

Stephen Bassett and Alexandra Meadors, One Canadian Advances ET World Views On A Governmental Level: Disclosure is Imminent!
April 7, 2015

(Stephen Bassett talking about Disclosure: Clip from Barcelona Exopolitics Summits Speakers Panel, Barcelona, Spain, July 23, 2009.)

“I do believe that Disclosure will trigger very possibly the greatest era of reform in history. In other words, it’s going to create a cascading effect in which because of the fact that the world’s attention will suddenly be focused pretty much in the same direction – billions of eyes focusing in the same direction. And then everything is sort of tossed up into the air, everything will be on the table suddenly which happens once in a while that the reformist movements that are out there, and there are reformist movements in everything, right, you just don’t hear about them but they’re out there, struggling along working out of their basements, will suddenly become life and energy and money. And you’re going to see what is literally systemically, I think, spectacular reform that will be staggering in its size and scope.

Now will it leave us to wonderful things, will it all work out, will it be like the French Revolution where you start out with a good idea and the next thing you know, you’ll be lopping off heads? I don’t know. But I know that the opportunity is there. And for me, that’s one of the reasons to keep going and do this. It’s not just, oh, they’ll tell us that ETs are here. We have a world that has basically been shoving stuff under the rug for a couple of centuries, putting things in the closet, sticking them in the attic, not taking care of business, not dealing with what has to be done. And that was going to catch up with us. And I think this is the trigger that suddenly says, OK, we have to clean the basement and clean out the attic and we’ve got to cut the lawn, we have take care of business, we need to clean up the secret empire, we’ve got start filming the Bilderberg Meetings, we’ve got to toss the Skull and Bones idiots off of the Yale campus, we’ve got to do a lot of things. We’ve got to have monetary reform, we need doctrine reform in the Christian Church, the Islamic faith, we’ve got to take care of stuff, because a lot of things are stupid. Right? It’s ridiculous.

But we’re all locked up. In the last 2000 years we’ve been just completely all locked up and can’t move. And so you go to the Congress for some simple thing and Congress is going ‘I can’t move’ and you go to the Islamic faith and you say ‘Let’s have a little bit of change here or we’re going to have world war. We can’t act. The Catholic Church can’t change its policies of birth control. We can’t get anything done. All of a sudden, BOOM, into this comes the biggest event of all time. So, what happens after that is up to us. I just look as my job as trying to help to look and see and maybe be a part of the Post-Disclosure world. But we have hopefully earned our right to be on the stage. Hopefully, we’ve earned the right – ”

Alexandra’s opening:

Good afternoon everyone, this is Alexandra Meadors of Galactic Connection.com and I would like to let everyone know that if you have not been to Galactic Connection.com please do. Please check our Daily Blog page. We are available 365 days a year, folks, get that, and we provide information on everything from conspiracies to spirituality to ufology, to quantum physics, everything that’s really allowing people to jump down that rabbit hole and expand your consciousness, because that’s what it’s all about – it’s really getting out of our boxes and be open to possible First Contact.

So today's radio show is for the date of April 7th, 2015. And I am really excited about this interview, I think because I've been asking for this for a long time. As many of you know I'm very, very high and keen to get the message about us being prepared for the new galactic society. And being prepared that we will be working amongst other extraterrestrials, which we know are already walking on this planet as we speak. So who better to bring some information forth than Stephen Bassett. And he has an amazing background. I'm just going to give you the short version Stephen. Stephen Bassett is a leading advocate for ending the 68 year – 68 years folks – the governmental imposed Truth Embargo regarding an extraterrestrial presence engaging the human race.

He's a political activist, lobbyist, commentator, degree in physics, and an Executive Director of Paradigm Research Group. He's also the Executive Producer of X-Conference, and of course, many of you are very well-versed on the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure. And he is the main man behind that project. He's also part of the Congressional Hearing Initiative and he'll talk to us a little bit about that. His work is being covered extensively on a national and international level within the media. He really, truly is someone who we all should follow in regards to the information he's bringing forth today. Since 1996 Bassett has assisted numerous organizations and initiatives working for:

Number one: Raising public awareness of both the Terrestrial Presence and the Truth Embargo.
Number two: Convening open Congressional Hearings to take government and agencies witnesses' testimonies.

And Number Three: Inciting the political media to appropriately cover the intended issues.

He has appeared on over 1200 radio shows, my God, Stephen, how do you do it, and talk shows, and numerous documentaries, speaking to millions of people across the world about the implications and the likelihood and what I would say, the definite-hood of Disclosure. The formal acknowledgement that Extraterrestrials are present, do exist, by world governments. So with that said, wow, that's an amazing résumé there, Stephen.

Stephen: Thank you. I could have done a lot more in these 18 years but I watched way too much television.

Alexandra: Well, what I want to start out with is, I think it is very interesting that some of the information that I've reviewed regarding all of your other interviews, you've talked very poignantly about the difference between UFO Contact and the Truth Embargo. Can you clarify that a little bit as far as changing the verbiage and the vernacular in using ET Contact or UFO Disclosure. You really don't like the word UFO.

Stephen: UFO Cover-up. Yes.

Alexandra: Cover-up, yes.

Stephen: One of the things that has to happen in advocacy is you need to create your own language so that people will have the proper understanding of what you are doing. Often times you are advocating against the government and what happens is, you don't want to use the government's language, you want to use *your* language. 'UFO' is a term that I believe lost its usefulness no later than 1992. 'Cover-up' is a misnomer because the policy to withhold the knowledge of the issue – to contain this issue by the government, which goes all the way back to the late forties. In fact it was a national security policy and is totally legal. And you can't cover up a legal policy.

And so, in order to not offend the government more than necessary I started to push the term Truth Embargo around 2001, maybe, I forget. And I'm pleased that it's used more and more and UFO Cover-up is used less and less. That is the difference. It's not a UFO, it's an Extraterrestrial Craft. It's not 'politics,' it's actually, Exopolitics. It's not 'Cover-up,' it's an Embargo. And Disclosure is a capital D, meaning the acknowledgement event, the day that the United States acknowledge the ET presence, that's capital D, Disclosure. These are just of the terms that are increasingly used which truly affects what we are trying to do.

A: Awesome. Well, that's very educational for all of us because I think we are still all using the UFO vernacular rather than the Truth Embargo.

S: It doesn't change easily, it's been around for a long time. So doesn't change easily, I get that.

A: So, one of the other things was, I was very surprised to hear you talk about the actually downed craft in 1947 in Roswell as not being the typical round saucer. It was actually a different vehicle. Can you talk about that a little bit?

S: Yeah. A lot of people don't know that.

A: Yeah, that was very surprising to me.

S: Well, the witnesses testify you can see examples of this craft, they are not perfect because we don't have a photograph, it's from multiple witness accounts, but it was a chevron craft, semi-aerodynamic which tells you right away it probably was not as sophisticated as the saucers (**A:** Interesting) that are typically common. And also the entities, the bodies, and the one living entity that was recovered from that crash. When you look at the witness accounts as drawn by the various artists they are not the Greys. In fact, they're virtually not even seen hardly at all since.

