then it's actually a treaty of private international law, not of public international law, because the problem of customary international law is not recognized (which is a norm that there are no medical treatments whatsoever without consent, which you cannot derogate from). So, yeah, it's a huge problem.

Reiner Fuellmich: So, we've learned tonight, from all the other experts – including, of course, the three experts who testified at the beginning of this session – that, for example, in the UK, healthcare has been largely privatized.

**It's being controlled by private groups, private charities, even.
We've learned that even their psychiatric system has been privatized.
There are private people behind all of this,
and this is how they control everything.
They even create their own future leaders
next to what the World Economic Forum is doing,
meaning they have their own people who they then seem to be
telling what to do in positions of power in the governments.**

Now, if I look at the WHO, there's a man by the name of Tedros, he's the Director General. Who is he?

**I have read in the papers that in his own country,
a criminal complaint has been filed against him for genocide.**

Is that the typical, let's say, puppet that the private entities who are running the healthcare show are using to further their aims?

Astrid Stuckelberger: No, I must say I've never seen a Director General like that. I've known many. But I know also from the inside, that the staff was very unhappy with him and they asked for his resignation. And of course, it never happened. Another scoop, if I did not say this already, is that on the board of the GAVI Foundation, you can see the names of people who have been part of GAVI.

**Well, Tedros has been part of GAVI before he was
the elected Director General. Conflict of interest.
He was on the board between 22 January 2009
and September 2011.**

The other person with conflict of interest is the former President of Ireland, who was also the head of the Human Rights Commission. And I know her, but I'm very surprised that she was there with GAVI from November 2008 to September 2011. I can give you the paper - it's no problem. It's very precise: 25 November 2008 to 14 September 2011.

There are many names that I don't know, and I'm sure you will find there are many names that you can find in your countries too, because there are country representatives that were in GAVI before they were even in position.

So, it's clear that Tedros was already entangled with Bill Gates.

Reiner Fuellmich: So, wherever you look, you see conflicts of interest.

Astrid Stuckelberger: I just want to add something that might be interesting legally. There are, in the annex in the notes at the end of this International Health Regulation of 2005, two countries who made reservations that they don't agree with that completely, because they want to apply their global security nationally. And you would guess who it is. It's the US and Iran. So it's interesting to see that two countries have managed to put a reservation to this. How come the others haven't?

Reiner Fuellmich: It's because their people haven't spoken. But they will.

Debbie Evans: I just wanted to mention very quickly, since you mentioned about the UK - we've also got a serious issue going on here with the unvaccinated, in that anybody that seems to be admitted to the hospital with a COVID-19 positive test would appear to be put on an end-of-life - an accelerated end-of-life care plan.

**Patients seem to be given midazolam and morphine.
And this is without their consent.
This is without their families' consent.
These decisions are made by the clinicians alone.
The families and the patient do not have any say in it at all.**

So, I just want to be sure to include the victims of this absolute disaster that are unvaccinated. And also to bring your attention to CEPI. CEPI was founded in 2017, and CEPI and GAVI worked financially very closely together. When CEPI was launched in 2017, Bill Gates stated at the World Economic Forum launch that they would be cutting out the safety with regards to clinical trials. He said it straight out and it was actually featured on UK Column news.

Bill Gates said that the safety data and manufacturing would be cut out, which would enable the 100-day mission to go ahead to have vaccines rolled out within 100 days of the World Health Organization declaring a pandemic.

And also, with regards to Whitney talking earlier about DARPA (see full session video), we have our very own kind of diluted DARPA, if you like. We have ARPA, but we also have Wellcome Leap, which Whitney has a lot of information about when it comes to bioweapons and making biochemicals.

And also, I just want to go back to the patent as well, because the Rothschilds' patent of 2015, if you look at the full paper, everything that we're seeing today was put into that and it was approved in 2020, but it was given priority in 2015. So it was written in 2015.

