

Coronavirus

Brian Gerrish's testimony to Reiner Füllmich: Our oppressors are very frightened people



by **BRIAN GERRISH**

Saturday, 29th May 2021

On 28 May 2021, I [gave evidence](#) to the 54th session of the Stiftung Corona Ausschuss, the German-based extraparliamentary inquiry by lawyers into the medical establishment's and public policymakers' handling of the Covid crisis internationally.

The theme for the day during the 54th session was "Caught between nudging and side effects". A transcript of my testimony is below.

[Auch auf Deutsch erhältlich.](#)

Reiner Füllmich: Brian, I apologise for having kept you waiting for twenty minutes or so.

Brian Gerrish: That's absolutely fine, and I'd just like to say that I don't speak German but it was fascinating watching you and listening, and it was wonderful to see you start laughing, because you looked very serious in most of the [dialogues](#) that I've listened to.

There was one word that I picked up that I found very interesting, and that was *Wahnsinn*, which came up several times, particularly when [*persecuted primary school headmistress*] Bianca was speaking.

Reiner Füllmich: You know what it means, right?

Brian Gerrish: Yes, “madness”. And I’m going to say to you: [it’s not madness](#). What we are facing is calculated, and it’s a mistake to call it “madness”, because it’s very precise; it’s very calculated. We need to understand that in order to be able to deal with what we’re facing.

Reiner Füllmich: That’s very interesting to hear, because we have come to the conclusion that “the other side”, as we call them, is using two major tools. One is, of course, psychology, [psychological operations](#); and the other, which transports this psychological operation, is the [mainstream media](#).

Can you tell us a little about your background?

Brian Gerrish: Well, my personal background is, professionally, I was military: I was in the Royal Navy for twenty-one years. I then worked in industry, essentially, for a while, but after a few years, I began to understand that things were not good in the UK, and I began to see things and investigate things.

Ultimately, that’s led me, over nearly another twenty years, to team up with a gentleman called Mike Robinson, and for fourteen years now, we’ve been running a media outlet called the UK Column, where I’m delighted to say that we’re expanding, and it’s clear that our viewers and listeners are now not only in the UK; they’re across the world.

Reiner Füllmich: Excellent. And now, of course, you’re busy covering Coronavirus and all the ramifications of what Coronavirus is bringing about.

Brian Gerrish: Well, the key point is that we originally started by looking at some of the issues that you’ve just mentioned. We were looking at how propaganda had come into the country; we were looking at [the use of applied behavioural psychology by the Government](#); and we were looking at changes which were very serious (or we thought they were very serious) that were particularly affecting the style of democracy, and that were also affecting our constitutional rights.

It was against that background of reporting that we have then encountered, obviously, what’s happened with Coronavirus. So I would say to you that our analysis of what has happened with Coronavirus is seen very much against the background of what was happening politically, and in particular the use of applied behavioural psychology and propaganda.

Viviane Fischer: So what do you think is the “calculated madness”? The [*description*] “madness” is more our judgement from when we look at what was the normal status of things before. No-one would have thought, had you asked us a year ago, that this could have ever happened; at least not us, I guess.

And also, we were really surprised how the *legal* system has [deteriorated](#), or at least, how it has become obvious that it is [really in bad shape](#). But we also have the feeling, at the same time, that it’s very orchestrated, what’s happening; that it’s like a jigsaw puzzle. They move this piece and this piece, and then the picture is becoming more and more clear what’s going on. But what are your experiences or your analysis of the situation?

Brian Gerrish: First of all, I’d agree with you that the Coronavirus “pandemic”, if we want to call it

that in inverted commas, did catch everybody by surprise. I don't think we saw that coming, and it happened very quickly. So I'd certainly agree with you on that.

But I'll come back to the fact that we started to see very, very serious things things happening in the UK. If I just focus immediately on the Government's use of applied behavioural psychology: back in 2010 and 2011, we as the UK Column were [warning](#) that the Government had set up a team which was called the [Behavioural Insights Team](#) [UK Column note: whose former homepage address 'behaviouralinsights.co.uk' now redirects to the consciously globalist 'bi.team']. This was a team of psychologists who were working directly alongside not only the political process, but the *policy-forming* process within the British Government.

A critical document which we found in 2010 was called [MindSPACE](#) (you can find it very easily by searching online for it as a PDF document). In that document, the Government admitted that it was using applied behavioural psychology to influence how it *designed* policy and how it *implemented* policy.

At one particular point in that document—in fact, it's at the bottom of page 66, if I remember correctly—the Government boasts that it can change the way people think and behave, and that people will not be aware that this has been done to them. But it adds the caveat that if they *do* realise that their behaviour is changed, they will not know *how* it was changed.

We read this document and we were shocked, and we then started to research further. That then led us to discover that, around that time and of course a little bit earlier, the British Government had been conducting meetings with the French, in which we were bringing the *political* psychology teams together to produce joint plans with the French. The key Frenchman who was present in the meetings was called [Olivier Quillier](#), and he was working directly at that time for Sarkozy's private office.

Now, all these meetings were essentially held in secret. We were able to discover that they had taken place, but we were only able to discover that by carefully researching along specific routes which we understood were important. For example, most of these meetings were conducted under the guise that they were part of a charity, the [Franco-British Council](#), which said it was simply set up in order to improve relationships between Britain and France.

So these meetings took place, and it was very clear that there was concerted effort to expand the use of these techniques: not only from Britain and France, but the implication at that time was that these techniques were going to be used across the wider power base of the European Union.