And I believe, and I'm speculating here that this particular group, were also around and things started heating up very quickly in 1947 because other groups were making significant changes in their engagement protocols. And things got very intense and this group really was over its head. It was time for it to step away. In other in words, they were playing double AA ball and the major league game was about to start. And so, either because of something that we did, but more likely a massive thunder storm took place over Roswell in early July, I've been in a thunderstorm in Roswell in 1977 it was like the end of the world. We think two of them smacked together and crashed. And there may have been other entities who needed to leave town when the main group decided to change the level of engagement here in 1947. That is my interpretation. (Sure) No, I can't prove it, but the craft was not a saucer.

A: Okay, are you aware of what species was actually part of this crash?

S: I am sure that there are channelled people that can tell you what their name is and where they came from and they ate for breakfast. I don't know that.

A: I'm just curious. And the other thing that was interesting was, why you thought that the Vietnam War was actually triggered, can you go over that a little bit. The boats in the ocean regarding Vietnam. That's another new piece of information for me.

S: Well, it's because you have a few less years on your automobile than I do. I don't talk about my personal politics very much and I'll try to couch this in non-partisan terms but to me, the path of the United States through the 20th century was significantly diverted by a very key event that occurred in 1964. And it was a supposed attack on our destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin, over North Vietnam.

And based on that 'attack' Johnson slammed through the Congress, it was over 24 hours a resolution calling for an acceleration of the War of Vietnam. Later it proved that that attack was not what they it said it was, it was a lie. Later we learned that it was a lie. So the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution essentially allowed the War in Vietnam to be profoundly escalated based on a lie, which in fact happens very frequently. And from that point forward I believe the fortunes of the United States have been in decline.

A: Wow.

S: So look it up. Google The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and you will learn quite a bit.

A: Thank you for that. Now obviously, we are so familiar with your work with the Citizen Hearing. And you did one in 2001, right, and 2013?

S: No, in 2001 was the Disclosure Project Press Conference at the National Press Club in the main ballroom. It was a significant event in which 18 witnesses came in and speak briefly for 100 members of the press about, well, military, agency and political witnesses was what they were. And 60, 70 were presented to the media in a 4-hour events video, I think from about 100 hours of video. And this was a significant event. I was there, I helped a little bit to put it together. It was the Disclosure Project's event, press conference. And I know for a fact that the media was definitely sniffing around after this and there was a significant potential for more interviews, for witnesses to start getting some attention, media attention, and so forth. And it could have been a game-changer. Unfortunately, and this happens more often than you think, history intervenes.

A: So the 2013 are you feeling that, because it wasn't done in front of the press,

S: Oh no, hang on, we have two different animals here. The 2001 Press Conference of the Disclosure Project did not achieve what it sent out to do because only four months later was 9/11. (Right) The advocacy movement in 2001 of this issue was flat. All right. It was a massive setback. Now, starting in 2004, I started holding X-Conferences in the Washington area. This was PRG's way to try to keep some of these witnesses involved. Some of the military and political witnesses had participated in these six X-Conferences. And they were held 2004, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010. All were good. But in 2013, was what I consider, and what many people consider, perhaps the most important event in the history of this phenomenon and that was the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure. Now that was also held in the main ballroom in the National Press Club. Almost 12 years to the day of the Disclosure Project Press Conference. Only this was not a press conference, this was a mock Congressional Hearing, the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure. And we brought 42 witnesses in from ten countries to testify for 30 hours over 5 days in front of six former members of Congress, in a mock hearing setting, with an audience, a press area, filmed everything, webcast it to the world. All right.

A: Okay.

S: And it went extremely well. And the six former members of Congress were very impressed. And that cost a lot of money, it cost over than \$700,000 to put that on and the money was given by an advanced thinking Canadian.

A: Wow, one person?

S: One person.

A: Wow, thank you whoever you are.

S: And I'm not surprised. I had originally put the idea out there for a citizen hearing in 2001 but had not raised the money. I could not find an American to fund it. Initially, the funding, the budget was around \$300,000. The money came from a Canadian which is not surprising because the Canadians are far less intimidated by the government, they are far less afraid of it, they have not been inundated with the Truth Embargo propaganda to the degree that the Americans have, so this gentleman who is an very advanced person that had some money that he could spare.

A: That's fantastic. I was wondering would you clarify, this is something that people don't have a super clear line on and that is how did you go through the selection process of bringing the actual former members forward from Congress?

S: It was not easy.

A: There are a couple of stories out there.

S: It was not easy. Essentially, simply, I had certain ones that I thought I had shot at and I started with that person and the word sort of got around and I think I got a couple of referrals. We signed up one person and had a second one that looked really good but that person couldn't commit and the time went on and it was getting really dicey. And then, somebody stepped in, a very important ally of PRG and a major supporter of PRG, the Dr Joseph Hauptmann, a PhD in economics, Libertarian Party member, and actively – he actually was the Chairman of their platform committee at one point. He had a lot of political connections and he got on the phone and he got some members interested, people that he was referred to or indirectly referred to and very quickly – but he also informed me that the amount of money I was suggesting for a full week from former members simply was not adequate so we increased it substantially. And it clicked. And very quickly we had five and we were going to stop there but then Roscoe Bartlett, a twenty-year member of Congress, a PhD in science became available, so I had to add him to it, and that's how it came about. They were paid, but that wasn't the only reason they were there. They were clearly interested, but none of them were selected on the basis of the views that they had on the ET issue. It was never even asked.

A: And it wasn't based on the donations, right? It was based on money or anything like that. Because that's been a rumor that went around.

S: Okay, you don't ask a former member of Congress to come and spend a full week and put in eight hours a day for five days in a hearing and think, oh, they will just do it. I don't think so. Most of them, most of these six members, get 15 to 20,000 for just a single speech that might last one and half or two hours. So they were paid, just like they were paid when they were in the Congress. So certainly that helped them to do it, without that payment, I could have not been able to get a committee. But that should not shock or surprise anyone.

A: Fantastic. That's just to clarify for the audience that it was former Representative Carolyn Kilpatrick, former Representative Merrill Cook, former Senator Mike Gravel, former Representative Roscoe Bartlett, then there are two others –

S: – former Representative Darlene Hooley, former Representative Lynn Woolsey. We have five Representatives and one Senator, three Democrats, two Republicans, and one Libertarian, three women and three men. With 80 years in total years of tenure between them. A very very representative committee.

A: Very talented. That's fantastic. So I know you have been asked this a gazillion times Stephen, but let's just do it again,

S: Either a gazillion or a bazillion.

A: I know most of the encounters date back to the 1950s and the typical reason of the alleged 'cover-up' is not wanting the Russians to get their hands on the alien technology. And I'm just wondering, can you review with the audience the complexities of why the US Government and the military complex are still covering this up today.

S: That was a short question summing up a 5-hour answer. All right.

A: Yes.

