



# Steven Greer: Interview transcript

<a href="#">Home What's New</a>	<a href="#">Mission Statement</a>	<a href="#">Interviews and Reports</a>	<a href="#">Round Table</a>	<a href="#">In Tribute</a>	<a href="#">The Big Picture</a>	<a href="#">Shorts</a>
<a href="#">Our Goals</a>	<a href="#">High Praise</a>	<a href="#">About Us</a>	<a href="#">Get Involved</a>	<a href="#">Questions</a>	<a href="#">Contact</a>	

---

## ***Steven Greer : The Unknown Agenda Barcelona, Spain, July 2009***

---

Kerry Cassidy (KC): Hi. I'm Kerry Cassidy from Project Camelot.

Bill Ryan (BR): And I'm Bill Ryan. This is Sunday, the 26th of July, 2009. Have I got that right? I personally want to say that I'm delighted to be here with Steven Greer.

Of all the people who we get emails asking us to interview, you are number one on quite a long list. The reason for that is that people see Project Camelot as continuing to kick the ball that was kicked off by the Disclosure Project back in 1993. You started something that we're doing our best to support you with in terms of bringing the truth to the world.



Steven Greer (SG): Oh, good. Thank you.

BR: We want to thank you for that.

SG: Oh, you're welcome. Thank *you*.

KC: So we have some questions for you, but they might not be the most comfortable of questions.

SG: Oh, I can take any questions.

KC: Okay. And we've heard that you're not a wilting violet, as they call it, or whatever. So what we're wondering here... because we have different philosophies, I think, and different approaches, and I think that's really interesting.

I know that we started out, maybe, at the same place in terms of we're taking witness testimony – and certainly you did – and that tactic was very effective and has stimulated us to go down the road we went on. We've been doing this for a little over three years now.

I just wondered if you have a philosophy that you feel like, or a trajectory, that brought you

from witness testimony to free energy, and if you could talk a little bit about that road.

SG: Well, obviously the Disclosure Project involves many elements. One is the disclosure of the fact that we're not alone.

The other is that there are highly classified projects that have been run illegally for about 50, over 50 years, dealing with this.

And, number three, you cannot say that this has been kept secret and it's real without giving *la raison d'être*... *Why* would something like this be kept secret?

Now, in the early days it could be argued that, well, there were religious issues, that the people would panic at the idea that there was life in outer space... or that there were theological objections. And in fact these still exist.

I had a junior Jet Propulsion Laboratory scientist say the reason that some of the information about the ancient structures on Mars has been withheld is that it would "collapse the foundations of all orthodox religions in the world." To which I said: *Great!*

I mean, it's time people who think the world's 6,000 years old and we rode dinosaurs bareback need to get a life.

BR: We agree with that.

KC: *[laughs]* Yeah.

SG: Okay, so that was one area. But the largest one... and this is when everything went deep black in October 1954 – we know it to the day – was because they had actually figured out, and mastered, the electromagnetic / gravitic propulsion systems. So that was 55 years ago.

KC: Right.

SG: Okay, so 55 years ago there was the ability to master those technologies. And obviously, when the Rockefeller Commission, that reorganized the Department of Defense and the CIA, was put together by Eisenhower, what they did was reorganize it in a way so that these sort of issues were handled under work for other programs, and aerospace contracting entities, and high-tech entities, and really took it out of the oversight of the president and the Congress.

And that's when it all "went south" and has been that way ever since.

The reason for that is because, if you acknowledge that UFOs are real, the very next thing that any *bona fide* scientist or policy analyst is going to ask is: *Well, how in the hell are they getting from one star system to another?*

And when that question is asked, it will be answered, because we have people on our team who can answer it in great detail.

BR: Yeah, they're not going around in rocket ships.

SG: And when that is answered – I'm trying to finish one thought here – when that is answered, you're going to then see the end of oil, gas, coal, nuclear power, all of it. There's a five-hundred-trillion-dollar asset base that they're sitting on and protecting. Two or three hundred people in corporations in the world control half the wealth of the planet – the net worth of the planet.

So the secrecy has to be understood within a larger macro-economic geopolitical crisis where there's been accretion of enormous power in the hands of relatively few people, and that this has gotten worse, not better, since the gilded age of the Industrial Revolution's dawn. It's actually worse now than it was in the time of Cornelius Vanderbilt and the Rockefellers. It's worse now than it was.

KC: Yeah, I definitely understand.

SG: So that, I think is... And so our focus, as we've learned more and more about the reasons

for the secrecy and the kinds of technologies that are extant, is that we have concluded that it's very, very important to be able to bring out those energy systems – at least what I call the "Level One" systems, the ones that you could put on a box over here... something about the size of a coffee table. And I've seen these.

Now, of course, seeing them and being able to bring them out and having people release them is another matter. But I've seen them.

They extract energy from... some would call the zero-point energy field, some would call it the quantum vacuum flux field... whatever you want to call it. But in the fabric of space-time around us there's enormous electromagnetic potential that can be touched into and brought out, and that is one of the practical implications of disclosure.

I mean, there are many implications. One is informational, one is diplomatic contact, and one is the issue of the science and technology which could transform the planet, get us off of oil, stop global warming, end the crisis of the have and the have-nots and the poverty in the world. So that, I think, resonates with many people.

There are a certain number of people who are interested in extraterrestrial life. There's a much larger number of people who are concerned about the environment, energy crisis, the poverty in the world, etcetera.

KC: So, is what you're saying that what you were propelled towards is the latter? Because I know your emphasis is now really free energy, or it seems to be.

SG: No it isn't. No, no, no.

KC: Well, it seems to be. Maybe I misunderstand...

SG: You need to not mis-state my priorities. Let me be very clear on this. We have three programs going on with equal bore – equal bore – simultaneously.

KC: Oh, really? Okay.

SG: Number one is CSETI, the Center for the Study of Extraterrestrial Intelligence, which is an interplanetary, interstellar, diplomatic initiative. That was the founding entity and it's still the primary focus.

The second is the Disclosure Project. That started as *Project Starlight* when I was briefing the CIA director and the Clintons and all these people.

It then evolved into the Disclosure Project when Clinton said: *I won't do it because I'll end up like Jack Kennedy*. And the Congress people that we met with said: *This is too big a fish for us to reel in. We're not going to do it*.

So it kind of devolved onto our shoulders. Then that's why we did in 2001 – to correct the date – the National Press Conference event and the Disclosure Project. And that still continues. We still continue to do that.

Then the third is the OrionProject.org and the focus on trying to identify people who have an understanding of these new physics and sciences so we can bring out some of the practical applications.

KC: Okay.

SG: So those three things are going on with equal bore. We have teams of people working on all of them.

KC: Oh, I see.

SG: I'm sort of the coordinator or head of those three projects, but they're interrelated. They're actually three sides of a pyramid or whatever... not pyramid, but three sides of one entity and three facets that are interlocking.

KC: I had a misunderstanding. Part of the reason is because...

SG: No, that's good that you brought it up because a lot of people do have that misunderstanding.

KC: ...we get a newsletter. The Orion Project, or however you refer to it, newsletter comes into my inbox and it is, you know, exclusively talking about more of the free energy side of things. So it's a misconception, you know, but is out there, as you say. It's very interesting to hear that you're continuing these other...