**What we're seeing now is everything within that patent.
So that, together with the SPARS exercise - and SPARS
Pandemic 2025-2028 was a coronavirus - and some of the
names are the same as in the Johns Hopkins futuristic scenario,
like CORAVAX. There's an awful lot of similarities there.**

And I know that you've been talking about Lock Step, but I just want to re-remind people that SPARS Pandemic 2025-2028 gives a month-by-month breakdown. So, if you look at when we first started in March, or when we have the first case in our country, or in December in Wuhan, it literally goes month-by-month.

So the prediction going forward would appear to be antimicrobial resistance, which is already what is written in SPARS. And we're finding many people in this country not being able to access antibiotics, and GPs and physicians here are not wanting to give antibiotics. So I just wanted to throw that in.

Reiner Fuellmich: So we do have lots of reasons to worry about our sovereignty, not the least of which is the World Health Organization's International Health Regulations. That seems to be the overarching theme.

**This is how through their constitution,
and through the revised International Health Regulations,
they seem to be trying to gain control over the rest of the world,
including, of course, all 196 Member States.
Is this a correct assessment?**

Silvia Behrendt: Yeah, at least, I think, because in the first part of my expertise, I trust that the military aspects were included in this agenda but were not named.

That's the reason why we now have a "pandemic" response which is not medical, which is unproportionate and political, and we do not realize it.

Because they included this bioterrorist scenario, and they adapted the language to 'global health security' – that's also the Center for Civilian Biodefense. Also, at the time of Dark Winter, Johns Hopkins was called the Johns Hopkins Global Health Security Center. But I think 'Center for Civilian Biodefense' was the correct name. And they also had a journal called Bioterrorism or Biodefense, and now it's called Global Health Security.

So, we should not forget that a bio war could go on, at least. So it's much more political, as the politicians would themselves agree.

Astrid Stuckelberger: I will add two points. One, we should worry about the whole United Nations, because the Sustainable Development Goals are 17 goals and 169 targets. It's the Agenda 2030, and it is all entangled, especially with the climate change, for example. But there are many other mechanisms under that, such as the UN Alliance for SDG Financing. What is this? When you dig, you find a lot of things very mysterious that we have to find out about.

But the second one that might interest you is this. Remember that a pandemic, or public health emergency of international concern, has four typologies. I was taking care of the case studies and it was very important to distinguish. That's what we should do with what's going on now, because we're all focused on the biological factor. But in fact, the first one is infections biology. The second is food-borne biology. And there's a whole organization behind that, called INFOSAN. The third is chemical, and chemical is mercury, metals, etc. And there was one expert, Kasten Gutschmit, a German that I was inviting, and he was always making great reports, but it was very difficult to find the experts there. And the fourth, which is very important, and you will see why, is radio nuclear radiation, and that's even more difficult to find experts for. I realize this because, in our courses, we were inviting people who are taking care of this. It is the International Atomic Energy Agency based in Vienna, and they are experts on radio nuclear, Chernobyl, Fukushima. They are the first in line there.

What I was shocked about, is when we were doing the case studies of Fukushima, we asked them what did the WHO do? And they said "WHO was not allowed to access Fukushima." They were refused the visa because the first one to be there is the IAEA, International Atomic Energy Agency. What is very strange is that they have an agreement which gives them power over the WHO.

**I went to look at what they're doing now with covid, just today.
I'm very scared to tell you, that they are in charge of the RT-PCR kit.
They are independent from the United Nations,
they have their own international treaty, and they report to the
UN General Assembly and to the Social Security Council every year.
This is for nukes, it's for a radio nuclear threat,
which could kill the whole planet.**

So they say that the IAEA has developed a nuclear derived diagnostic technology that can help detect and identify covid or anything else in hours, in humans and in animals. They have developed this test. And this test is very efficient, the RT-PCR, because it's polymerized-chain-reaction and rapid test, and they think they are the experts, especially for Ebola, Zika and the African swine fever virus. So just today I read this, and for me it rings a bell because they are offering now the PCR test kit and their lab. They're linked to labs and that's where the power lies. I don't know what you think but that's a bit worrying.

Reiner Fuellmich: You mean other private organizations, or half-private or, most of these organizations which we spoke about tonight, pretty much all of the international organizations are more or less controlled by private citizens, by private groups, charities, et cetera.