S: Here is the speed slide show on that, all right. The United States crashed the atom, built atomic bombs and dropped them on civilians in Japan in late 1945. And then proceeded to begin a bomb-building program and of course developed the hydrogen bomb, which we were well on our way to by 1947. In early 1947 the extraterrestrial engagement dramatically increased. There is no question that they'd been there before then, they might have been around for the last 10,000 or longer, but whatever they were doing, prior to early 1947, they went hyperbolic. Sightings all over the world, including the legendary Mt Ranier sighting by the pilot Keith Arnold. Only a couple of weeks after that is when the crash in Roswell takes place and they almost had Disclosure in July 1947. Whatever the government may have suspected or known prior to Roswell, and I think they knew a lot, based on the Foo-Fighter events and a possible crashed vehicle even prior to the war. But there was nothing known in the public about it, it was very closely held, very limited. So the real eye-opener comes with the Roswell crash. And in the aftermath of the Roswell crash they formed a committee which has come to be known as the Majestic 12. I don't care what it was named, it very likely it wasn't Majestic 12. But whatever, it's what it's come to be.

A: That's a good point.

S: And a deal was to be issued, all right. The Truth Embargo was not really underway at that point other than they weren't telling anybody, but they didn't have a program but they certainly were trying to decide what to do about this. And as of late 1947, the government knew these things – there were extraterrestrials here, they had a crashed vehicle of unknown technology, they did not know their agenda, they did not know a lot, and they certainly didn't know what this technology could produce. But also know that the Soviets were working on an atomic bomb that they would test very soon. They also knew that the Soviets had the hydrogen bomb secrets and were dabbling with the development of those. They knew there was an Iron Curtain across Europe, they knew in a very confrontational situation, and likely, as history has dramatically shown to the next war and that war would be nuclear and it would make World War II look like a garden party.

So they had a serious plate full of issues to address. And naturally, they were not eager to simply tell the public, right? They knew not what the consequences of it would be. So until they understood more, until they knew how things were going with the Soviet Union they decided to stay tight on this. And that's what they did. They sort of sat tight on it for '48, '49, '50 and '51, there were sightings and things happening but it seemed like things were under control and then in July 1952, ET craft turned up over Washington for several days and scared the living daylights out of the government because there was nothing they could do about it. And that meant that these ETs, whatever their intentions, were more than happy to push this issue, push the presence.

So in late 1952 they convened a secret CIA panel, which became called the Robinson Panel 'to decide what the hell to do about it.' Years later we got a copy of the Robinson Report. Basically

what that report included was this: After five years of deliberating with this phenomenon, it did not appear that it was a direct threat to the American people. What was a threat, was the awareness of this issue by the American people and therefore, it needed to deal with the awareness and shortly after that they really got serious about a full Truth Embargo. The intention I am sure, was, okay look, we are embargoing this, we have to do whatever we have to do, disinformation, misinformation, threaten witnesses, threatening researchers, throw out the media, which they had done to some degree already but they were going to get serious about it. All right. And then we will see where it will go.

Perhaps in five or ten years things will have settled down in the Soviet Union, circumstances will be this or that or whatever. What they didn't know, they couldn't have known, was that, no, we wouldn't have a nuclear war, but we almost did on a couple of occasions. But the Cold War, the stand-off, would last 44 years costing 15, 16, 18 trillion dollars depending how you want to count it, and there was no way that they were going to simply announce the extraterrestrial presence with by 1980, 70-some-thousand nuclear weapons archived in 7 countries with thousands of them on immediate launch capability which as the scientists have appropriately pointed out would have launched a nuclear winter and end most of the larger life on the planet. They were not going to do that.

So by the time the Cold War was finally ended in 1992, the Truth Embargo was fully institutionalized. It was in the political propagandist worldview DNA of the American people and the press. And so, and there was a 44 year history behind it and nobody was particularly enthusiastic about being the first one to go out there and say, you know, guess what, so they started to dance with this issue. Now a lot has happened in the last 22 years that we know about that generally explains why to this day that they haven't made this announcement. And I could spend a very long time filling that out but I've got tons of lectures on Youtube, go find them and you will talk about that. So that is the answer, but the punch line is that the Truth Embargo is almost over. And I believe that it will end this year. And even this summer.

A: I'm coming to that question.

S: Oh, I'm sure that you are.

A: So you know there were a bunch of FBI documents that were released.

S: The FBI documents, sure.

A: And they were indicating that the Roswell event was due to the downing of the ET vehicle by an electromagnetic system that was hidden within a radar dome.

S: That's possible. It could have been a combination of the radar system that they were using and the electric storm. Okay. Again, even though I do not believe the ETs in Roswell were as advanced as the ones that we generally know about, but they still were advanced, and it might have been a combination of this tremendous lightning storm and some radar activity on our part that just overwhelmed their awareness. Their local awareness of what was going on and they crashed. So it is possible. So that memo could even be true.

A: Yeah, and I was trying to remember there's that outstanding – what is it like – 4 hour and a half long interview with Nancy – do you remember this – and she was actually telepathically being interviewed and interviewing the one survivor.

S: Yeah, that was a nurse.

A: I just remember in that interview supposedly they mentioned that there was something about that they got caught in a net, some sort of electromagnetic net.

S: I can't really respond to that. It's outside of my flight zone.

A: Now how about this. I'm not sure if this is something that you're aware of. In the Citizen Hearing they talked about the statement was made where we needed to develop a new series of equations. Do you remember this?

S: That might have been me. I like to use that phrase.

A: Well, can you suggest what that would be and what are we tossing out?

S: That's a very big subject. It's primarily a worldview statement. And it applies a little more to governmental policies and the worldview of governments, which is really the collective worldview for all domestic policy than it is as, say, individuals, although it could still apply it to individuals. So what I mean by that is that the governments of nations, every single day, are working sets of equations. They're addressing groups of variables that apply to the oil issue, the metal issue, every relationship they have with every other country, some of which are trivial, some are quite complex, and on and on and on. Each of these relationships, each of these issues, have their own sets of variables and are solving these equations. You could have a set of variables in one equation and you could have the same set of variables in a whole different equation – this is true of physics. Right? (**A:** Right) So there are equations that involve mass and energy and frequency and all kinds of stuff and in a certain equation you get one result and in another equation you get a different result. It depends on what you are looking for.

What has happened, is that the worldview of governments, of the managers of social contracts, is no longer working. The world had changed and the equations they are using will not give them the answer that will produce the results that they want, so they have to change their worldview. And what that means is, is devising new equations into which to work with these variables so that they will get results that are helpful. And they haven't been able to do it. In fact, it's remarkable to watch since 1964 which I believe was a turning point. Now these equations have failed over and over and over again to advance the collective human condition and the welfare of not a single mission, but all missions. We've had a few things that we've been able to pull off, that surprisingly, took too long and too much effort, again because we had the wrong equation.

It's like having to sweep out the house but you have a short broom. It's not long enough so you are able to do it but it takes at least three times as long and breaks your back. So even so, the clock is right twice a day, the stop-clock is right twice a day, so we have to change the equations, that's really it. That is typical, right? Now a human being who also has a worldview that is not working, read a good book, find a new relationship, have an insight, change your worldview and your life begins to change. And you turn things around. And it happens. It's not easy though. If it were easy everyone would be turning their lives around.