And I'll just say again that the *MindSPACE* document was boasting that this was the first time the Government would be able to use applied techniques where people would have their behaviour changed—that means their *thoughts* changed!—and they wouldn't even be aware that it had occurred.

Reiner Füllmich: For what purpose?

Brian Gerrish: Well, if you want to execute power, then you're going to try and use normal, democratic politics, or you're going to try and use force, or you're going to try and use *other means*.

And so this comes to me as *other means*. I have to say that when I saw how cynical this was, how calculated it was, when I was using effectively my military background, I could see that this was the [use of raw power](#).

Now if I jump forward into events around Covid: very early on in the Covid pandemic (I've called it a

Now, if I jump forward into events around Covid. Very early on in the Covid pandemic (I've called it a "pandemic"; of course, I don't believe that that is what it is, but that's how it was reported), it came to

our attention that the Government scientific advisory group, SAGE, had actually had an [internal meeting with elements of the Government's Behavioural Insights Team](#).

The key gentleman concerned with this was a man called Dr [David Halpern](#). That meeting was not properly minuted in a proper official sense, but they did put out a briefing sheet from the meeting, and in that document, which I think was dated 22 March 2020, [it admitted that the SAGE team and the Government's policy on Coronavirus was going to use applied psychology in order to ramp up fear in the population](#), in order to get the population to adhere more closely to the Government's policy over the response to Coronavirus.

We have the [document](#); we can provide you with a copy of that document.

Reiner Füllmich: Yes, please, because we have the same thing. It's a leaked paper from the [Federal] Secretary of the Interior, and it is now referred to as the Panic Paper [*UK Column note: reported by us [on 10 February](#), commencing at 53:15*].

Brian Gerrish: Yes, I've heard about the paper in Germany. I haven't seen it or been able to read it in English. I'm going to suggest to you that that German paper would have come out of the specific talks that I just referred to. When we started to see that the British Government was having these secretive meetings with French applied behavioural psychology experts, it was clear to us that this was going to be rolled out in other European countries. So I was not surprised when I heard about that German document.

Now, in the [SAGE document](#), aside from saying that they were going to ramp up fear, there was something very interesting. It said [*UK Column note: in paras. 6–8 on p. 2*] that inside [local] communities, community members were going to be used to effectively police each other. So people were going to be used to put pressure on their neighbours, for example, to wear a mask; to adhere to social distancing.

So it was very clear in what they were talking about that they were going to use this covert applied psychology to pressurise citizens to act against one another. And, significantly, they also said that this had to be *done with some care*, because they believed that it was possible that this situation could get out of control. Clearly, what they meant by that is that instead of having somebody saying to somebody else, "You should wear a mask!", that requirement could be translated into violence.

Having told you about that document—very clear-cut, very specific—I now come back again to Bianca talking [*just before Brian Gerrish*], because I could understand a little bit of what she was talking about: she talked about angst, she was talking about stress.

Now, of course, the techniques that are being used on adults—these psychological techniques to induce stress and fear—are [also being used on the children](#). I could only understand a tiny bit of what she was talking about, but I understood enough to grasp—correct me if I'm wrong—that the rules change, so she doesn't know what the rules are from time to time.

Reiner Füllmich: Exactly, yes. Every week, they changed the rules [*for schools*], so that she had to sit at her desk over the weekend in order to figure out how to make these things work.

Brian Gerrish: Right. And what that is, the uncertainty and the change in the rules: that is part of the [psychological attack](#). Because the uncertainty immediately is putting people in a position of [stress and anxiety and confusion](#). And if we go back into the professional world of applied psychology

and anxiety and confusion, and if we go back into the professional world of applied psychology, people who are in a distressed, confused state are very susceptible to further messages and instructions. If there's a fire in a building and people are starting to panic, the first person that starts to give *clear* commands to the people, those commands will be followed. And that is due to the psychological state.

Now, I'm not professionally trained in psychology; I do know a reasonable amount, which I've now learnt as a result of the investigations that I do.

But the other point that I want to bring into this is that many years ago, we started to get very interested in a charity called Common Purpose. Common Purpose, as a charity, said it was there to create "future leaders in society".

It effectively was like an octopus: it had tentacles, it got into the hospital system, it got into the police, it got into the military, it got into the schools. And once inside these organisations, it was essentially spreading a new philosophy in many areas.

Everything I'm saying to you is fully documented. I have a website which is packed full of documents talking about what this organisation was doing. It particularly went for children. In the earliest days, it was going for children of the age of about 11 to 14, but it also was interested in university students.

Aside from the fact that the people who went on [its] courses were *selected*, they were also keen to get *younger people* into their so-called training courses.

When I was investigating this organisation, because I was extremely suspicious about what it was doing (it was a very interesting claim to be "choosing future leaders" who were going to "lead beyond authority"!), *[I found that]* the training was clearly designed to produce people working in an organisation who were *not* working in the normal culture of the organisation. Common Purpose had given them a new set of values.

When I took some expert advice on how they were doing this, that was the first time that I was told about the technique of neurolinguistic programming. NLP is actually a form of hypnosis. You can look on the internet and you will find many consultancies providing training in NLP, and you will find many people providing training who say that it has a therapeutic [value], that it can be used to care for people and help people.

In essence, this is true; but what *we* were interested in is where we started to see the use of neurolinguistics in *government* policy.

So, [we must] bring these two together:

- It is a fact that the British Government set up a specific applied psychology team.
- It is a fact that that team was promoting ideas to make the population fearful around the pandemic.

But, on a much bigger scale, that team was using—amongst other things—NLP in order to influence virtually every document that the Government was producing.