SG: Yeah. And people have to understand... You know people say: *What about disclosure?*

I say: *We have the testimony of 110 of these military witnesses out there. We have DVDs and other materials and books out there with thousands of pages of government documents.*

We have put this positive proof and testimony out there and that then has launched a worldwide disclosure movement in many, many countries, as you know.

KC: Mm-hm.

SG: At this point, when we started that endeavor, it was 30 or 40 percent of the public thought these were real. Now it's 80 percent. Some countries – in polls that they did recently here in Spain it was 90-some percent – think that we're not alone and ETs are real.

So we feel that the big over-arching strategy of establishing that fact happened. What has not happened is, at least within America, an official acknowledgement of the issue and the ending of the secrecy. But this is due to a complex problem that I work on behind the scenes, for that's where the problem is.

The problem is within Majestic. And the problem is within conventional political leaders and the military-industrial complex.

When we started this effort I had about a third of this Majestic group who thought what we were doing was something they would support. Now it's 70 percent. Now the other 30 percent would probably like to see me dead.

But the point is – and they're vicious – there are 70 percent of them now who are really lining up. This includes the elements within Majestic that are in Europe, that are within the Masonics, that are within a lot of secret organizations that are fed up with the secrecy and know that we're at the end of how far we can take this silly game of secrecy and secret power.

So a lot of the work that I've been doing, and it has directly to do with disclosure, has to do with trying to fix that highly dysfunctional dynamic which cannot be ignored.

You cannot pretend like those lions aren't out lurking in the jungle. You don't have to capitulate, but you have to try to educate them and give them another vision.

One thing I say to the people is that people who are addicted to secret power, it's... Kissinger once said power is the ultimate aphrodisiac... that then the secret power would be that on steroids and Viagra and every other thing – quite blunt.

And so, one of the real issues becomes what can you... You can't just take away. You have to give.

So my job is to try to also give some of these leaders, both conventional leaders and people who are within these classified projects, a new vision – a vision that can guide the world out of its current direction, into a path of peace, safety, justice, free energy, and a whole new transformation of our civilization on this planet – very quickly.

Because, you know, we've run out of time, in my opinion. I don't think we have another 50 or 100 years to fritter away.

KC: As it happens, neither do they. I mean, what we get from our secret witnesses and from people that are exposed to the Illuminati philosophy constantly is that our time is running out,

in terms of...

Like, we just heard from a secret witness – and I’m running this by you to hear whether this coincides with what you know – that there is around ten months left of food before it runs out on the planet, and that there’s another three to four years’ worth of oxygen.

I mean, I don’t know if this is down to the minute or not, or whether it’s more vague than it was stated to me, or more... You know, where you would fall in that category, in terms of how you understand that.

SG: Let me say that there are a lot of... My father-in-law used to famously say: *Paper does not refuse ink*; and in the modern era, that the computer screen does not refuse digits. So, in other words, anything can be said.

Now, one has to... My own assessment of that is that there are competing interests that try to use whatever axis that they have to provide a certain paradigm that is highly eschatological. The eschatological axis within Majestic is a very powerful one.

I remember meeting with a member of a Royal Family in Europe back in the ‘90s and his entire purpose in providing funding to abduction researchers was to – and I know who they are, all the mainline ones – was so that they would put the information out to the public so that the public would learn to hate enough of the aliens so that we could have an interplanetary war, which would be the Armageddon that would precipitate the return of Christ.

KC: Yeah, we’ve heard this.

SG: Now, this was a very specific *Opus Dei* perspective and that is really what is driving... It’s like Ahmadinejad in Iran saying that, well, it’d be okay if we went to nuclear war with Israel because that would force this Twelfth Imam, which is their return of their Christ, to return to Iran.

KC: Sure.

SG: So this eschatological *end the world* perspective is...

KC: So you’re actually saying... Just to cut to the chase here, you’re saying that this man’s testimony, to what I just said about ten months and four years, is basically him being programmed by the controllers, in a certain sense.

SG: Well, it’s “through a glass dimly”. In other words, yes, we’re headed for a crisis. Yes, we’re headed towards a *hiatus*, can I call it that, in the situation.

But what they don’t understand is that it is the end of one era and the opening of another. It isn’t the end of life on Earth. It is not going to be the end of the human race on this planet. These are all...

KC: We would certainly agree with that.

SG: This is... And so the conflation of certain misinterpreted spiritual traditions, whether it’s from the Book of Revelations or elsewhere, or the Mayan calendar and 2012, has created this sort of eschatological juggernaut – which is very Scientological, it’s very Majestic, and it has a lot of underpinnings within the philosophy of why the secrecy has continued on like it is.

This is one major axis of why the secrecy is continuing. The other one is the technological and money and control, the macro-economic control of the planet.

My point to people is that... For example, now I’ve been doing this for 19 years and I’ve had... You know, if you brief the CIA director you’ve had some good access, and that’s 16 years ago. My family put the first man on the Moon. So I have had access to people within classified projects for a lot of my life.

For example – and I know that we’re going to probably disagree on this because I saw what you wrote on your blog after my talk last night – there are people who have been exposed to what they wanted them to see. This Bob Lazar was one that they then allow to speak out.

Now the question is: *What's the agenda behind that allowing?*

I have had more than a dozen people who have worked in facilities in Dulce and in Pine Gap in Australia and other places where they have actually been *growing* the Gray and Reptilian species that people *think* are ETs.

And the people who've been in the projects *think* they're working alongside an alien – and they're not. They're absolutely what are called *nano-bio-machines* and they are *Programmed Life Forms*. There is no question that that is going on.

So the larger question becomes: *If someone comes up to you with just an empirical observation, what is it they're seeing?*

Now I'm going to cross over into something even more controversial.

We have some people at Lockheed, and another program... I can't say where it is but it's in the South in an underground facility, and its chief scientist is someone I knew very well.

They have developed electromagnetic systems where they can put someone into a state, and they can go into – and this gets into a cosmological, complex discussion now – a lower astral, or denser astral field. And some would call this *demonic*.

They can actually see beings and creatures there and bring them in three-dimensional and materialize in flesh and blood – through these electronics.

So a lot of these things that people are seeing have nothing to do with interstellar and extraterrestrial.

So when I'm talking... when I talk about the interstellar civilizations that also have transdimensional capability... You can't go through interstellar space at the speed of light or less.

KC: Right.

SG: But there's a cosmological indigestion happening within ufology and disclosure that I find disturbing because people are conflating *interdimensional* with *extraterrestrial* with *PLFs*, that are Programmed Life Forms, man-made.

All of this is being put together as if it is one thing, and it isn't. It's, unfortunately, much more complex than this. This is exactly why...

BR: We would agree with that as well. It's very complex.

SG: This is why, when Martin Cannon, back in the late '80s, put together a 2000-footnoted paper and collection proving the military-human involvement with abductions, and that the creatures they were using were not ET... It wasn't some alliance between Majestic and these ETs. The ETs wouldn't bother with 'em.

Now, I say they're *aliens*, but they're not *extraterrestrials*. Okay? And now we're getting into... and people say I'm being cheeky. I'm not, because these are very bizarre creatures. Some of them even... I'm going to take it one step further.

You've all heard of Roswell, and you've all heard that there have been a number of electromagnetic weapons systems that have targeted and knocked down interstellar vehicles... not at a great kill rate in the early days. – I hate to use the words *kill rate*. It's terrible. – But it's become more and more efficient since SDI, and since the '90s, particularly in the last five or ten years.