Now with governments, when you are talking about major change it is brutal to make change. So we continue to sail right towards the water rapids and haven't been able to steer the canoe away from it. Now we are heading right over it. And it isn't just one of those small ones, it's a big drop. So unless we have this worldview change I think we are screwed.

Well, there is only one candidate in the world today that has the leverage to change worldview at a governmental level. Nothing else even remotely comes close. And that is, the formal acknowledgement of the extraterrestrial presence, the Disclosure Event, which it's possible if we do it now, to intellectually show why that is a worldview-changer, a game-changer, that will allow us to reboot our operating system, right? It actually has the power to allow us to suspend the current operating system, the worldview that we are working on, reboot it with a better software with the ability to solve equations in a better way. And in that Post-Disclosure world, I believe, you will find the ability to deal with these problems finally before it is too late. That's what I meant. So obviously just saying we have to change the equations –

A: There's a lot more to it than that. So can you also expound the sundown rule that they described in and discussed in the Citizen Hearing about the classified files and their expiration dates?

S: Sunset. Sunset rules. Look, with respect to government documents there are various laws that apply to them. And there's a number of different laws, and it depends on the documents, it depends where they came from, and in general these laws have time frames in which the documents can be held classified and then can be released. Fine. But the government disregards those time frames all the time but it does demonstrate the effort to increase transparency. Usually the time frames are long enough for the culprits to be dead.

A: Interesting.

S: It's really just all about saving your ass. It's all about C.Y.A. Well, we wouldn't want that to come out right away because somebody – it's about being able to do stuff and not have to face the consequences in many cases, in most cases. And the people have seen through this, they're kind of fed up with it. So Edward Snowden, bless his heart, I guess you could say he wasn't buying into the sunset rule, he released several hundred thousand documents ahead of schedule. By and large, American people have said "good." That should be a huge message to the United States Government which, very thick-headed, and it may take awhile to get that message through their thick skulls.

A: A dramatic effect on the planet, a dramatic effect.

S: A big deal, a milestone event, coupled with Wikileaks actions and now the thing is, what is government going to do about it? How are they going to respond? We really haven't really gotten their full response yet. Because the government is trying to decide what to do and how we might react. And it's just one of the many watershed moments that we are facing. Tipping points, watershed moments, milestone moments, and the decisions we make in these kinds of moments will determine the 21st century. And right now I don't have much confidence in, what would you say, the judgements of those who remain in power.

A: I totally agree. Now you know, a lot of people are wondering about this, regarding you, because you are walking a very murky pathway in this particular field of black ops programs, government officials, politicians, anybody to do with anything that has to do with Secret Space Programs and all that stuff. And I've always wondered how do you make sure that the people that you are contacting, or aligning with, to get this off the ground are trustworthy because there are so many CIA operatives, and people that you can't totally trust. I mean, you are walking a line where it's very fuzzy because the actual people that you are pulling forth to do the testimony are the same ones, possibly, that have already taken those oaths to keep things secretive.

S: Well, look, really we are talking about the witnesses. How do you deal with witnesses. I don't call them whistleblowers, the witnesses. Because again, the basic policy is legal, you don't whistle blow legal policy, you hear witnesses to bring their testimony.

A: That right there is the total difference. So I see what you are saying.

S: Well, yeah, that's where it really matters. In terms of colleagues and other researchers, you use your judgement. In some people you have confidence and in some people you don't.

A: People are just amazed that you still are alive.

S: No, no, they shouldn't be amazed. There are good reasons . . . I've never been bothered at all. All of the problems that I have had have not come from the government, they come from people in the field. So I understand why that it is.

A: Yes.

S: Here is how I deal with a witness. And this is very much affected by the realities of this issue which is the Truth Embargo, right? There are a lot of people out there who would just like to pretend there's no Truth Embargo and make decisions about this or that and everything else and it's not going to work. It's like trying to solve an equation with an variable that's missing that's supposed to be there, you're never going to get an answer. So with in respect to the Truth Embargo, in 68 years of obfuscation, misdirection and interference and so forth and intimidation is another part of it. Anybody that comes forward with testimony about what they've seen, heard, done, while still serving in the government or politics or agencies, whatever, as far as I'm concerned, fully legitimate until proven otherwise.

You say how do you prove otherwise, well let me be clear, this advocacy movement has very little funding – it's almost impossible to get serious funding. It's probably the least funded, major advocacy movement in all of history and that is the direct result of the Truth Embargo, all right? So do we have the hundreds of thousands of dollars it would take to do extensive background checks on scores and scores of witnesses? Not even close. Not to mention the fact that when you are dealing with government people you can't get into the files. Truth is, they've been classified, what are you going to do? You might find out if they've had parking tickets. So you assume, you give them legitimacy until something develops that convinces you that they're problematic.

But there's another reason for that. People that are going to come forward on this issue, whether or not they're violating their security oaths, or non-disclosure agreements, which they feel that their advanced age, or their years of retirement, don't fly anymore or not, deserve default respect. You respect these people, you don't treat them like some problematic witness that turns up to a murder case or something that could mess up the case so you work them over in the interrogation room.

A: Absolutely.

S: Or maybe put them under arrest, as a witness arrest. You do that and you send a message to everybody in the government, 'Don't come out!' Of course not. So automatic respect. Then over time they will present, they will talk and you will be able to get a sense of whether you have confidence in that person. Because often times these testimonies interlock. A perfect example. One of the most important issues today is nuclear weapons tampering. Now if there was only one air force officer that come forward with this testimony that would be one thing. So you would assess that testimony based on that, you don't discount it out of hand, not at all. But if you attract twenty

or more, so in terms of that testimony you have total confidence. Now it's possible that one of those people is giving the same testimony but was never even there. They just want to be a part of the game. Fine. Is that going to undermine anything, no, it's not.

A: No, not at all.

S: So that's one fundamental principle. And then, the other area about selecting witnesses is that some issues, some areas are much more important than others. Some testimonies are much more relevant to the advocacy process than others. Not just anybody who has had an experience, anybody who has seen something, or worked at NASA, it doesn't mean that yeah, yeah, you put that in the pot. You are looking for the witnesses that have testimony, facts and evidence, that are very powerful in terms moving the advocacy process forward. That's how I make the selection, that's how I chose those people.

A: So ultimately that's the connecting link right there, is having the motivation to get the advocacy movement moving forward.

S: Well, it's not necessarily the motivation but rather the nature of their testimony, what they are addressing, does it have the power to advance the advocacy movement. No matter whether they are motivated or not. And if doesn't, that doesn't mean we don't treat them with respect, we don't toss them aside. It just means in terms of what I'm doing, I'm going to go for those witnesses because all of those stories will have their place and time. Post-Disclosure will have everybody with a story, with testimony, is going to want to be heard and we will want to hear their story. Right now it's all about getting to Disclosure. And so, each of those witnesses was there because I had a sufficient level of confidence that everything they were going to say, by and large, was going to be relevant, legitimate, did I approve that? No. Does that mean that there wasn't something said in that Citizen Hearing that probably was off-the-wall or definitely will prove to be not true? Not at all. There could have been some things. There wasn't much. And so as far as I am concerned, that was the most powerful assemblance of testimony and witnesses that has ever been brought together.