I don't know whether any of your team have come across NLP before, but I'll say that it's an open secret (you can go and research it, and many professional people *teach* it) that essentially it's a form of hypnosis. And this means that you can put across ideas and concepts to people which are not necessarily just going through their conscious mind.

This is fact; this is not fiction.

Now, when you start to see NLP being used for *political* objectives, of course, the wider public is very, very vulnerable, because unless you have a little bit of training or knowledge of NLP, you won't even realise that it's being used on you, and it can be used in a verbal sense but it can also be used in writing.

So, for example, you can have a document in front of you: you may notice a full stop at the end of a sentence; that marker is in the wrong place, and you believe that somebody made a mistake when they were typing.

But this is not what NLP can do, because when you are reading the sentence and you come to the full stop, your *conscious* mind makes one decision but your *subconscious* mind makes another one. And it is perfectly possible to be writing documents where it *appears* that one message is being put across but actually a completely different message is being put to the audience.

If I bring this into the realm of Coronavirus reaction, we are now seeing that every statement made by the Government, every piece of paper that comes out, is invariably very carefully crafted, it's very carefully put together, and I can see that in much of this documentation, carefully-applied behavioural psychology is being used in the *written word*.

To back that up, to reinforce that: we also have a government document where they are specifically boasting of being able to use psychology in written documents.

Viviane Fischer: So you think that also the leaked documents that we see [in Germany], like for instance this Panic Paper that was leaked by someone, or at least it was not officially put out—I mean, this created a lot of fear, I guess, also, because some people could see through the whole narrative then, after reading through the paper, but actually even the fact that it came out, and that some people read it or heard about it who were stuck in the fear narrative: maybe it even put them into *more* fear, just the way that it was designed.

I mean, that you get an outcry, that a lot of people were upset that the Government would use this picture of your Grandma basically being suffocated by you, the child who infects her with Coronavirus; but once this picture is kind of in the official realm, some people hear it and then have these fantasies in their head, and get even more afraid.

Brian Gerrish: Well, that is absolutely correct. We can see here in the UK that particularly the BBC has been using applied psychology in this way: heavily emotive, distressing photographs with very little factual reporting to support the image, the idea given in the photograph.

This is deliberate. It's calculated. It's now very easy to see that this is taking place.

So, [with] the background of everything that's happened with the "pandemic", we *know* that every speech that's made, every document that goes out, is likely to contain a reinforcing psychological message.

But the other thing that I think that is important, from the UK at least; if we go back to 2010, when that *MindSpace* document was released, within a year we started to see the first exercises which were going to prepare for a pandemic.

So, in 2016 [N.B.: Brian said '2011' by mistake, which was the year of the previous Pandemic Preparedness Paper], we had a thing called [Exercise Cygnus](#), which was the UK influenza pandemic preparedness plan

preparedness plan.

That was followed by other official documents talking about a *possible* future pandemic, and then in 2017, there was a very significant document called [Emergency Preparedness, Resilience and Response](#) [N.B.: Brian generalised the name as “Preparing for the Next Pandemic”].

What was, and what is, interesting in reading these documents is that some of them—not all, but some of them—qualify the document by saying, “Well, we can’t predict that a pandemic will happen: we can look long-term over what’s happened in the world; we can look back to 2018 and the flu pandemic and the damage; but we can’t be certain of when there will be another future pandemic.”

But suddenly, in a very short space of years, we can see in the UK a flurry of papers—and again, we can make these available to you—where, suddenly, people are all talking about “the coming pandemic”.

Now, these are UK political public documents. They are not even on the level of the [SPARS Pandemic](#)-type documents, where these big exercises have been run in America and elsewhere, looking at the possibility of a pandemic coming. This is a *cluster* of papers and supposed research in the UK which is quite extraordinary.

Is it a coincidence that in a few years, you have paper after paper warning that *a pandemic is coming*? What I can see when I read these papers is very little fact but a lot of emotive language.

And, of course, people who had a job in the public sector, in the lower government system, would have been very susceptible to reading this material and then thinking, “My goodness, we need to make local preparations for this!”

So I look at these documents, and I’m pretty confident that what we are seeing is the *seeding of ideas* of a coming pandemic.

Of course, those seeds were placed in people’s minds, and then the moment we started to get *reports of a pandemic* coming—particularly, for us [in Britain], from the BBC—people would have started to become worried, or would have started to think about that material and would have started to react in a way that the Government would want.

So we’ve got the substantive evidence showing that the British Government will and does use applied psychology to get its policies across, that substantive evidence saying that they’re going to go as far as making people fearful.

And I’ll add that if you make people stressed and fearful, you’re also going to give them mental health problems, and we now live in a country where there’s a huge rise in depression and [suicides](#), none of which is being talked about in the mainstream press, because the increase in those adverse mental health effects has been so huge since the lockdown policies have been in place; this is an elephant in the room in the UK.

We have the evidence in documents of this type of calculated, destructive applied psychology; but then you can *also* see, if you start talking to people in public services, to doctors and nurses in the National Health Service here and the hospital service, they are telling us that they’ve also witnessed the sudden flood of these papers, effectively preparing them for a pandemic that was coming. Yet this was a pandemic that the papers said couldn’t be predicted!

Reiner Füllmich: Brian, at the beginning of today’s session, [Dr Wolfgang Wodarg](#) and I discussed the fact that a new narrative has been put out into the mainstream media, probably starting out in the United States with Fox News, and they have a host by the name of Tucker Carlson, who [explained](#) on

one of his news shows that finally, there will be justice, because [Anthony] Fauci has been caught lying to the public about his involvement with the Wuhan virology lab, and how he had conducted

gain-of-function experiments there, which was being financed behind the back of the American taxpayer, and against the will of the [US] Government, by US tax dollars.