What happened, however, in the early days... They had enough crude stuff. And of course, we had things like the Philadelphia Experiment – which did not happen in Philadelphia. It happened in Rhode Island. That was just a cover story... that's another whole discussion.

But that was in the '40s. So there were very advanced electronics that were already being used. And by the time the extraterrestrials showed up when we were detonating nuclear

weapons, we were able, at Roswell, at our only nuclear bomb squadron, to have one of these weapons and a radar dome, or configuration, that caused the two of those to crash.

KC: Right.

SG: There were bodies on that. Some of them were living, and I have a witness who actually handled one of the living ones as late as 1950-'51 here in Virginia not far from where I live, at Camp Peary *[spells]* P-E-A-R-R-Y, a very top secret facility. [Ed note: Greer means Camp Peary, Army experimental training center near Williamsburg]

Now, what's interesting is that that genetic material from some of those bodies has subsequently been cloned, from a number of different species.

Now, you know, I have a daughter with a Ph.D. in neuroscience and genetics from the most prestigious university in the world.

What I've done is, I've looked at this, sort of... What the current state of neuroscience is in the non-classified world is that if they wished to, they could take cells from a human and clone them. Absolutely.

BR: Sure.

KC: Yes.

SG: Now, imagine what has existed within the classified world, because these were the people who were the... These were the humans who were the spiritual descendants of Mengele and the Nazis, Wernher von Braun and that whole cell.

KC: You're talking about the scientists.

SG: The scientists who were brought into these classified projects, and who were at the foundation of the CIA and the early space program. So the highly compartmented programs that deal with this issue...

KC: Yeah.

SG: And this is the thing: Everyone talks about antigravity and this and that, but what they forget are the enormous advances that have happened between the early '40s and now in genetics and bioengineering and neuroscience.

Those have gone into application where they now have created these creatures that people think: *Oh, that's an extraterrestrial.* I say: *It is NOT an extraterrestrial!*

So the whole thing has deliberately become confused so that people will make an assessment that there are the good aliens and the bad aliens.

And if we step into that "cowboys and Indians" mindset, they can then divide the human race into another war footing that will fulfill the Majestic plan that was hatched in the '50s, that will take us, as Douglas McArthur said in his last address to the Congress, to interplanetary war, which is the World War III they want.

KC: Right.

SG: So most of retail ufology – I would say 90-plus percent of it – has embedded within it this message and this information and these images for the purpose of Majestic. Now, I think people do it completely innocently because...

KC: Right.

BR: I want to ask a direct question here because this is personal, and I haven't said this on camera before. So here we go. I'm an abductee, and I'm a mountaineer. I was abducted out of my tent in December, 1981 in the Himalayas on the slopes of Makalu, which is in Nepal on the border of Tibet. And that wasn't done by the military.

This was done in December, in winter in the Himalayas. I was taken out of my tent, floated

over the glacier in the middle of the night and it was minus 40 degrees. This wasn't the military who were doing that. They couldn't do that.

SG: I'm not saying all contact has been military. I'm being very specific. I'm saying that there's enough... Let's look: If you have a nugget of gold and you dump a whole bunch of fool's gold on it...

BR: Sure.

SG: ...and no one's doing an assay. And the question becomes: *What part of it is extraterrestrial, what part of it is interdimensional...*

KC: Exactly.

SG: ...*what part of it is manmade?* And what part of it is some mixed-up, where people...?

And here I'll make it a little more complicated. There are people who've had ET contact and when these classified projects find out about it they will then target them for an abduction so that their paradigm and their perception of this will become confused. This is...

KC: Okay. I think what happens here... We are aware of this level that you're talking about. We're aware of all these different dimensions because we've basically... ("dimensions" – not *dimensions*, but "dimensions of this argument") ... because we've been exposed to these levels by different secret witnesses, okay?

But, and I think if we have a disagreement, what it is, is... I don't know if it's *completely*, you know? It's not an either/or question. It's a *how much?* It's a percentage, as you say.

It's going to be: Is there, sometime, abductions that are ET-related that are *real* ET-related – okay? – and handled by a certain group of ETs? Is there a MILAB element to it, and is that maybe the largest portion? Highly probable. Okay?

But is it exclusively that there are only good ETs? I think that when you extrapolate that, that's where I have a problem.

SG: I think the problem is with the caricature of the...

KC: Because I think that that's, philosophically, a problem of a limited way of looking at reality.

SG: No, I think the problem is a Manichean view that has to divide entire species into good and bad. This is precisely what Hitler did when he would say, you know, the Jews are bad and they're dirty and they're this... I think we have to be extremely careful...

KC: I don't think it's necessary to do that quite so much as it is in terms of the overall... I mean, were talking universes. Okay? We're talking multiple species out there that go beyond this solar system, certainly...

SG: Oh, I'm very aware of that.

KC: ...and we're talking about life in general, okay, so...

SG: But the point is that...

KC: I don't think we can sit here and make a statement like what I heard you say on stage yesterday, which was: *There are no bad ETs*. I mean, how absurd.

SG: No, I think you could say that there is no evidence that the planet has been invaded by *hostile* – is the word I used – civilizations that have an intent...

KC: So far, to you; that you have not... In other words...

SG: You can't prove a negative. This is axiomatic. What I can say...

KC: Well, then we have a problem. *[laughs]*



SG: You can't prove a negative.

KC: In other words, that's the point.

SG: No, no. But it is the point. You can't prove a negative, but what you can do is go with the evidence that you do have.

One of the sets of evidence we have through CSETI, which has gone around the world and made contact all over the world with thousands of people... We have never had a harmful event happen. We have never had anything resembling anything that has frightened or harmed anyone on the contact team.

On the other hand, we have had members of our team that have been targeted with these psychotronic-related military-type abduction events, including myself.

KC: Right. I agree.

SG: So, what I have to go with is the evidence that I have. I also know that there's the *stage craft*, to use an Institute for Strategic Studies document that I have, that talks about the stage craft of abductions because of its psychological warfare value to the agenda of an *Us versus Them* Manichean worldview that would redound to the benefit of the military-industrial complex. So this is very circular.

I think that what I'm saying is one has to be very careful if you're going to be involved with disclosure and contact in saying: *This group is bad, this group is good.*

We're good and we're bad. And we're slipping right back into the Israelis versus the Palestinians, the Jews versus the Christians, the Muslims versus the whatever...

KC: Okay, but this is not where we're going...

SG: But if you say that there are *bad* aliens that are working with a secret government, then...

KC: The language is actually Service to Others versus Service to Self, and that, in itself, is also a matter of degree. So it's not really *good*. Anyone...

SG: But you can't judge. See, here's the problem.

KC: Well, none of us can. That's my whole point here.

SG: Well, that's my whole point!

KC: It's a matter of degree.

SG: And I think before one starts going down the path of *The sky is falling!* and we start unleashing this Manichean worldview of *Here are the ones that are Service to Others and here's the ones that are selfish...* I would say that there's some enlightened self-interest everywhere.

KC: Right.

SG: And let's back this up just a little further. Let's say that these civilizations...

KC: Especially by the invaders.

SG: By the who?

KC: *[laughs]* If there's an invasion race, then enlightened self-interest is going to be the predominant model by which they're going to operate, right?

SG: And, you know, you're entitled to that. I think you're...

KC: I'm positing. All I'm doing here... Look, until it actually happens in black and white...