A: Beautiful. So do you think that it's true that the MJ-12 are desiring full disclosure as well?

S: I have heard from people, that within government, within those areas that are appropriate there is a majority view that Disclosure should happen. Okay. However, this is not a democratic process. They're not taking a vote. If there are still a number of that are opposed to it and they are raising the objections then that is a significant barrier. More importantly though, the military intelligence complex do not disclose the ET presence. They work with the President of the United States. Any unilateral action in that regard by them is high treason. (Umhmm) End of career, constitutional crisis. So just because there maybe be a consensus, unless some sort of a deal could be struck with the Executive branch, which would allow them to reach out they're not going to do anything. But the fact that, and if it is true, that a majority actually favor, intellectual Disclosure, that's one more item in the list of why Disclosure is inevitable.

A: Yeah, a good point. Well, some people want to know what do you know to be the actual security restraints that are implemented by the military intelligence complex preventing folks from stepping forward?

S: This is the most highly-classified issue in our government. So you've got a certain number of people that are working directly on this subject, on this issue in government, and their security clearances are ultra-tight, you can count on that. Lifetime ban on revealing anything, all right,

draconian penalties. Then you've got people that are outside that circle that have some interaction with it, some awareness, that are in non-disclosure agreements as well, maybe not quite so secure. There are different kinds, different levels of classification, some of them are lifetime, some an x number of years, and all of these apply. And if you violate them there are consequences. And you know, the fact is, the higher up somebody is the more money they are making, they have more to lose.

Government workers generally are family people, the vast majority of them have spouses and children all of which would suffer. Not to mention that it's against the law and so forth. So these basic tenets, now in the case of witnesses, they've been known to threaten. Researchers, they have been known to have been threatened, not so much. So these are the part of the Truth Embargo. Since 2000 that's changing. I'm not aware of any significant interference with witnesses since 2000.

A: Wow.

S: I've never been interfered with since 1996. Now part of the reason is I didn't get in until 1996. Things are changing. No, on 1996, 1997, 1998, early 1999 some very unpleasant things were happening. Let's just say they went through a reactionary period. But because I was so new they didn't bother with me, they bothered some other people but not me. And then in 2000 things started to change. But it's also the case it's the way that I approached the issue. I deliberately planned a strategy and an approach to this that would not unduly antagonize the government.

A: Yeah, I noticed that. That was a smart move on your part.

S: What is to be gained, in making enemies, with a state that has nuclear weapons. There's no good side to that. I can get on their case, but, no, and another reason for that is that we know that there are plenty people in government who probably are on our side but can't 'join up.' They're not going to believe the government and join the posse. But they're on our side. So if you're antagonizing, if you're really demonizing the government then you are demonizing them too. So that's not good. Secondly, I made a commitment from Day 1 that everything out in the open. (**A:** Good for you) Anything, no encrypting, don't care about the phone, tap me all you want, say pretty much what I'm going to do before I do it, so there's no paranoia. (Yeah) Minimizing the paranoia and cover my hat with what I'm going to do. They like that. (**A:** Yeah, big time)

Here's a wonderful little example. A number of years ago I was pulled over for speeding here in the Bethesda area. And it happened at about 10:00 o'clock. He pulled me over and I knew what the situation was. The first thing I did was put my arm on the seat and the other hand on the car door handle so that he saw my hands very early. Right? So he recognized that I was doing that so not to make his job easier and reduce his paranoia. Then, of course, I was nice. I was speeding, by the way, about 10 miles over the speed limit.

A: Was that all?

S: He gave me a warning ticket. Okay. Do you get it?

A: No, I totally get it.

S: So that is the reason that I believe – that and the timing is the reason that I've never been bothered. That can change tomorrow but if it does I will go on Coast to Coast immediately and talk about it.

A: It sounds like you made the right choice. Now one of the other things that I wanted you to go into more detail is the contactees accounts are indicating that regarding they being a part of a 'transition process' that is underway leading to Disclosure and possibly followed by open contact. What do you seem to find as the common variable amongst all the contactees that you've spoken to as far as what they are receiving, the information that they are receiving regarding Disclosure and the transition process.

S: Well, first of all, in terms of the transition model and open contact, that's me, that's my assessment.

A: It's you baby, huh?

S: That's where you heard that. In terms of contactees you have a range, a pretty complex range of interpretations. Everybody is looking into their personal filter and of course, the events themselves are complicated. You've got memory issues and all kinds of things. One of the common threads with contactees, if they are getting table work done, they don't like it. And they resent it. So there's one. (**A:** Interesting)

Contactees are frequently getting images and messages often times following table work. These messages seem to have a theme. They are shown images of environmental destruction, war, bad things. Some interpret that as a threat, some interpret that a message, some believe it is the future that are actually being shown that.

I would say though if there is a consensus emerging out of the contactee world, which includes people that aren't getting table work and it also includes people that are alleged psychic/mental. Is that there is a process underway? That is leading somewhere? And I think that the consensus is also that this process is leading to someplace okay. Now what percentage of contactees are in denial. So many of them are still in the closet, (**A:** Yes) we are dealing with a limited sample. What distinguishes this group is that they are in the public at all. So that is a defined group – those willing to be public. So who knows what the overall feeling is, the acknowledgement of those that have not.

A: You said something really interesting about how the contactees are one of the last groups of people to come out of the closet.

S: Absolutely.

A: And I thought, that is really interesting.

S: Large groups, substantially sized groups – they are the last. Okay. The gays are definitely out of the closet. The ones that are still in there are [unclear]. They're out, they're forming politically, they're getting bills passed, they're winning victories, you know, rapidly, being gay is just no longer a big deal anymore. Now are they fully out of the closet, no, but for all intents and purposes we are moving out of that phase. So there was a time when, well, Jews were in the closet, right?

A: Right. Or Christians, Christians way back thousands of years ago.

S: If you go back far enough the Christians were in the closet. So this is a very significant factor in the human experience within social contracts. Positive people. Now, we are smarter now than to know that we don't want this. It's not appropriate in our social contract, period. I get that. And that's why we're pretty much out of closets. Save one. Contactees. This is a tough closet. Okay. Why? Take a gay in 1955. Think of the entertainment business, whatever. But whatever business they are in they know that if they were to be openly gay it would have affected them, it could cost them a

job, limited their options and so forth. We know some of the actors actually grew beards, they had women just as men, they would have a girlfriend but, in fact, that was just for show. So they were in the closet unable to be open, but now they're in there and they're gay.

But the government was not going around telling people year after year after year like Ahmadinejad, that there are no gays. They don't exist in our country. They are somewhere else. So they are in the closet unable to be what you are and say who you are but your own government is telling all your fellow countrymen you don't exist. At least gays do exist. Now that is a serious problem. That's the closet that the contactees are in. The White House just stated three years ago there's no evidence of any extraterrestrial presence. So there are contactees but they can't talk about it, the government says the entities they are dealing with don't exist. This is not cool. So they've got a doubly tough time. Now they are slowly coming out. But they are nowhere near where the gays are. I'll make you a prediction right now.