But the real message wasn't, "We're going to get Fauci." The real message was, "Fauci didn't tell us that there was a dangerous virus that escaped from the Wuhan lab!" Now, in the meantime, we know that there was probably an accident at the Wuhan lab, but it didn't cause any real damage. However, those people who seem to have been preparing for this [agenda](#) to be rolled out (as you just explained, and as others have explained to us before)—those people took this opportunity and used this as a springboard in order to start rolling out the "pandemic", which is really a plandemic, and which is really only a [PCR test pandemic](#).

Would you agree with that, that in reality—and this is really important—we do not have a dangerous virus, because the WHO, in accordance with [what John Ioannidis says](#), put the danger of this pandemic at about the level of a common flu: 0.14 or 0.15% infection-fatality rate; so would you agree that this is really not a pandemic but this is a co-ordinated effort?

As you said when you first started talking to us, this is not madness, it is a calculated effort which uses lots of psychology, NLP, in order to keep people in fear, in order to make them do things that they otherwise wouldn't do?

Brian Gerrish: I certainly do believe that. There's a number of points there in what you've just said to me.

The first important one is: all of the evidence that's come in through the UK Column, and our analysis, has shown that even the Government's own statistics have proven that what is happening is effectively a normal flu season. And although they tried extremely hard to manipulate and skew, bend the statistics, the Office for National Statistics in the UK actually did its job: the statistics that that centre pushed out to the public were actually correct, and [showed](#) that there was no pandemic. But the Government's interpretation of it was a blatant twisting of the facts and information.

Reiner Füllmich: The same thing happened here.

Brian Gerrish: Yes, and I can reinforce that statement by saying to you that we now have a [stream of people](#) coming to us—doctors and nurses—saying that at the time when the British Government was claiming hospitals were full of Covid patients, they were *not* full.

Even specialist facilities that were created in hospitals never had a single patient going through them, never mind the big centre set up in London for thousands of patients that ended up, I think, with about 63 patients in a multi-thousand [bed] facility!

In hospitals, we have had hospital consultants [*senior treating physicians*] telling us that they were responsible for setting up specialist Covid wards, which they did, and when those wards were set up, they [never had a single Covid patient in them](#).

And while that was happening, the British Government sent elderly people, who clearly *did* have flu—they were in the hospitals and they had flu, they were ill—[the Government sent those elderly people in their thousands back into the care and residential homes](#), where of course, in a closed environment, that infection spread.

Even the wider press—certainly the newspapers in the UK: the [Daily Express](#), I think the [Daily Mail](#)

and the [Daily Telegraph](#) and the [Guardian](#)—all reported at one stage that the evidence was that tens of thousands of elderly people had [died unnecessarily](#). Now, the experts that talk to us at the UK Column say the figure is not tens of thousands; it's *hundreds* of thousands.

So, we have the lie over whether it was a pandemic, and one of the tricks that the British Government *and* the BBC have used is that they talk about the statistics relating to Covid-19 in a *cumulative* sense. [They keep adding the figures together](#). But, of course, flu is always logged as a *seasonal* occurrence.

A flu season comes, people catch flu, some people die—that's always the case—and then, as the weather gets better, flu disappears. And then, next winter, that is a *new* flu season, and the statistics start again. But with Covid, the statistics have been *added across the two seasons*.

Now, this is the use of psychology to manipulate people's minds. It's absolutely [blatant](#).

You mentioned Fauci. I believe that what you're seeing at the moment is a smokescreen. Yes, there are questions that need to be asked about what was happening in the Wuhan lab, and certainly we know that it has been standard procedure for many years that if a vaccine is to be created, the pharmaceutical companies will enhance a virus strain as part of their techniques for producing a new virus; so we can imagine that in any laboratory, dangerous enhanced viruses might be created.

So we know that laboratories are doing what is essentially dangerous work on the enhancements of viruses, so it is of course *possible* that something escaped.

But I think that the *timing* of the suddenly turning of attention back to Fauci is very interesting, and I believe that this is being done because they know that the wider public is starting to ask the right questions about what has been done as a result of the Covid-19 vaccination policy. So, to try to distract people away from asking the key questions about vaccination, they're now coming back to Fauci.

And the other man who has suddenly disappeared from the public arena is Bill Gates. Now, why has Bill Gates disappeared? Well, there are a number of interesting questions, but the first problem he faced was that it became known that he had a [friendship with Epstein](#). So, all of a sudden, Mr Bill Gates has gone from being the squeaky clean, well-behaved entrepreneurial philanthropic businessman to being smeared with the fact that he had a [very questionable](#) friendship with [Jeffrey] [Epstein](#). And Melinda Gates has now said that she warned her husband about that relationship many years ago.

So, suddenly, Bill Gates has been exposed in the wider media. That happened first, and now suddenly we're getting attention focused back on Fauci. My feeling is that the people who are responsible for this despicable plan have now started to think that the public is beginning to look in the right direction, and so they need something to distract them.

And I think we're going to see a ramping-up of accusations that it was the Chinese who produced a bioweapon, that Fauci was involved. This is all emotive media stuff; this is not proper analysis of what's been happening. That's my personal opinion; I could be wrong.

Reiner Füllmich: Actually, I think we agree with that, and everyone who we've spoken to agrees with that. It looks as though those who are responsible for this agenda are beginning to throw people under the bus, but—obviously—only for this very purpose: to distract the general public's attention from what they're doing. They're asking the right questions.