SG: Look, where have they invaded? Who has been invaded? And here's the...

KC: There *is* evidence. In other words, you can get evidence on both sides of the question.

SG: Well, but to characterize it as an *invasion*... *What if* there is an interstellar group that have different... Different ones of them have different functions. For example...

KC: Right.

SG: Okay, I'm going to take this a little further. There's one group that has a very specific function. You might call this the *Noah's Ark* function, that this planet is under tremendous environmental stress. We're losing thousands of species and plants and animals.

I have spoken with people about the landing in Provence, of this ET craft in a lavender field, and there were these little ETs out picking lavender. It sounds hilarious. What were they doing?

BR: Just like the movie, yeah.

SG: Absolutely happened and it left physical trace. Could there be a human genome project that's trying to protect the human genome *and* a genome project for Gaia, the Earth?

There could be all kinds of things going on that are beyond our ability to say: That's *happening by people who are selfish and invaders. And that's happening by people who are the good ones.*

KC: Exactly. Yes.

SG: I think that that sort of dichotomy and dualism that I read on your blog is the exact script that Majestic would want people to buy into to support interplanetary war. I think that there is another...

KC: Yeah. I think that the paranoia over interplanetary war *per se*, and that scenario, is laudable, okay. In a certain way we understand that you're coming from a heartfelt perspective when you talk about *Let's not get caught up in polarities.* Okay?

But what we don't want to do is analyze this scene, this scenario, and the realities that are out there, and say we've come to definitive statement where we can say: *There are only good ETs.*

Now, let me tell you why that's dangerous as well, because what that does is leave people, humans, and humanity possibly in general, in a vulnerable position. They are then going around following ET like the Pied Piper down whatever road they're taken.

SG: No. I've always said, and unfortunately you haven't read my books and things, but...

KC: Actually I have.

SG: Well, I have made it very clear that there are two things that are equally dangerous – the deification of these visitors or the demonization of them.

KC: Exactly.

SG: Both are equally dangerous, and I've said this since the '90s.

KC: Then we're in agreement. But what you said on stage was not that.

SG: I didn't deify them and I didn't demonize them. My point is that we're living in a universe together; we're going to have to live together in that universe.

KC: Absolutely!

SG: The solutions are not going to be name-calling and *We're better than you are* and *Those are in service to self* and *Those in service to others* and this whole thing.

I think we have to look at this from a much larger picture, and that is not only Earth, but the whole cosmos is going through a quantum moment.

KC: Right, that's true.

SG: It is not just an Earth moment. It's a universal moment...

KC: Okay.

SG: ...the hallmark of which is universal peace, the hallmark of which is that. And so it is also true...

KC: The ideal would be...

SG: ...that interstellar civilizations are not allowed to leave their biosphere until they have become in agreement for peace. Now, and...

KC: That's an assumption.

SG: This has been proven, because if these civilizations...

KC: No way. Nothing's been proven on this planet to that degree of sophistication. There's no way...

SG: Well, if they were here and they were invading and they were hostile, they would not have waited for us to have the kind of weapons we have today. They would have absolutely shut this civilization down in 1945.

KC: On the contrary... I mean, we have to actually get into a whole socio-political look at what it is to be an ET space-faring culture in search of planetoids or planets, and building new environments, and then what you do with them.

In a sense, you can actually take the Earth as a microcosm and you can look at *How did it go when we took over different continents here...*

SG: Yeah. But see, this is the whole problem...

KC: ...and what was the model? Then we get to space and we also have to figure...

SG: This is a huge problem. You're engaging in an anthropocentric projection onto interstellar civilizations...

KC: *As above, so below.* In other words...

SG: Well, so in your belief. But I think that you're completely involved in this.

KC: All I'm saying is that we're part of the universe and you can't eliminate... And there's no definitive decision on this part. You're making absolute statements.

SG: Do you think our classified projects have traveled interstellar yet?

BR: Yes.

KC: Absolutely.

SG: They have not.

KC: We've got evidence that they *have*.

SG: Well, I'd love to see you prove it.

BR: We don't have evidence but in May 2001 you said that they have superluminal capability.

SG: Yes.

BR: What have we done? Gone to Pluto with superluminal ability? It takes five seconds.

SG: No, because they're not allowed to use it. Now here's something that... There is a quarantine on this planet until we become peaceful. This is why, if you look at...

KC: There is a *philosophy* that there's a quarantine.

SG: No. There *is*. If you look at even what Neil Armstrong said after...

KC: Why? Because an ET told you? I mean, really, let's get down to it. We're all in communication with different races...

SG: Well, let's get back to the cover-up with what Neil Armstrong was heard saying. It's in Timothy Good's book, *Above Top Secret*. You can read it.

BR: Yep.

SG: And I'm sure you have. You've read it.

KC: A mind-controlled astronaut is what you're talking about. You're gonna give me testimony from a mind-controlled astronaut.

SG: No, no.

BR: Let's hear where this goes. I'm interested.

SG: He said that when... We were basically warned off the Moon, and that's why we didn't continue to go.

KC: And I believe these warnings exist. There has been evidence that we're warned off Mars because certain craft have never made it there, have been shot down, have disappeared, have had technical problems that haven't been explained by NASA.

SG: Well, and one can put a xenophobic spin on that. Or one can say that perhaps there's a wiser cosmic order that says that until a civilization reaches a certain amount of civility for the civilization, and peace, they are not allowed to travel amongst the stars; that the entry ticket *is* peace. And I think that *is* the situation.

KC: Okay, I understand that's your philosophy.

SG: No, it's not my philosophy. It's what the evidence... This is not how I started out. This is what I have found to be true from many different witness testimonies and the observation overall and accurate...

KC: But our witness testimony would contradict that. So what do you do with that?

SG: Well, fine, I'd like to speak to them.

KC: Yeah, absolutely, and maybe we'll have to compare notes. You know, really, to be honest with you, this is valuable, because what happens, for better or for worse, is we're both out there. We're both investigating these questions and they are open questions. Actually, the information has...

SG: They are. But I think it's rather unhelpful that you go onto a blog and say that what I'm saying and doing is sinister.

KC: But I said it was...

SG: I think that, you know, I have never said anything harmful about you.

KC: It's insidious. The reason it's insidious is because...

SG: Insidious and this and that.

KC: ...it leaves the Earth vulnerable...

SG: And I think this is exactly the kind of thing, and I'm going to absolutely... You know, you invited me to an interview.

KC: Sure.

SG: I'm going to provide an interview. If you want to over-talk everything I say, you can over-talk what I say.

KC: You over-talk us.

SG: But I am telling you that... But I'm being interviewed. So the point is...

KC: *[laughs]* It's mutual. See, you don't know this and I'm sorry we didn't have time to tell you our philosophy of how we conduct an interview, but I did kind of warn you...

SG: You obviously want to have a debate.

KC: ... that we have differences of opinions.

SG: We have differences of opinion, and that's fine, but I think the most dangerous thing we can do is with... See, everyone has partial information.

KC: Right.

SG: To start making sweeping judgments that are negative... And you can say: *Well, it's not negative. We're just saying that they're in service to self versus service to others*, and couch it however you wish.

But if we go down that path, we're already creating a new cosmological *Us versus Them*, which is the absolute recapitulation of the mistake on Earth for the last 10,000 years. I think we can do better than that. I think we have to learn to look at these things...