A: Oh good!

S: A day will come, I seriously don't think it will be pre-Disclosure. For one thing, I want Disclosure right now, and they don't have time, so it will probably be pre-Disclosure. But the day will come that contactees are out of the closet and they will be fully politicizing themselves and they're going to exert a substantial political influence, okay. Now, post-Disclosure that influence is going to be more along the lines of policy – post-Disclosure policy, because post-Disclosure now they're out of the closet they're going to be on everybody's invite list. They will be very popular people.

A: Yeah.

S: Meaning, meeting people in a party in Georgetown and you're inviting a lot of hotshots over, you're going to have some contactees there or you're finished, right? You're social life is finished. Right? Where are the contactees? So that's not going to be the problem. Where the politics comes in is they have more first hand knowledge of the ETs than anybody else. And so, if the US Government wants to have a stupid policy regarding ETs in the post-Disclosure world, look to the contactees to politically come together and exert the kind of influence that the gays are showing now. If they somehow were able to come out of the closet pre-Disclosure, meaning we don't get it done this year, a couple more years go on, and this stupidity continues to advance, enough of them will be out of the closet, but they will be politicized. And you will have contactees of holding press conferences and making some really powerful waves, all right? Which would help the Disclosure process. But I doubt it only because the contactee era – the modern era of the contactee is only about 30 years. A little more than 30 years. The gays have been struggling in their closet much, much longer.

A: Oh yeah.

S: It would be remarkable for the contactees particularly to the Truth Embargo to move forward that quickly but you are starting to see the early stages of it. And pay attention if you look for it you will start to see the politicization of contact.

A: Interesting. Cool! I look forward to that for sure.

S: I'm sure you will be part of it.

A: So now you had also mentioned that the extraterrestrials are not a threat to the human society and the future.

S: Not a threat.

A: Okay. And my question to you is how do we know which extraterrestrials we are talking about. The reason that I say that is because my audience has gone miles and miles and miles down into the rabbit hole about all the conspiracy and alternative ways of seeing the government and the way that they operate behind close doors and there's a clear schism of the military-related ETs and the extraterrestrials that are actually here for our benevolent support. So I'd like to hear you comment on that.

S: Okay. Well, as far as the extraterrestrial engagement in terms of assessing its future outcomes you need to do a collective assessment. Because they are working together. It's obvious. There's plenty of evidence for that – that they are working together so they have to have arrangements, alliances, does that surprise anybody? Of course not. So collectively. Now in an individual basis it's possible that for the individual ETs, their ultimate intentions could be considered a little – more sour. And a little more problematic. But that individual intention is not what will prevail, the collective intention will prevail. So that's the first point. The second point: the military – MILAB – this is nasty business.

A: Very

S: But I've heard enough, have talked to enough people to believe that it's true –

A: I agree.

S: – to believe what is true is that – now I'm giving you a speculative model, okay, that military abductions take place – what I'm about to say now is a speculative supposition because I don't know for sure, nobody knows for sure. But it appears that the – obviously the government is fully aware and has been for a very long time there's been contact, right, they know that, of course they do, if only because based on the percentages there are plenty of people in the Pentagon and in the intelligence that are contactees.

A: That's true!

S: It's not like they have an off-limits to the military and if you're in a genetic line you're going to play. So they know about it.

A: That's so true.

S: Admittedly, within their own ranks, I suppose, assume that person came forward, which may or may not be a good idea, they might be able to garner some information but let's assume there's a limit amount there. So if you're the military or the intelligence and you want to know more about what the ETs are doing here, well you have several options. One, send them an email and say, What's up, guys? No, that's not going to happen. Or, you could go to the contactees' homes and introduce yourself and say, Hello, I'm Major So-and-So from the Air Force, and we know that you are in touch with extraterrestrials, and we would like you to help us. No, we can't do that because then they are basically announcing to that person that we know all about the ETs and if you do that about 50 times you've got some problems, right? So you can't do that.

So what do they do? They take the contactees and they drug them, then they take them and interrogate them and they are very powerful drugs (**A:** very powerful, yes) and they have been perfecting it for a long time and they pump them for information. And then using those same drugs, they apparently, with some success, they are able to lead that person with either a black-out of the event or give them a false memory. Usually the memory is along the lines of, this was another ET abduction.

A: Right.

S: It's a nasty business. This one of those PR problems that is going to have to be dealt with in post-Disclosure. This is one of the reasons why when they are chatting about the Disclosure potential somebody is always going to raise their hand and say, it sounds good, but you know you're going to answer to this, don't you?

A: Yes.

S: Okay. So that leaves one other matter. And that is that some have claimed that ETs are working with the military with the abductions. Well, that's interesting. If that is true, meaning the ETs that abducted you, it's easy for them to do that, and not us, and then we are able to, we are involved, for whatever reason, you are gaining something from being there present, that's an even bigger public relations problem. A *really big* public relations problem. But in that area I'm remaining still pretty neutral and there are a couple of reasons. I have to be really careful at this point because of the public relations problem it's important that we withhold judgement until we have an absolute solid proof about this. And why? Well, the extraterrestrials that we do know have extremely sophisticated ability to manipulate human minds. They can erase your memory, they can freeze you in place, they can put in false memories. So the matter of the fact is that in the middle of an abduction and the extraterrestrials dealing with you, want to see the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff that's what you want to see.

A: Absolutely.

S: So it's possible that the military figures that are seen in these events are in fact screen memories, not real military. That one thing alone means I've got to withhold judgement about this until we know a lot more. It's also possible that the military person is also a contactee and has been abducted as well. So, we're getting deep into the rabbit hole, aren't we. Oh guess what! The history of this phenomenon is extraordinarily complicated (**A:** Yes) and may have become even more complex by the Truth Embargo. And unless someone respects that degree of complication and respects the effects of the Truth Embargo they're going to get tangled up, foul some, maybe go up some blank canyons or maybe go around in circles. It is not easy to address the entire situation.

A: I know that there was some sort of agreement apparently made between the government and the extraterrestrials regarding the abductions and actually doing the human bodies, you know, analysis and experiments and things like that, but I've also heard through the grapevine, that supposedly to be halted. Have heard anything about that?

S: In the first place, how do you know there was an agreement?

A: Well, it's just so much information out there. You're right, I personally wasn't there. I have a lot of friends that are contactees.

S: Wait a minute. You're saying that contactees have told you this?

A: I have had contactees tell me some interesting stories.

S: Well, but I mean, have you had contactees telling you that there was an agreement between our government and extraterrestrials regarding a technology swap for access.

A: Well, it wasn't that detailed but some of them have picked up on that when they've been regressed and there's the problem right there is that they don't remember what happened after the time. It's not until later that their lives are all screwed up and they have to go back and get regression therapy to even remember what's causing all the pain and suffering in their lives in the first place.