So, in a way, I think this shows that they're losing control, to a degree. They're not losing complete control but they're *losing* control. What do you think about this?

control, but they're losing control. What do you think about this?

Brian Gerrish: I agree with that, and if we want to inject some good news into our discussion, the people we are up against, the people we are fighting, are inherent liars. [They tell lies](#); they do not tell the truth. And the problem with that is that eventually, they become caught in their own lies. So I think this is a big part of what's started to happen.

I can give you another example, from within the UK, of where we see that there has suddenly been some emerging fear in the system. The UK agency which is responsible for the safety and regulation of medication is called the MHRA, the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency. That is the organisation which has been collecting data on vaccine adverse effects, and for you and anyone who's ultimately watching or listening, their latest reports are that within the UK, there have been 859,481 adverse reactions ...

Reiner Füllmich: Did you say 850,000?!

Brian Gerrish: 859,481. And there have been 1,213 deaths. Now, those statistics are the UK Government's own statistics; they've not come from me, they've come from the UK Government, and they come from the MHRA Yellow Card system.

This is supposedly the safety system by which anybody who comes into contact with an adverse vaccine reaction—whether it be something you experienced yourself or you witnessed as a family member or friend, or indeed if you're somebody in the medical profession—you should log a Yellow Card vaccine adverse reaction message, and it is the MHRA that holds that database.

Now, in the MHRA's own documentation, they [stated in 2018](#) that to their knowledge, for *any* medication, including vaccines, *less than 10%* of the serious adverse reactions were ever recorded. Less than 10%! And for more minor vaccine adverse reactions, they said that the figure recorded would be between 2% and 4% [of the actual total].

Now, if we consider that statement against [the record of] 859,000 adverse reactions and 1,213 deaths, we *could* be looking at 12,000 people who have died.

We as the UK Column have reported a great deal about this data, and on the ukcolumn.org website, my colleague, Mike Robinson, has provided a [search engine](#) so that you can search the MHRA's own data. And this is very interesting, because you *cannot* search the data on the MHRA's website; it simply provides it as sheets of data. This is very confusing and misleading for the public.

But the caveat that maybe only 10% of serious effects got recorded is very significant. In the last couple of weeks, the MHRA added a new paragraph in relation to that caveat about the low reporting of adverse effects. They said, "Of course, the figure of 10% and 2–4% *does not apply to Yellow Card reports of Covid-19 vaccine adverse effects.*"

So, once the UK Column started to draw the public's attention to the fact that the MHRA already had 859,000 adverse effects recorded and 1,200 deaths, and that this might only be a very small proportion of the total number of adverse reactions, the MHRA attempted to deceive the public by posting a notice saying that this 10% [rule] did not apply to adverse reactions as a result of Covid-19 vaccination.

Viviane Fischer: But did anyone buy this?

Brian Gerrish: Well, *some* people will inevitably buy it, because members of the public who read this information without having a fuller understanding are still in the psychological position that they *believe* what the Government tells them. And this is a very big mistake, of course. So some people

did believe them, but some didn't.

Now, we as a media organisation challenged that very strongly, and then something very interesting happened: the MHRA suddenly announced, in the last few days, that it was going to have a special initiative for patient information and safety. And when you look at the documents they produced, there's words on the paper, but the documents do not actually say *what* they are going to do to improve patient safety.

The other part of the story in the UK is that the MHRA has overall responsibility for logging vaccine adverse effects, but what they are **not doing** is then investigating to produce the final conclusion on whether an effect was indeed created by a vaccine or not.

Viviane Fischer: The same here.

Brian Gerrish: And if it's the same in Germany, then we are starting to see that there's a pattern emerging. This cannot be an accident; this cannot be a coincidence.

Viviane Fischer: And it's amazing: we just discussed this earlier on in this session that they're not doing autopsies. They're really refusing: it's either coming from the state prosecutors or it's somehow being hindered behind the scenes, political decisions, whatever. They're not doing any autopsies on the people who were registered or declared by their relatives that there might be a causality with regard to the vaccines. They're not looking at it, and if they *do*, they say, "Oh, there's no connection." Even after doing a minor, cursory inspection, they say, "Oh, there's no connection; it cannot be."

Brian Gerrish: Well, that is also happening in the UK, that **post mortems are not being conducted**. We've even seen—this is factual, because **we have interviewed the family concerned**—[a case] where a family's father died of a heart attack very shortly after receiving a vaccination, and the hospital did not submit a Yellow Card report, and later, when the *family* had submitted that report, nothing happened. Six and a half weeks passed.

They then said to the MHRA, "What are you doing to investigate the death?" And the first thing the MHRA asked them was, "Was there a post mortem?" Well, of course, the responsibility to do the post mortem comes from the medical team, who should have taken a decision that it could be linked to the vaccine, [and that] therefore, there was a need for a post mortem. But when it was too late, and the person had been buried, *then* the MHRA said, "Well, **there wasn't a post mortem.**"

And the other thing that happened in the UK, about two years ago, [was a change:] originally, death certificates had to be signed by two doctors, and this, within the "pandemic", was changed so that there only had to be one signature. Constantly, on the death certificates, "Covid" was recorded when family members said, "But my father, my mother, my brother died of cancer!" But because they had supposedly tested positive for Covid-19, that was actually recorded as the cause of death.

So this is the official falsification of statistics, with a direct impact on the health of the nation. This is calculated. And this is why I come back to the statement that it is not madness; if you analyse very carefully the political decisions, the policies, the documents, what we are looking at is genocide. It's planned. It's premeditated.