And let's say that everything that your philosophy and how you're viewing this is correct. If it's a hundred percent correct, I would still say the path of wisdom is education...

KC: Absolutely.

SG: ...elucidation, engagement peacefully, higher states of consciousness – all of this.

BR: Yep.

SG: I don't think it consists in characterizations, name-calling, what have you. Now that goes on on the diplomatic front and between nations on the Earth, and I think we have to be very careful not to engage in that sort of anthropocentric projection of the current state of duality of the human condition on these visitors. I think it may be much more difficult to make those kinds of assessments.

But if we go down that path, what we'll be doing is that we'll be dragging the baggage of the old era into this pivotal time, this embryonic time, where we're trying to transition to a new civilization – the hallmark of which *will* be universal peace.

I don't think we're going to be going into a period of time of competing planetary systems having wars. I think that this is – all of that – is the Scientological view and it's many of the eschatologists' view.

I think that actually we're going to go through a quantum transformation that's global and interplanetary that will make this quite clear in the coming years, if not months.

I think that time is getting very short for how much more time we're going to have before there's this large transformation.

And I think the other thing is to say... I would say to people: *If there is a civilization that is here for their own purely selfish interest, and have not a shred of altruism or concern for humanity or Earth, those are the beings I would want to meet with first.*

And I've said this for years, because you need a diplomatic initiative to North Korea and Iran and China more than you do to Great Britain, if you're an American, let's say. So this is...

KC: Absolutely, but you can't be in denial of the potentiality...

SG: There's no denial here. I'm not some sort of Pollyanna fool. And that characterization of me being in denial... I'm not in denial about anything. I'm just saying that...

KC: Well, I... Wait, wait, wait. You're personalizing this in a way that it's not personal. In other words, what I said is I didn't direct it at you. I said...

SG: Jan can give me what you wrote on the blog. I'll show you what you wrote on the blog.

KC: Excuse me. I said that what you said on stage was *insidious*. And it's insidious because what it does is leave, again, humanity... Look, let's both agree here...

BR: It's a real misdirect.

KC: We both love...

BR: It's a real misdirect.

SG: *[to Bill]* [unclear]

BR: It's a misdirect.

KC: We both love humanity. We're both here to make sure that we make it through this next era. Okay?

SG: Right.

KC: And we can say we have a common goal, in that sense.

SG: Absolutely.

KC: When I say it's insidious, I'm not saying you *personally* are insidious. What I'm saying is what you're saying leads to an insidious state of affairs if people out there were to become disarmed and completely vulnerable and allow, like I said, ET to take over "the sovereignty" of the Earth and of humanity to develop...

SG: This is not at all... I never suggested that.

KC: ... to develop on its own. But there are implications to what you're saying when you say: *All ETs are good*.

SG: *Your* implications about that.

KC: When we're using the words *good* and *bad*... Let's be honest, we're using the words *good* and *bad* because we have to use language and we're just using it in a simplistic way...

SG: Right.

KC: ... to cover a very wide spectrum of what it means to be good, philosophically, and what it means to be bad, philosophically. We're not naïve, and we're not looking at this in a black and white way, so let's not go there.

SG: We have to be very careful because that slips into that very quickly. That language slips into that paradigm very, very quickly.

KC: Sure, and it could be misleading. I appreciate that.

SG: And I think it *is* misleading, but I think the other thing, that it's also very dangerous. I'm not at all suggesting that humans disarm. My whole message is about humans empowering, not only in consciousness, but in organization and every other way.

BR: We agree.

SG: And moreover, you said that we need to be armed. Well, yeah. Armed with what? I think that knowledge...

KC: That's the other discussion. We can talk... That's spiritual.

SG: It *is* spiritual, and this is the chief purpose of CSETI.

KC: Knowledge is to question constantly. What we're not positing is answers here, so much as *Let's keep exploring*.

And at no point do we decide that "all ETs are good" because suddenly we have a paradigm that says: *You cannot leave the planet beyond a certain point unless you believe in "peace" and unless you have obtained a certain level of civilization*.

That means that you are there for good, all good, and therefore better than humanity. There's sort of an implication under there.

SG: And your alternative would be what? Conflict with the ones who aren't good?

BR: No, that's polarizing it in a way that we are not.

KC: It's a model of universes, multi dimensions, that is more complex.

BR: You're polarizing it.

SG: What's your answer then?

BR: My answer...

SG: What's your answer to these ones that are in service to self?

KC: It's complex. It's more complex.

SG: The ones that you see...

KC: There are no limits. Go ahead.

BR: Okay. My response to this is to agree with you that it's a very complex situation and there may be alien agendas that we are not able to understand. Just like the farmer can understand what the farmer's doing, but not what the veterinary surgeon is doing. You know?

If you approach a wild animal because you want to give it some food, the wild animal's going to run away because it doesn't trust the human.

SG: Right.

BR: There are all sorts of aspects to this that we may be very presumptuous in our ability to understand. But my point is that it's *dangerous*... And I'm not even saying that it's a deliberate misdirect, but I do believe it was...

Personally I believe it was a misdirect to lead people to believe, with the authority position that you have in the UFO community, that if anybody feels that all... that anything other than *All ETs are friendly*, then they're somehow working on the side of the Illuminati!

That's a polarization that's not true. We don't agree with that – at all! We think that there's a big *maybe* category, where *for sure* some ETs are friendly.

KC: Absolutely.

BR: I've met some of them, personally.

SG: Right.

BR: I don't even think that my abduction was ill-intended. I think that this was a program in some way for something, which I'm doing now. You may have had a parallel experience.

But I don't *know* what's happening. I'm willing to roll with that wave, because I don't think they intended any harm to me. But they sure as hell weren't military. That wasn't a MILAB operation.

SG: No, but my point is... Here's what I said.

BR: But we don't *know* these things. We don't know...

SG: My point is that there's no evidence that these visitors are *hostile*...

BR: Sorry. Give me 20 seconds, yeah?

KC: Actually, there *is*...

BR: But we don't know – hang on. *We* don't know, but neither do *you*. And you shouldn't say that you know and you don't. That's my point.

SG: Well, actually...

KC: Yeah, let's get to the place where, you know, the fact is...

SG: I'm saying there is...

BR: ...irresponsible because he doesn't know, and you're *presuming* to know...

KC: Exactly.

BR: ...and you're capitalizing on your authority position in the UFO community and that's irresponsible. You're leading people who are feeding off your words, and you shouldn't do that. You should be very...

SG: No, I am totally not irresponsible. I'm trying to do this very responsibly...

BR: Okay.

SG: ...because I know what's at stake if people are led into the path of panic and polarity and duality.

BR: But we're not doing that.

SG: And this is absolutely the impression...

BR: And you're giving the opposite impression, saying: *Don't worry about a damn thing*.

SG: No, no.

BR: And that's equally bad!

SG: I'm not saying *Don't worry*. I'm saying... Let me tell you...

BR: Okay.

KC: Why not just enlighten awareness.

SG: Can I answer any of this?

BR: Do it. Go on.

SG: It's too long...

KC: *[laughs]* I think you're answering it. I think you've been answering, but go ahead.

SG: Is that? Because no, you haven't heard my answer yet. My answer is what I consistently say, is that there's no evidence that they're hostile and that we have to be in an *armed* position, in a Star Wars SDI position. And that dealing with it in that way is the last thing that we should be doing.

BR: I agree with that.

SG: So, whether or not...