S: Well, okay, that's at the individual contactees' dilemma. Let me make an obvious point. This is what happens. Particularly in a Truth Embargo setting. Some one puts out, based on whatever what they have seen a thread, in this case the thread is an Eisenhower meeting, providing certain evidence, and the people put it up like that and they tell other people, they blog it, somebody else turns up and maybe had saw something that if that is true what they saw seems to connect and they put that out. And after a number of years you have a lot of people talking about an Eisenhower meeting. When in fact, the actual fundamental genesis of it was the wrong person. This is another serious problem. I am aware of almost all the hard evidence for an Eisenhower meeting and it has not been proven.

A: Interesting.

S: More importantly, even if there was a meeting, it hasn't been proven what happened in that meeting. It's also possible, that he never met with anybody, that he simply wanted to see it, either the live one or some of the dead ones, right? That would make sense too.

A: Yeah.

S: So we don't know if there is a treaty. Now how does that matter. Well look, it matters for this reason. The advocacy movement to get the Truth Embargo and the position of the government and this stuff coming together isn't easy and if that false theory is out there, in which the government is matter-of-factly are accused of cutting a deal with extraterrestrials for the technology they never got so the ETs could have unencumbered access to human beings to experiment with, that's not a trivial matter. That seriously impacts the ability to resolve this issue. Now if it is true, it is true. Let the chips fall where they may be. But if it's not true, it's a problem. If I'm going to be able to advocate for this, I have to work from the truth.

You know, it's like the civil rights movement. There was a famous case in the civil rights movement when three civil rights activists, I think it was three, it could have been four, were murdered in Mississippi and were buried in a landfill. And this generated a great deal of intensity in response. But if the case had been that, no, that never happened, these people weren't killed, or the people were found to have never existed and the whole story was false, that wouldn't have helped the civil rights movement. It would have undermined it. All right. So it was important that whatever things were happening, that were dealt with and the people were responding to and in any other movement needed to be true. Integrity is very important in the advocacy movements. Right. You know that the government in almost case is not integrous on this. So to the extent you maintain your integrity you have a significant and important advantage.

And this is a long answer to what was a simple question, was there a meeting. But the Eisenhower case is not the only historical data point that's suspect and or not yet proven yet. There's a lot of

them. And I just want people to keep that in mind as we slog through this. And another thing I usually say is that with some confidence – I can say that at least half -at least half – of everything on the internet and in books written about this subject will prove to be wrong. It doesn't mean that it's all nefariously wrong, it doesn't mean – I mean some of it clearly is government misinformation, so that's part of it, so that's kind of nefarious, but it could simply be proven to be wrong. And that's something worth remembering.

A: Yeah.

S: Okay. The principal task that any researcher, any advocate has, right, that is dealing with this issue, is to devote a significant amount of their time to assessing everything that comes across their radar and trying to assess its validity to the best that they can and its truthfulness and stay away from the stuff that is problematic and simply do not embrace anything that turns up. It's not easy to do. And some people don't care. To them it's just something that they follow, they're interested in, for some it might even be an entertainment to them, it doesn't matter them, they're going to grab everything that comes through and who's to say that they shouldn't. They are not a researcher, they are simply a spectator and they are enjoying it. It's a hobby. There's a lot of people in that zone. So that insures that a lot of the stuff that is problematic is always going to be floating in there and that just makes the job a little harder but that's the hand that's dealt.

A: We've all have been talking lately of how there's so many lies upon lies upon lies upon lies that nobody even knows what is true anymore. Especially those of us that have been delving into all of us. Now, I am not just talking about the military or the Truth Embargo or anything like that but really we've all come to the conclusion that everything is a lie.

S: Wait a minute, now that is not fair.

A: Seriously, there's so much information out there that is continually being proven to not be that which – especially what we were brought up to believe.

S: Well, of course.

A: And the only thing that I'm saying is that same premise that you're pointing out applies to that preconceived notion that we all have, that many, many of us have, about the government, about the military, that they haven't been here for our benefit and you are just making us aware that we have to apply that same principle to that level of government as we do to everything else that we read and research.

S: That's fair enough. A proper statement you might want to make is that a significant number of people in our society now cannot determine what is true and false about a lot of things. There's a certain number of people that are so, well they're very smart, they're very informed, they're very knowledgeable and they're able to pretty much figure out what's true and what's not with a fairly high degree of accuracy but it's a very small minority. A lot of people don't care one way or another. Now, the fact of it is, the percentage of people in our society right now that are increasingly unable to determine the truth from falsehood with respect to government issues, including the extraterrestrial issue, is a percentage that is dangerous. It's too high. It's never going to be zero, believe me. But it's way too high. And that's a threat to our society. And by and large the government is strictly responsible for this.

A: Yes. Yes.

S: Period. And another thing that people in the field don't get, they are forgetting about the government and just putting that aside and then reacting to stuff and other people in the field based on the absence of that clarity that makes a big mistake. All right?

A: Good point.

S: When people get things wrong, when people do something stupid in this field, and I tell you, this Truth Embargo makes fools of us all. Nobody escapes the Truth Embargo's consequences. The Truth Embargo makes fools of everybody. When something like that happens rather than to jump down that person's throat, I just remind myself repeatedly that this person is a victim of a Truth Embargo.

A: Absolutely. And they have the capacity technologically, you've got your trolls, you've got the capability to get into people's computers, into their emails, they have so much access, to technology we don't even know about.

S: Oh yeah, there's that. There are so many ways that they can mess with us.

A: There's so many things that they can do and still do, to create, I see it all the time, create dissension amongst even those of us that should be in union, working together. And this is the reason that I brought this up, by the way.

S: We're never going to have a broad-based coalition on this field assuming the truth on this, it's never going to happen. The Truth Embargo has been so effective,

A: Yes, it has.

S: that it couldn't happen. Now they would say, I don't know what happens in the field. The civil rights movement developed a pretty much broad-based substantial advocacy movement that had – it had its break-offs, and its dissensions – but it was pretty broad-based. Opposing segregation in the South evolved into the Civil Rights Act in 1964. But the United States government hadn't instituted the decades-long policy of propaganda and misinformation to convince large segments of the population and the press that there was no segregation in the South – that that was an illusion. There really is no segregation down there, what are you complaining about?

A: And throwing trillions of dollars at too.

S: I don't think it's trillions but spending a lot of money to completely confuse everybody.

A: Yeah.

S: They didn't do that so a coalition could be brought together. But this issue, the government's position still to this day, and only put in writing for the first time in 2011 in November the 4th. There is no evidence for any of it. And then of course they are messing with the field. So there's never going to be that broad-based – so everybody that's upset about that needs to understand it ain't gonna happen. So just accept that and those that want to get on the band wagon and those that want to get on the train, are going to get on, and those that can't, won't – we don't have to have a huge phalanx of deeply cooperating people in groups, even if we could afford it which we can't, to get this done. But we're just doing fine. Well, we're doing pretty good right now. It's moving along.

A: Yeah, we are. I think we are doing really well right now.