**This harkens back to the theme which we heard about first today,
about how the City of London, basically Big Finance,
is controlling everything through their emissaries.
They're private people trying to gain control
over the rest of the world.
Again, we have to take back our sovereignty.
That is what all of this tells me right now.**

We also have to take a much closer look at PCR testing, which we will do in tomorrow's session.

Astrid Stuckelberger: And maybe also look at all the NGOs, because in the WHO, there's the World Alliance of Hospitals - the World Alliance of the alliances of alliances. And a lot of British people are in charge. You have to also know that a lot of militaries are there, because the CDC in the US was formerly military. And I think it still is, by the way. We must, I think, disentangle those WANGO (the world NGOs) or the BINGO (the business and industry NGOs), because therein are the mechanics, where it's very difficult to find them, and they have a lot of power - more than we think.

Reiner Fuellmich:

The people have to learn that they have to disconnect and start grassroots democracy, look into their regions and their communities. They know best what's good for them.

Dexter L-J. Ryneveldt: Doctor Silvia, you were mentioning global health security. And I would like you to perhaps maybe just put it in perspective, when it comes to the definition changes of "pandemic criteria" from the World Health Organization in 2009.

Silvia Behrendt: Well, my personal view is that WHO just realized they don't need a pandemic definition anymore because everything that is needed is a PHEIC, a public health emergency of international concern, because they want to manufacture vaccines. And it doesn't matter how the pandemic is defined in non-legal documents.

They actually alleviated the very high threshold because they realized they can, at any time, make a public health emergency as long as there is international spread and as long as they have diagnostics. So, they focused no attention to this theme, and that's our problem.

Lawyers are always looking for this pandemic definition, but there are no legal consequences linked to the definition of a pandemic. But there's a huge legal consequence if the Director General takes his authority and proclaims a public health emergency of international concern.

Virginie de Araujo Recchia: Does it explain, perhaps, why they use the models of Sir Ferguson to increase the fear and explain that there is a pandemic? Because the epidemiology and mathematics they use that are not useful, it's wrongly used to study the spread of the virus, they use this synthetic information from these models perhaps? Because it seems very strange that they use the models of Sir Ferguson *that don't work at all*. And these models were duplicated in other countries, like in France, for example. And we took this for granted. And it's not based on experience and medicine at all, it's only mathematics. We can't use that at all.

I would like to know if it's for this reason that we use these models - to increase the fear of the pandemic and to mass-manipulate.

Silvia Behrendt: I don't know any specifics about it because actually they had everything they needed to proclaim a public health emergency. They needed it for the population because there was also the first PHEIC declared in 2009, where the vaccines were manufactured but nobody was threatened, at least I was not threatened by this PHEIC, because there were no media releases that threatened us.

But now they needed the population to stay at home during the lockdowns and to get the vaccine in the end.

Virginie de Araujo Recchia: Yes, because from the model of Sir Ferguson, the only solution was the vaccine and no treatment at all, only vaccines.

Astrid Stuckelberger: But I could just add that there are many scientific definitions they have changed, not only "pandemic." They have changed the definition of "health professionals" - it's everybody. They have changed "data privacy," there is no data privacy any more. They have not made ethics in communication, for example, in the International Health Regulations implementation course – and you have to do it, it's to reassure people that "we don't know, we are looking for something, you will know what is going on", and step by step you keep people informed. And there it was, fear right away.

Not only this was a psychological operation for that fear, that constant fear with cases, with images, with deaths (that were not deaths, because we know today there was not more mortality in 2020) - but also with contradictions, as we discussed before.

And this is in Melanie Klein psychology. You make psychotic people and children when you say "I love you but I hate you", or you push or you say "I love you and I hate you" at the same time with your behavior. So, they made a very crazy nonsense of coherence, no control, no sense of control. It's also another concept in psychology.

They make people totally insecure, which diminishes their immunity, by the way.

What they also did psychologically was to take away all the religions and all the belief systems. This is something that keeps people up - and they censored religion; they censored death. They

forbade the ritual of death, which is one of the most important rituals if you want to have a good grief, development, coherence and healing.