I've even had a senior member of the National Health Service—who has **spoken to us** as a whistleblower—use that very term. Her words were, "What I have watched unfolding within the health service in the UK is genocide."

Reiner Füllmich: Was that a member of the medical community?

Brian Gerrish: That was a board member of one of the NHS Boards. And we have nurses telling us this; we have nurses using the term “genocide”. I have some doctors who are also using this term, but they’re not using it lightly, and they’re not using it because they’re aware that that other individual used it. It comes out as a word when you interview them about their experiences and what they have seen.

Viviane Fischer: Do you think the rush to vaccinate the children ... The [German] Government has now said that from 7 June on, children are supposed to be vaccinated, and everything is supposed to be over and done before the next school year. So this seems to be pretty outrageous; obviously, a lot of people are very upset about this new thing.

They say it’s not going to be mandatory, but with peer pressure, and with them saying you can only access the schools again with testing or with vaccination, or *only* with vaccination, of course, there’s pressure; it’s basically mandatory, or it’s going to become mandatory.

I wonder, do you think they are now rushing this through because they see that the side effects of the vaccinations are going to become more and more obvious?

Maybe if they introduced this later in the year, quite a few parents might shy away from the vaccinations, whereas now it’s still in-between, and maybe with the option of going on vacations, it’s maybe a good idea to lure people or nudge people into getting even their children vaccinated now? What’s your take on that?

Brian Gerrish: I totally agree with your analysis there. It is very clear that there is now a massive urgency to vaccinate children, and we can see that in *open* statements of politicians. One politician, [*the former Health Secretary*] Jeremy Hunt, stood up in Westminster a couple of days ago and basically said that it was vital that we started to vaccinate schoolchildren.

So we can see open statements, but we can also see other documentation circulating where, again, there is this malicious use of psychology, because schoolteachers are being told that if they encounter parents who are reluctant to have their children vaccinated, those parents are effectively going to be listed as extremists.

So we can again see this psychological wedge coming in, to break people away from their children. Of course, if you get parents away from the children, then the Government can do what they like with the children.

And, as I say this to you, I think it’s reasonable for me to say that many years ago, twenty years ago, I was reading a very informative political book called *The European Union Collective: Enemy of its Member States* [by Christopher Story], and in that book there was a table which purported to be a table of the psychological attack on Western nations. It involved a period of demoralisation; it involved a period of destabilisation; and the ultimate five years was that there was going to be complete chaos and collapse.

And as I read that table—and I had not long been out of the military at that stage—my mind said, “Some of this is happening around us. I can think of examples!” And I have given public talks on part of this idea—I will call it an “idea”—that a psychological attack, a demoralising attack, is being unleashed on our respective nations. I believe that that is the case.

And I believe that when you see how the policy for this Covid scam this lie is being mirrored in the

And I believe that when you see how the policy for this covid scam, this lie, is being implemented in the UK, in France, in Germany, and across all the other countries, then we can see that clearly, the power base that's injecting this is not democratic in any form. It's *hostile* to us.

I'll just add, because it's a little thing that I didn't want to forget, that Bill Gates has supported an organisation called CEPI: the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation had put in several hundred million dollars to that organisation.

Well, by a "miracle", CEPI ended up funding the very biological testing laboratory that the MHRA in the UK was going to use, and is using, to tell us whether the vaccines are safe! So Bill Gates' money goes into CEPI; and from CEPI, it goes to support the very laboratory that is being used to tell us that vaccines are safe—on the basis that they've recorded 860,000 side effects, officially!

But they haven't done any correlation as to whether there's causation there with the vaccines themselves. That research has not been done.

So it's obvious that what you have is a system that has been set up in order to deceive the public about what is truly happening with these vaccines. And I think they want the children because they are now quite scared to see the right questions being asked, and they know that if they want to get the children vaccinated, they've got to hurry.

Viviane Fischer: I have one more question. We're looking at all the measures: the masks, this bizarre testing, now the vaccination, and the social distancing. Do you think these have foremost a psychological aspect, of being that you're power-struck or that you have to show obedience?

And also, I was wondering: do you think it's maybe also, in addition, that they're all technologically, pharmacologically, all elements of the same goal: to get you sick?

Because there's stuff in the tests, the swabs, we know, that is not good, and the masks are making people get infected more easily with a virus or the flu or whatever. So could it be that it's also really elegantly orchestrated on a medical basis?

Brian Gerrish: Yes. I think what you are saying is correct. It's difficult for people [to imagine]. If we say that we are reasonable people—we, the assembled people here today, are not perfect, but we're reasonable people and we're concerned about our fellow man and woman; that's what's in our heads—when you have that in your head, it's very difficult for you then to look at somebody who is unleashing an utterly brutal plan on people.

If even [just] *tens* of thousands of elderly people were deliberately killed in the UK (and I believe the evidence for that is overwhelming), then the people who took the decision to kill the elderly people are also capable of taking the decision to kill off other members of society that they don't believe are worth anything.

Just to come back to psychology and documents: I have a National Health Service document which is talking about patient safety, and it says "If we did this or that, we could perhaps save the lives of 160 people a year. *That would be worth £23 million.*"

Every time the NHS document is talking about protecting human beings, it puts a *financial value* on that. And when I see those sentences, I know that the person who has written that document does not think in the way that I suspect you and we all think.

So, what they're doing to the children with the masks and the social distancing—and giving them lessons in "how dangerous the virus is"—that is frightening the children. This is all a psychological attack on their minds, and the people are doing it know full well that this is going to result in all sorts

of mental health problems in the children.