So now to kind of segue away from that conversation, now there was a really aggressive closure of the military bases in the early 1990s, (S: Right) and does this line up with the end of the Cold War?

S: Yeah, sort of.

A: I'm just curious do you think this was catalyzed by anything to do with the Truth Embargo?

S: Oh, God, who knows? The Truth Embargo is a massive variable and I'm sure that it is a factor in a whole lot of stuff. But not being acknowledged. The base closures was done mostly because of economics. A lot of pressure on the budget. And the progressives had some leverage. And the Pentagon doesn't go out to spend its money, they had other things to spend money on so they closed a lot of the bases that weren't necessary. I think that was not particularly meaningful event, okay.

A: Okay. I was just curious because, you know, come on, you've heard the information about how they are using a lot of these bases for the very subject that we've brought up, like the MILABS –

S: They didn't need to close bases to play games like that. Look, I've been to some of these things. They are converted into business parks and stuff. The base where I was born, Mare Island, the Naval Hospital, right, was a converted closed base. No, it wasn't for that purpose. They have plenty of underground facilities, they have them all over the place. Now admittedly, if they closed it, but when they close a base down usually the property gets re-used. We've got some people up there mucking around you don't want an entrance to an underground facility there. No, no, here's the reality. As of 2009, the United States was spending more money on its military and defence than all the rest of the nations in the world put together.

A: Wow.

S: Now this is just incomprehensible. We have more over a thousand of bases around the world, we still have 5800 nuclear weapons. As of 2014, because of the economic collapse, right, that was triggered by the Republicans in 2008 our growth has slowed some and so right now, our spending is the equivalent of the next 8 countries, okay. And let me really put that in perspective. A lot of people will be shocked to hear this. The United States as of 2015 is spending about 570 billion dollars on defence, military and secret operations. And it's probably more than that because a lot of the secret funding is not disclosed. (A: Yes) Russia is spending 17 billion dollars. The great bear, the great threat, the United States is being outspent 35 to 1. And yet we're doing everything we can to irritate them. Encroach, push them, to the point where we've got the basis for a new confrontation and possible Cold War. This is what I mean by wrong equations.

A: Yes

S: All right. And so yes, we've closed a bunch of bases but, trust me, the trillions are still pouring down that hole. (A: My God) And one of the reasons of that, by the way, that justifies this internally, is the ET issue. Because the Cold War ended but the ETs haven't gone anywhere. So internally, we got some people saying, just in case, we're really going to keep building these weapons because, you never know, we might have to fight these ETs. So it's a big justification for maintaining a massive military presence. And you know, the way they think, I could give some briefing in the Pentagon, not that I'm invited, and I could spend hours making a very powerful case that it's an utter waste of money, right, because anybody that knows anything about physics knows, would know right now, that we haven't a snowball's chance of dealing successfully in a military engagement with extraterrestrials. We haven't a chance – all those movies where we win in the end are completely fiction. Nonsense. Okay. And if somehow, if over a period of time we started

developing a technological weapon so powerful that we could be a threat to them and they cared, they would just take us out before we had a chance to build it.

So it's all in an old equation being solved over and over again. They cannot give you the right answer. And so, our country slowly falls apart, bridges, roads, and environments, education systems, medical systems, while we spend more money in defence and the military, than the next 8 nations combined and we think that somehow that's going to work out okay.

A: It's crazy. So what I want to talk to you also about is the Obama Administration. And this is a little bit of a long question but there's a purpose for it so bear with me.

S: I give you long answers so you can give long questions.

A: So you've stated many, many times in your interviews that you had provided a Disclosure petition to the White House back in 2011 –

S: I rarely miss an opportunity.

A: And you generated a response from the Obama Administration and the response basically was that “The U.S. government has no evidence that any life exists outside our planet, or that an extraterrestrial presence has contacted or engaged any member of the human race. In addition, there is no credible information to suggest that any evidence is being hidden from the public's eye.” Okay, that's Number One.

S: Probably the most bogus paragraph ever written by any government in history!

A: Yes. And Number Two is John Podesta who admitted through a personal tweet that his biggest regret was leaving the Administration with unfinished UFO business. Now I'm not sure if you are aware of this but just as recently as last month Obama came on the Kimmel Show and one of the comments that was made was when he asked Obama if he looked at Area 51 and UFOs, Obama's comment was, “The aliens won't let it happen. You will reveal all of their secrets. They exercise strict control over us.”

S: As all said with the half of his tongue in his cheek.

A: So my point is, apparently, he is the first president to actually mention Area 51. Clinton supposedly made reference to it but he actually mentioned it, and I think my question is, isn't this a little bit of soft disclosure?

S: It's more than that.

A: I'm curious what you think.

S: All right, here we go. Get ready.

A: I'm getting ready!

S: You opened the door to basically give your last audience a quick summation of the status of the Congressional Hearing Initiative.

A: Awesome.

S: The Congressional Hearing Initiative was supposedly to launch in November 2013. But after the Citizen Hearing was over a lot of stuff went wrong. And that's just life. So it was delayed. Eventually, I made an announcement, probably in late January, in which I announced that we would

launch the Congressional Hearing Initiative on March 31st. And what that meant was that on March 31st, 2014, we would ship the full 30-hour record of the Citizen Hearing with all that testimony to every member of Congress, for every Congressional office, accompanied with a letter signed by the witnesses calling for hearings, calling them to review that DVD material and meet with me – meet with a registered lobbyist for PRG.

Now as it happens, in the very first day of the Citizen Hearing, at the afternoon session, for three hours, was on the Rockefeller Initiative. And the Rockefeller Initiative was a three-year effort by billionaire Laurence Rockefeller to convince President Clinton to release all the UFO files in the government's possession and grant amnesty to witnesses that might come forward. In other words, spill the beans. Which would have triggered Disclosure, it would have resulted in Disclosure. We know this because we have a thousand pages of documents via folia obtained by Grant Cameron in 2000. So we know all about it. Plus many of the researchers which were involved are still alive. So what happened was, in 2000, in late 2000 maybe early 2001, Grant Cameron got those thousand pages of files, sent me a copy, I made a couple of copies, and handed the whole set over the U.S. News & World Report newspaper and the Washington Post *who did absolutely nothing*.

And Grant flipped the files up on his website. In a year and half later I put the files up on my website along with a lot of other material at Paradigm Group Research.org and then talked about it repeatedly, sent faxes to the Congress, anybody could have gone and seen it, okay. Nothing. Now, why is this important? Very important.

What happened is that the major funder of the Democratic Party, a friend of the President and his wife, initiated an initiative that went on for three years. They held meetings, reports, letters, and the people that knew about it was the President, and his wife – I think her name is Hillary – his key advisor John Podesta, his Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, his very close Vice-President Albert Gore and another very close friend and political colleague who became his Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson. It went on for three years. But the press never covered it. One story was written in the New York Post by Deborah Orin – who is now deceased – and that was it. And in the 22 years since it began, none of those six people I have mentioned has ever, ever uttered a single word about it. Or has ever been asked a single question about it. Interesting.

CONTINUED IN PART 2