So there are many things they have done, not just this manipulation. They reversed the values completely. And this is a bit of this Melanie Klein psychotic.

**I call it the Hansel and Gretel Syndrome because
“I love you; I’m going to give you this, I’m going to be ethical,
we are going to treat you well with the vaccine” -
and they’re killing them.**

They have absolutely abrogated ethics research guidelines that we developed from 2006 to 2009, and I was involved in that. So all the values are also a PSYOP. They have changed the values and the definition.

Reiner Fuellmich: One thing for certain: *this is not about health.*

Debbie Evans: If I could just clarify Professor Ferguson. In 2002, he modelled that 50,000 deaths would happen in the UK from mad cow disease. And he modelled it completely incorrectly, where we saw the burning of all our cattle after only 150 deaths. So he was very incorrect.

**We were very surprised in the UK when we found out
that Neil Ferguson was responsible
for the modelling of this pandemic,
because he was so incorrect in the last one.**

Reiner Fuellmich: It is astonishing, indeed, how many people are completely incompetent at what they’re doing. One of them being the person who runs the EU Commission. She has failed at every single job she’s ever held.

**It’s incredible how many completely incompetent people
are kept in office, obviously, by the people who put them there –
those super rich people who somehow seem to be fueled
and kept alive through the City of London
and its fifth columns that seem to be everywhere in the world.**

CONCLUSION

PRIVATE ENTITIES TAKE OVER THE WORLD

If we need to summarize all the information revealed by these expert whistleblowers, we can state that the world is being taken over by private entities who hide behind government and health agencies. Their financial headquarters are in the City of London, from where they influence the rest of the world. They collaborate with the elite from other countries, like the German and Italian elite. These private entities have been building an undemocratic framework that allows the World Health Organization to seize all rights and freedoms from the entire world population and submit all nations to their tyranny. All they need is a 'public health emergency of international concern' which they can easily fabricate using fraudulent diagnostics. They apply psychological techniques of manipulation to hypnotize and brainwash the public. Trained 'change agents' are sent into every sphere of our societies, where they transform the thinking and behavior of the people, according to the agenda of these criminal entities.

Although they use 'health' as the excuse for their crimes, their influence causes true health care to be destroyed and to be replaced by criminal financial operations.

In the view of these oligarchs, the people are 'livestock', which they claim to own - body, mind and soul. Essentially, they revive the ancient practice of slavery, in which humans are literally owned by rich masters. During this current revival of slavery, the systems of enslavement have been greatly technologically enhanced for the purpose of effectively enslaving the entire human race.

MONOPOLY

A brilliant and eye-opening documentary that anyone should watch in this context is called *MONOPOLY - Who Owns the World?* This film shows all the evidence of how virtually everything in our world is owned by a very small group of super-rich people. Many have praised this documentary as a must-see for all of humanity, and one of the best documentaries of all time.

Monopoly can be viewed here: www.jaoc.org.uk

THE FALL OF THE CABAL

This is the best resource in the world to learn more about who these criminal oligarchs are and what kind of crimes they have been committing for centuries. There are two series: the original Fall of the Cabal, which exposes the unspeakable horrors inflicted on humanity - and especially on the children. The Sequel continues with more information about who they are, what kind of organizations they are running, and so on. These series are life changing and a must see for anyone who wants to help end these cruel crimes and help build a world of hope for our children.

Watch *The Fall of the Cabal* on Rumble video platform

VACCINE DEATH REPORT

The Vaccine Death Report is the world's most comprehensive and detailed report showing the unspeakable destruction caused by the experimental gene therapy which is falsely marketed as vaccines. Millions of people have died already, and hundreds of millions are disabled for life. And this is only the first short-term wave of devastation. In the long term the effects will be beyond anyone's imagination. This is truly the worst assault on the human race of all time. Download the free Vaccine Death Report to inform yourself and to wake up others who are still blindly believing the criminal propaganda by the corrupt governments.

Download *The Vaccine Death Report* here: www.jaoc.org.uk