There's a very important paper which is called [Biderman's Chart of Coercion](#). It's a World Health Organisation-recognised paper about non-physical techniques of torture. [Virtually every Covid pandemic measure can be ticked off against one of the entries in Biderman's chart.](#)

And as I was waiting to come live with you, a very well-informed lady has sent me a document where in the UK, they're now saying that if a baby is born and there is *any suspicion* that that child *may* test positive for Covid, there should be *no skin contact*.

Viviane Fischer: It's really getting out of hand. Do you think that the spin for this whole thing is written in England? Do you think that [the UK] is really the spider in the web? Would you discover [that], together with the French people? Is it an American script? It must be centrally organised somehow.

Brian Gerrish: Well, this of course is a very interesting question, because when I talked about the [destabilisation chart](#) [*in Christopher Story's book*], that allegedly was part of a Communist plan to destabilise the West.

But I think that if we take a more mature view of it at the moment, if we look at the power base (and at the moment, we're focused on the power base of the pharmaceutical companies), the power base is within the networks of those companies. And, of course, those companies can only function with the [people who control their billions of dollars of working capital and profits.](#)

So, for me, it's very easy to say that if you want to start working out who is doing this, then you have to look at who is actually controlling the sums of money.

And this can be quite emotive, depending on how you put this argument across, but in the UK, the Government—which has not been able to build hospitals, which can't fill in holes in the road, which can't run the schools—suddenly announces that we have got £800 billion which has appeared out of thin air in order to fight Covid. Well, this tells us something very important.

The other thing which I think is significant at the moment is: you might have thought a few years ago that *if* such a pandemic happened, then at this stage, when the economy is so badly hit, we would be hearing the banks complain; we would be hearing the banks saying that "This is disastrous, because the British economy has shrunk by 30% to 40%. The banks can't function."

But actually, the banks are *silent*. And that says to me that the banks are *happy*. [They must be happy, because they're silent.](#)

Reiner Füllmich: It is, according to what we have learnt by now, the banks. It's high finance which is profiting from all this, through their investments in the pharmaceutical and the tech industry.

But the bottom line of all this, if this is an agenda (and I have no doubt that it is an agenda; it's a calculated effort), is that the killing of the middle class, of the small and medium-sized businesses, driving them into bankruptcy, *and* the actual killing of people, is not collateral damage; it's the *intended* damage, right?

Brian Gerrish: It's intended, and about nine months ago (I can't substantiate it further, because it's a whistleblower), a whistleblower who had clearly been within some reasonably high-level meetings within the British Government told us he was shocked that at one stage, they'd discussed the *need to destroy small to medium-sized businesses*.

He said it was discussed in a way that was so cold that it really disturbed him. When he came out of the meeting, he could not believe what he had just heard.

The previous Governor of the Bank of England, Mark Carney, announced publicly *several times* that companies that *did not adhere* to the new “climate change” greening agenda *would be punished*. They would be put out of business. He said that publicly, and anybody operating a small business really should have paid attention to what that man was talking about.

And, of course, if you stop small businesses from working, you are stopping people from earning a living; and when they can't pay to live, when they can't pay to eat, that also increases mental health problems.

The word in English for this is “malevolent”: it's a poisonous agenda. But it's deliberate, because it's being spoken in Parliament and it's appearing in the documents that are being put out.

Viviane Fischer: What was the pseudo-argument that people from the Government used when they talked about the small and medium-sized businesses needing to be taken out? Climate change?

Brian Gerrish: Well, of course, they're selling to the wider public that there is a climate change problem, and it's desperate[ly important] that we take any and every measure to deal with the climate issue; and if that means that a few hundred thousand small businesses are going to be destroyed, well, that's what's got to happen.

So the fear factor is the constant thing: the psychology is based on *fear* and *control*. We've got to be *fearful*, because the world's going to end because of climate change. We've got to be fearful of a pandemic. We've got to be fearful of a war with China and Russia. This is deliberate, calculated psychology.

And, to my mind, this is why, if we want to fight what's happening with Covid and vaccination, then we have to address this issue as well. When we can *prove* that our governments are lying and using propaganda, that has to be hit as hard as saying to the public, “We can *show* you that the vaccines are dangerous, because of these statistics around adverse reactions.” We have to do the two things simultaneously.

One of the ironies is that lockdown has been very good for the UK Column, because many, many more people are coming to us, and every week, we will probably get six, seven, eight e-mails where people say, “We would like to thank you for keeping us sane. Your news, your information, your facts, your analysis has helped keep us sane, because we were getting distressed; we were getting anxious.”

And that is a huge compliment to us. That is something very special that those people are telling us. But, of course, what it also told us was how *powerful* this effect was on the minds of the public.

Viviane Fischer: I have one last question. We have the impression—and it's maybe connected to what you said about neurolinguistic programming—that people are under some sort of *spell*. We've discussed this with a lot of psychologists.

Brian Gerrish: Well, we also believe this. This is [the conclusion] we've come to. We can say that people are under a spell, and the best description, we believe, is that they've been mesmerised.

Viviane Fischer: Yes, mesmerised. But how do you think we can break through this spell? Is there a way?

Reiner Füllmich: Information. We have to get the information out, because knowledge is what kills the illusion. Real knowledge kills the illusion that they've created.

Brian Gerrish: This is true, but we also have to be realistic: if you look at what happens when you attempt to hypnotise a group of people, then you get a bell curve distribution. Some people are very susceptible to it and will be extremely hypnotised; some people might be slightly affected; and some people it's very difficult to hypnotise.