KC: *[unclear]*

SG: Let me finish.



BR: Wait a minute.

SG: I cannot say that there is... You can't prove a negative. I've said this three or four times. I can go with the evidence I've seen. Moreover, I can go with the experience of 19 years, of thousands of people in CSETI expeditions and experiences we've had with these visitors... none of which has been fearsome, negative, invasive. None of this sort.

The other point that I have to make is that if it were true that there were civilizations that had self-interest and were going around the cosmos colonizing and invading different worlds or planetoids or what have you, then I would say that those are the civilizations we need to find a way to engage. And it isn't going to be down the barrel of a laser weapon or an electromagnetic pulse weapon.

BR: True.

KC: I think you're making a jump. I mean, I have to say here...

SG: Let me finish. I haven't finished my answer.

KC: You're making a jump to Star Wars from us just saying there may be ETs with some self-interest guiding their paradigm.

SG: Well, but let's take a step back from humanity for a moment and look at this through the eyes... Let's say there is a civilization like you're describing.

BR: What civilization are we describing?

SG: The ones that you think are not in service to others, but in service to self.

BR: We think they may have agendas that are not necessarily in our interest. That's not a polarized position.

KC: Right.

SG: Right. But let's say that's the case...

KC: And it doesn't mean we want to shoot them in the head, either.

SG: Okay, but let's say that's true. I don't think it is true but maybe I'm wrong. It's possible, I mean. I don't pretend to know everything. Maybe I'm wrong.

But let's say that's true. What might have instigated that?

Now, let's go back 100 years. We're in horse-and-buggies and rifles and things. My grandmother, born in the late 1800's post-reconstruction South, saw her son design the Lunar Module, put the first man on the Moon, and now her grandson doing what I'm doing.

We've gone from horse and buggies to the capacity for interstellar travel and antigrav, and dematerialization and transdimensional technologies, from gunpowder and the early stages of the Industrial Revolution. At the same time we've gone from rifles and machine guns to thermonuclear weapons.

Is it a coincidence that the sort of *Pandora's Box* that opened when we started detonating thermonuclear weapons was because it was having an effect beyond just the Earth, transdimensionally?

Is it possible that the trajectory they saw our civilization going on, these ones you think may not have our best interest in heart, may have seen us going on a trajectory that, if it continued on that trajectory would lead to us going into their neighborhood with weapons of mass destruction, with our unchecked simian tendency towards war-making and what have you?

So, I'm trying to say let's look at this for just a moment through another perspective that's non-human, if we can. It's very difficult because we are human. I think...

KC: I met Robert Solace. He watched the craft fly over, okay? In Montana, the missile silos,

and turn them off. I've talked with him in his house about these experiences, as you have in your Disclosure Project...

SG: Right.

KC: We're totally on the same page on that. There's no doubt whatsoever that they came and they are absolutely adamant that this technology not go... first of all, not happen on the Earth...

SG: It would destroy the planet.

KC: ...but second of all, not go beyond. It's actually interdimensional in its destructive ability.

SG: Correct. Yes, I'm very aware of this.

KC: So, I think we're in agreement on that.

SG: In other words, what kind of hornets nest did we pick? And therefore, what kind of provisions and things are going on as a consequence of that? So, I always say...

You know, everyone starts getting into the, oh, *This alien agenda* and *That alien agenda*, and I would say: *What would be more constructive is that the human agenda be fixed. That we learn to live on this planet and fix...*

KC: No disagreement there.

SG: *...fix our own home. Create a peaceful civilization rather than worrying about other motives from other civilizations.*

Here's what I predict. I predict that if we were to do that, and learn to live together without clubbing each other over the head and killing each other on this planet – *as below, so above* – that we would see a change, perhaps, in the cosmic order for that reason.

So, rather than engaging in debates and speculation about the agenda, perhaps harmful aliens and this and that, I would say why don't we create a civilization of abundance and of peace and of enlightenment here? And go into space with that intent and see what the response to the cosmos will be then?

It may be the response that we're getting now is a directly proportional response, karmically and otherwise, to what we have been doing to each other.

KC: Absolutely. We are attracting... like a mirror.

SG: You know, in the last 100 years we have killed *160-million* of our own fellow humans. I think that if you reflect on that... And I was seeing an interview with Robert McNamara towards the end of his life where he was reflecting on the terrible mistakes he made in Vietnam and the other wars of the 20th century.

What I think is that there needs to be a sort of *Let's look at ourselves* and I think that many times...

KC: But let's not do that to the exclusion. It's not an either/or question. In other words, what I hear you saying is let's be a little more sort of Earth-centered in our view of reality and not worry about the agendas of those other beings out there. And let's concentrate on building our nest and making it a good, healthy place, and playing nice with each other. There's no disagreement with that.

SG: No, it's not either/or. I'm saying let's do that. That's why we're doing the OrionProject.org.

KC: We have absolutely no disagreement with that.

SG: That's why we're also doing the contact, diplomatic effort. And we invite all these... We always invite all these civilizations to make contact.

KC: But actually you're assuming that there's no intervention going on. And I think this is getting to the root of the question. In other words, do you know about *screen memories*? You must know about them if you've been as deep as you have.

SG: Well, yeah, the psychotronic programs that have been in existence for many years...

KC: All right, because you obviously have a positive view of all your interaction. And, you know, not to get personal on this level, but to say that if I meet a being who thinks they've only had positive interactions with certain ETs or animals or whoever they are, then I might look at that person and I might question...

This is my issue – I might question whether or not that person really knows what they're having because they might be screen-memoried and they might actually be having some negative interaction in there and not know it. Now, obviously I'm not...

SG: So you're back to the positive and the negative and the polarity...

KC: But we live in a 3-D level and we are moving to the 4-D...

SG: And see, this is... The whole point is that...

KC: Actually it goes beyond that, so don't interrupt me, because I want to finish here.

SG: I don't think it's that simple.

KC: Absolutely, and we agree on that. It is *very* complex.

SG: Right.

KC: We're multidimensional beings. We live on lots of different levels. We are spiritual beings first...

SG: Mm-hm.

KC: ...and humans second. Okay? We actually are just inhabiting these human bodies at the moment, in my view. Okay?

SG: Correct. Short-term lease.

KC: I have had a number of Samadhi experiences myself, so I totally know where you're coming from with that, and I appreciate that. But that doesn't change the fact that it is *extremely* complex, this picture of what's going on here.

None of us have all the answers, and to make definitive statements that we feel you are making out there – okay? – and to actually limit... to put blinders on to such an effect to say: *There is nothing to be worried about, at all, humans out there. Just worry about your own little playground.* And meanwhile, out there, are...

Because I got to tell you, if you're aware of psychic and you have psychic perception, you know there are entities that do not have bodies that *are* negatively oriented. Now "negative," again, becomes a judgment. And how do you want to call negative...

SG: Those aren't *extraterrestrial*. Now you're confusing the whole cosmological...

KC: I'm not confused. On the contrary, I'm using an example...

SG: I've never denied that there were those kind of entities...

KC: Okay. Fine.

SG: But those aren't extraterrestrial, physical... Some of this may be definitional.

KC: I know that. Let's extrapolate from there. I'm simply focusing, right now, on what you might term a "negative entity" that doesn't have a body, and I'm saying...

Or you could even say fire. Now, fire is an entity. It's a non-... It doesn't have a body, and yet

it has a power, it can create itself. So, in a sense you could say it's negatively oriented if it burns your house, but on the other hand it could keep you warm.