So, across the population, I believe you need to think about it in a bit more of a measured way: you're going to have some people that I think, probably, we're not going to get to. They're gone. They can't think for themselves. And you'll have other people—you are clearly some; I hope I am one—who see through what's happening. It doesn't matter what they say or "show" us; we can see what the truth is.

So, by exposing it and putting out the correct information ourselves, we are getting through that hypnosis. And, to be positive, I think that is accelerating. The British Government has just [announced](#) that it's spending £1.6 billion to interface with media companies! £1.6 billion. The BBC's budget is £5 billion on its own.

So a £5 billion BBC [evidently isn't sufficing], which is [the biggest propaganda machine the world has ever seen](#). It is the most dangerous organisation. You should not believe *anything* the BBC says without checking it with another source. I could talk to you for an hour about [what the BBC really is](#).

Reiner Füllmich: Yes, well, we have the very same problem with our national public radio and television stations, I believe. It may be worse in Great Britain, however, because I think your history is a lot longer with that kind of propaganda!

Brian Gerrish: I'm sorry, I didn't answer Viviane's question fully on whether I thought the seat for this was in the UK. I am very embarrassed to say that I do believe [it is in the UK](#). We are looking at a power base which is a mixture of the monetary power of the [City of London](#), and what is very clear from the documentation is that that monetary power base is now fully working with the wider security services.

This is part of what in the UK they are calling the [Fusion Doctrine](#). That's another discussion, but essentially, we can see that the monetary power base is now [controlling](#) both the intelligence networks, like GCHQ [*equivalent of Germany's BND*], but also the secret services. They are acting together.

It is fact, I assure you, because it was announced publicly (but very quietly!) that we now have both Google and GCHQ, the British signals intelligence organisation, [working inside the National Health Service](#). This is outrageous.

Reiner Füllmich: But as the picture emerges, it is becoming ever clearer for more and people to understand: to first see and then ask questions and understand. That's why they're pushing so hard, because they understand that something is going off the rails right now.

Brian Gerrish: Yes, they're understanding that people are waking up, and we are seeing this. I think that there has been a great ... Social media has stabilised. I think, in many places on social media, you're seeing a huge improvement in the quality and the accuracy of information coming out, and I don't think they ever realised that people would use social media for professional analysis and reporting, as you're doing today. This frightens them a lot.

Reiner Füllmich: Good

Brian Gerrish: So I think we've got to expose what's going on. The other thing that we have learnt over ten years is that it's always better to slightly understate what you're talking about.

If you tell it reasonably gently, you can always come back and have another go; but if you're too aggressive, if you're too forceful, if you scare people, then you lose them. So we've tried to always be talking about what's happening very quietly, in a measured way, and also we don't cover all of the things that we're watching.

To take an example, people are talking about magnets sticking to you after an injection. Now, I don't know whether that's true or not; I'm *interested* to follow it, to see; [but] I'm not going to report on it, because until I can *prove* it, I don't want to say anything that could undermine what else we've talked about.

So I think the [approach] of not being caught up in being too outspoken and aggressive helps people to come to us, to absorb the information.

If you want to end on a really positive note, I decided I would put some greenery behind me today, because I thought a little bit of sunshine and some greenness might lift our spirits a bit. I believe that something very interesting has happened in the last four or five months: professional people are beginning to ask the right questions.

I think that the speed at which this is happening is now causing all of these strange decisions you're seeing by the establishment: [the sacrificing of] Fauci, the rush to get the children vaccinated even when they haven't got the rest of the policy through—this, to me, is a sign that they are very frightened people.

The last thing I'd like to say—and I have to smile when I say it—is that there was an activist in Chicago called [Saul Alinsky](#), who wrote an extremely good book which is called [Rules for Radicals](#), and in the book he's talking essentially about techniques to [overthrow government](#), but one of the things he says is "Always make the argument [personal](#)."

Reiner Füllmich: That's what we're doing, yes.

Brian Gerrish: And so it's not enough to talk about "the BBC"; we've got to talk about *Tim Davie, the [Director-General](#) of the BBC*. It's not enough for me to talk about "the MHRA"; I've got to talk about *Dr [June Raine](#), the Chief Executive of the MHRA*.

The other little thing, which you can accept or laugh at—I'm very happy either way—is that even in writing to some of these officials, it's very powerful if you put *their picture* on the letter or the e-mail that you send to them, because what that does is it takes it from a dry communication to actually putting straight into their minds that you are looking at *them* as an individual.

And, of course, what am I doing here? I'm using applied psychology, but if the bad people use it on us, I think we can use a *little* bit of it back on them.

Reiner Füllmich: Well, that's what we're doing, actually. We're making it personal. We're going after these people personally, not after the institutions. Brian, thank you very, very much.

This was extremely interesting and very important, and I think we're going to be able to hear more of each other, because we have to stay in touch now that we realise—I mean, we've had this suspicion all along, but now we *realise* that this is an *internationally*-concerted effort by some very, very evil people.

Brian Gerrish: Yes, and what a wonderful opportunity that is, because whatever else these people do, they are constantly pitting nations against nations. If we get a little bit broader and we look back

at the wars and the trouble, it was this type of people that caused it, and I think we've got a wonderful opportunity now.

The "pandemic" that's been thrown at us to make us fearful could actually be the very thing to get people coming back as human beings, no matter what their nationality or religion or colour is. I think we've got a very exciting opportunity here.

Reiner Füllmich: We agree. It's a real pleasure, Brian. Thanks so much. I think we'll talk more.



Brian Gerrish

Founder and joint editor of UK Column.