So by the same token we could find entities that are in physical bodies – again, spirits having a physical experience – which could be an ET, it could be us... it's so multidimensional. Don't you see what I'm saying?

SG: Oh, absolutely.

KC: In other words, if they are spirits as we are spirits, then they can be moved by the positive polarity as they could be pulled by the negative polarity.

It could look, from the dimension of being in this 3-D world that we're inhabiting called Earth, in this human body, in this experience, and how they impact us, could in fact be ultimately negative to our growth cycle. That is, in fact, something that has been posited as a very real possibility.

SG: Well, anything is possible. I mean, obviously. I just don't see the evidence for that. I do see the evidence for humans killing each other. I do see weapons in space where we have targeted these visitors...

KC: I appreciate that.

SG: ... and all of that. So, I mean, we can talk in circles all day on this.

KC: Yeah. Sure.

SG: My position is that there has not been an action against the Earth and humanity from an extraterrestrial, interstellar, physical civilization to here, that I think would cause us to want to have a sort of armed conflict response.

Now, are there experiences people have that they interpret as negative? Absolutely.

I'm going to tell you something, and people don't like to hear this, but in a major trauma case, if a child comes in and there's no time for anesthesia, and I have to put a chest tube in the chest wall of that child, I must look like the most horrible monster and devil that ever lived.

My *motive* is to *save* that child. My motive is to *help* that child. But to anyone seeing it who would just walk in from another planet or off the street, they'd go: *What is that monstrous doctor... or What are they doing?*

BR: You're doing what you must.

SG: And what my motive is, is that I've got five minutes or less to save that child's life. So, all I'm saying is that this sort of anthropocentric...

KC: It's a matter of perspective.

SG: ... and it is a matter of perspective. I think that's why I prefer to be cautious, cautiously optimistic, put out a positive view on how we should be interacting with this thing. It is not irresponsible. I am not insidious. I think that these sort of characterizations are highly offensive, as I have never attacked you folks publicly.

I found I was attacked on your blog today. It was unfortunate. But my perspective, I want to be very clear...

KC: No, no. Your *philosophy* was attacked. *You* were not attacked.

SG: Yeah, well, whatever.

KC: Actually, you were complimented.

SG: But I just have to say that that is why we're wanting to be cautious because it is so easy for humans... I mean, look what happened after 9/11. It is so easy for humans to take shreds of information and then go on a war footing or go on a conflict footing.

BR: We agree with you.

SG: This is the inherent danger of some of the things that you're saying, is it can shove humanity.

KC: Yeah, okay. I understand.

SG: Okay. And there's one thing to have a private conversation about speculating about the motives and the agendas of the aliens, but when you start talking to the people of the planet about this and you start putting out... and positing that there are these – and to use your word, and the polarity negative and this and that – this *would* throw the planet into...

And it would also throw the planet completely into the camp of Majestic, who for years has been trying to... and has also taken presidents aside, like Reagan, and tried to convince them of exactly the argument you're making so that he would spend hundreds of billions of dollars on SDI. I think this gets into serious policy issues.

KC: Yeah, yeah.

SG: Okay. And I have responsibilities here that you're not aware of. So to say I'm irresponsible... You don't know what my responsibilities are. And therefore...

BR: I want to...

SG: No you do not! What I'm saying here is that...

BR: I want to ask a question which is very... I want to take this back, now. Just wait a second, let's cool down and I want to just make an analogy.

Now, an analogy that I sometimes use, and it usually results in nods of agreement, is that we're like fishermen on a South Sea island, in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, having believed for generations that we're the only people in the whole world.

We're sitting around a campfire cooking our fish and we're trying to figure out: *That big metal ship on the horizon, what do they want with us? That metal bird that keeps on circling around our island, what are they doing? Is it real? And Did you see it?* And all this kind of stuff.

We're trying to figure out the intentions, assuming that we believe in their existence, of these other beings that we're suddenly starting to realize might exist in our universe on this little tropical island.

Now, the problem is that if we really do look at this as a human situation which is quite real, really, what experience do we have as South Sea island fishermen to figure out –

*Maybe they want to cut our trees down. Maybe they want to save us because the sea level's rising and they want to take us to another island. Maybe they want our minerals, or maybe they want to convert us to Christianity. Maybe they want to eat us, kill us, or maybe they want to make friends.* How do we know?

The danger is – and this is a question now – the danger is that I'm here around this campfire with you guys and I hear you saying those other men in those big ships and those metal birds *must be friendly*.

And I'm saying: *Wait a minute. We need to be a little bit careful here because, actually, even though we do get into fights on this little island every now and then, how do we know we can trust them? Maybe we can, maybe we can't. What's your experience?*

That's an attempt to characterize, by analogy, how complex this is. That's why I said that it was irresponsible, as I would do if I was around that campfire, as an elder of this community saying: *They've got to be friendly, we've got to trust them, you've got to trust them.* This is what the Incas said about the Conquistadors!

SG: Yes, but your metaphor is, again, an anthropocentric projection onto something that I think is non-applicable.

I think that, in addition to that, our... I keep coming back to this. Not only in my personal experience, but the experience of hundreds of people, thousands of people, that we have had involved with our diplomatic contact programs, have not had any of this sort of experience that would lend us to believe that there are civilizations that are hostile to the Earth and to humanity.

On the other hand, I have had many sources describe to me the Programmed Life Forms, the military involvement with hoaxing abductions, a false-flag operation to create an alien threat that we can unite against.

So I have to go on the knowledge and the experience I have, and it isn't just observing something from afar, because we've actually had contact. We actually have more information than something just floating up above the island. So the analogy breaks down very quickly.

And even if there was this potential for one or more of these planetary civilizations to be of concern to us, my answer would still be the same:

*There needs to be engagement. There needs to be a diplomatic détente. There needs to be a rapprochement. There needs to be an enlightened approach to this where we really move out of a sort of duality that leads to conflict on Earth.*

I think that regardless of what your assessment of the agenda, the path of wisdom and safety is that.

KC: Okay, we don't disagree with that, okay? Let's talk about where we agree...

BR: I agree fully, and it needs to be in the public domain.

KC: I mean, we certainly agree on the end objective. Okay? The end objective, from our point of view. Okay? We are not part of the military-industrial complex. Okay?

We're doing what we do because we believe in truth, because we're dedicating our lives. And, indeed, our lives literally have been in danger because of what we believe. We do it on a daily basis and you, of all people, should understand this.

SG: Mm-hm.

KC: So we're not taking this lightly. Our end result is not to be what *they* may desire as *their* ultimate end-game. In other words, we're not here to support their end-game and we're not naïve about what we're doing either. So neither of those things is true. Okay?

We are not trying to promote sort of a fear-based paradigm such that people get into a place where the only thing they can think of is to shoot ET in the head, to be graphic, or to allow for space-based weaponry.

I mean, we basically agree with your philosophy in that way, wholeheartedly. In fact, I would say, we are dedicating our lives to that.

However, on the other hand, we are also not going to sit here and pretend that we know all the answers. And we're also not gonna assume that all contact is positive. On the contrary to what your...

SG: You're going to say whatever you think.

KC: Yeah, obviously we are. But in terms of this discussion and for the reason that we... You know, you're sort of saying our blog thing, our posting, you found offensive because we're saying... What you're saying on stage, and again, you're on stage. You're on stage actually more often than we are, far more often – and I have to say, therefore your responsibility is great.

Perhaps your approach is a bit simplistic in that you are assuming that if you talk about the potential that there are other things going on, or a potential for other ways of looking at the question, that the jump that the whole audience out there is gonna make immediately is to fear and panic. And that they're gonna jump on this bandwagon of the military-industrial

complex, and all go out and grab their guns and knives and want to go shoot ET and fight with each other and other worlds, and so on. That's not... In other words, you're going from...

SG: But the problem is, is that I'm completely aware that my position is the minority position. Okay? I'm acutely aware that.

KC: Actually, that's not true either. I mean, there are plenty of people out there that are advocating peace and love, and getting on their cars and jumping up and down: *Please, ET, come save us because you're all good.*

SG: No. I would actually challenge you to look at Hollywood, the UFO community, the books and videos that are out on this subject. They are overwhelmingly negative and terrifying. I think that this is one of the problems.

BR: I don't think so.

SG: I think that one of the problems is that we have to look at this with a long view. And the long view, as I see it... And this is all I can do is go by my own moral compass and what I think is right. I don't think I'm irresponsible. I don't think I'm simplistic, and all these sort of characterizations.

I think that I have a responsibility to help articulate a path forward that is wise and that does not redound to further fear and panic and negativity on this planet, but that moves us forward in a positive way and that can lead to what I'm certain will be the future for this planet.

That's one of, not only world peace, but universal peace and a wholly, completely new, transformative civilization on this planet that isn't thousands of years off or even decades off now. I think it's very, very near.

So, I think that that's what I wish to articulate. There's no simplicity to it. It's actually a rather complex concept. It's also a way of engaging spiritually.

I want to share a dream I had. I don't share this very often, but... Back when my friend Shari and I and another member of my team all got metastatic cancer in the same month and we were all going to die. She died, but she was still alive. And Bill Colby had died, been killed trying to help us just before this. It was a terrible time, actually, for me.

I had a dream. And, of course, I'm human. I was angry. I was mad as hell at what was happening to us.

I had a dream – I think I was in England doing some crop circle work – and in the dream there were these giant lions that were stalking me. They were going to try to kill me. (It's funny because Dr. Tom Bearden talks about "the lions" of this cabal, and I'd never heard him use that term at the time I had the dream.)

But here were these huge lions, and they were stalking me and they were going to kill me. And it was this lucid, lucid, full-color dream.

I didn't run. I didn't get angry. I didn't have hate in my heart. I opened my heart and went to a place of universal love and consciousness and I engaged each lion in their eyes.

We were doing this, following each other around, and eventually they became so engaged with that energy that, even though they had huge claws and fangs, they actually flipped over on their back and I was petting them like this, like they were big pussycats. We had become... It completely diffused that situation.

I use that as an analogy of sort of an *aikido*, spiritually, of the engagement I'm endeavoring in, both with the public, with Majestic, with the visitors. That's what I'm doing.

KC: I understand.

SG: That's it in summary.

KC: I think that's a great description of your approach and what's motivating you. Thank you

very much for that, Steven Greer.

BR: Thank you for sharing that, Steven.

SG: Thank you.

BR: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

SG: Thank you.

[Click here](#) **for the video**

---

**Support Project Camelot - make a donation:**

[Make A Donation](#)

*Donations are not tax deductible for U.S. citizens.*

*Thank you for your help.  
Your generosity enables us to continue our work.*

Bill Ryan and Kerry Cassidy

[kerry@projectcamelot.org](mailto:kerry@projectcamelot.org)

[bill@projectcamelot.org](mailto:bill@projectcamelot.org)





# Dr. Steven Greer

Home What's New	Mission Statement	Interviews and Reports	Round Table	In Tribute	The Big Picture	Shorts
Our Goals	High Praise	About Us	Get Involved	Questions	Contact	

## Dr. Steven Greer : The Unknown Agenda

Barcelona, Spain, July 2009

download .mp4 (QuickTime) [click here](#)  
 download .wmv (Windows Media) [coming soon](#)  
 PC users: clicking streams the video.  
 To download, right-click and then  
 select Save As.

download .mp3 audio [click here](#)  
 stream (YouTube video) [click here](#)  
 transcript [click here](#)

**--- The fact that you and I are still breathing  
 the free air of Earth is abundant testimony to  
 the fact that these civilizations are not  
 hostile.**

Dr Steven Greer [talking to Art Bell](#)  
 8 August 2004

Dr Steven Greer of the *Disclosure Project* is almost too well-known in the UFO research community to require an introduction. His ground-breaking Press Conference, in Washington in May 2001, was one of a number of influential factors which inspired us to found Project Camelot five years later. Our intention was to support his initiative and add further momentum, and information, to the disclosure moment at a grass-roots level.



Yet, all was not well. Whenever a correspondent wrote to Steven Greer asking him about Project Camelot, they received a standard letter back from his office stating that Project Camelot was disinformation. And despite being extremely accessible on the UFO Conference circuit over the last three years, we had never once had the chance to meet or speak with him.

Since we were all attending the Barcelona Exopolitics Summit in July 2009, we were looking forward, at last, to the opportunity to talk. More than one person in his entourage was also supportive of our meeting, as they themselves had been following Camelot's work for long enough to know that our intentions were honorable.

However, Steven Greer ignored us, and declined to appear at the pre-conference panel discussion which we had been specifically invited to Barcelona to moderate. Disappointed, we attended his main conference presentation and heard him state explicitly (as he has done on many public occasions) that all the ET visitors were friendly.

In response to this, we made a [statement](#) on the 'What's New' section of our site, making clear our disagreement and that this unilateral position was, in our informed opinion, dangerous and premature. We had only weeks previously been explicitly told by Dr Pete Peterson that most ETs were friendly, *but some were not*, and that was the main reason why he continued to do work for the US Government. We spent two full days talking with Dr Peterson on this and other topics: what he revealed was compelling to us, and rang true. [Click here](#) for a four-minute extract of Dr Peterson's testimony to us on this subject - which could not be more important.

After we had stated our opinion on our site, we were approached by Dr Greer's PR representative and were informed that he would do an interview. What you see here was hastily arranged, for which we apologize. We

needed to catch the moment while it was available.

What you will see in this 70 minute video is an impassioned, articulate and intelligent discussion which has as its central theme the most important question that may be faced by the human race: *Can we trust ALL the visitors to Planet Earth?* To risk a simplistic paraphrase, Dr Greer says *Yes*, and Project Camelot says *Not Necessarily*.

The debate is well-informed and vigorous. We thank Dr Greer for appearing with us, and he gave a good account of himself. And so did we. Enjoy... and we would like to emphasize again what we stated clearly in the video: that none of us can know with certainty the agendas of all the many visiting ET races, and to presume that one does may be irresponsible and premature. Informed by what we know, we stand by that view - and we look forward to further discussion as more information continues to become available.

[Click here](#) for **Steven Greer's Disclosure Project website**.

---

**Support Project Camelot - make a donation:**

[Make A Donation](#)

Donations are not tax deductible for U.S. citizens

*Thank you for your help.  
Your generosity enables us to continue our work.*

Bill Ryan and Kerry Cassidy

[kerry@projectcamelot.org](mailto:kerry@projectcamelot.org)

[bill@projectcamelot.org](mailto:bill@projectcamelot.org)