

The Anglo-Saxon Mission - Interview transcript

Audio interview recorded January 2010

http://projectcamelot.org/lang/en/anglo_saxon_mission_interview_transcript_en.html

BILL RYAN (B): I want to thank you for coming forward with what was immediately clear to me, once I'd read your written debrief, that you have some highly significant information that needs to be shared. And it's our job at Project Camelot to assist you in reaching people who are aware enough to understand what you're saying, why it's important, and to put it in perspective with other information that they may have.

And to introduce all of this, I wonder if you could say what it is that you're prepared to say on record about your background, about your history... just in general what you think is okay to share about how it is that you've actually been positioned to get a hold of the information that you're going to be reporting.

WITNESS (W): Okay. Well, the information I've shared with you already, I feel, it's not Earth-shattering. I feel it's something that a lot of people will already have grasped with the amount of information that is getting put out on the internet already.

If there's any uniqueness within the information that I'm providing to you, that I feel should be shared, is that it's first-hand information and it's given to you freely for those who wish to use it and to inform themselves. I think that that's my initial position on this.

For my part, I've spent a long time in the military and then held a senior position in the City of London, and within both institutions I became very intimate with events that were being manufactured secretly, covertly, on behalf of a group of people -- I can't say it's on behalf of a nation or a community because it's certainly none of that -- but it's certainly something is to do with a group of people whose interests lie within themselves and what they're doing to coerce a series of events to happen.


Looking back with hindsight now, I can see quite clearly they're being most successful in doing what they're doing. And I feel, because of what I know, that time is running out for these people.

So the timeline that I'm going to describe is somehow ... and that's an apt title, really, because a timeline starts somewhere and it ends somewhere and these people are very well aware of it.

We're coming up to a critical time now, which everybody's discussing at the moment. I'm very well aware of that. But the information I've brought may put some flesh on the bones for other people to consider themselves.

And as for the veracity of it, I can only tell you that what I'm going to tell you is truthful, albeit lots of people may think it's a perception. I'm quite happy with that, too. But it's been my experience, and it's that experience that I'm going to share.

B: Yes. What would be great is if you can differentiate between information which came at you first-hand when you were physically in meetings with some of these



people, and other information that you've got that was through more subjective means, which you may feel very confident in. It's important to separate out the provenance of the information. But for you, of course, and for many other people who will be reading this, it actually forms a coherent picture. Right?

W: Yes. I think that's important. I think anything like this has to be coherent. And of course there is a subjective element to it; I mean, I can't deny that. But, you know, all of it could be looked at as being subjective, but it's also from a witness point of view. Hopefully, how I'm going to describe it, people will be able to see through any subjective

feelings I've got about it and get to the core of what's going on.

B: Right. Now, if you could just add a little bit of detail about the group that you referred to. Does this group have any kind of name that they're calling themselves? Is this a group that other people reading this would recognize when cross-referencing information?

W: I've had difficulty myself in trying to describe these people. I've called them like a "Band of Brothers." I've also called them an "over-government". There's also other names I could call them, some of them derogatory, and that would be deserved. [laughs] But I think the best way, the most sensible way to describe these people so that people can understand what they're like, is they're like an over-government, because that's what they're doing.

B: Are you talking about British people here, or international people?

W: The meeting that I will refer to later, it was all British, and some of them are very well known characters who people in the United Kingdom will recognize immediately. Those who are international who might read this might have to do bit of research on them. But they are national figures, some of them.

B: Are they political figures? Or are they figures in the "noble classes", so to speak?

W: Yes, there is a bit of aristocracy there, and some of them come from quite aristocratic backgrounds. There's one who I identified at that meeting who is a senior politician. Two others were senior figures from the police, and one from the military. Both are known nationally and both are key figures in advising the present government - - at this present time.

B: And inasmuch as there's a political component to this, does this political component go across both parties?

W: No, this senior political component belongs to the right-wing party in Britain, the Conservative Party.

B: Okay. For the benefit of American readers, that would be the equivalent of the Republicans.

W: Yes.

B: All right. So, it's an insider group that functions in Britain as many American readers of this transcript would recognize by analogy -- it's like the American secret government. You're talking about politicians behind the scenes who are still very influential, links with the police, links with the military. Are there also American military links in there?

W: Yes.

B: Okay.

W: One significant military figure, now retired, but active in advising government.

B: Okay. Are you aware of or did you hear any discussion of any participation by church authorities or the Vatican or any of the religions of the world? Was this mentioned as part of their strategic planning for all of this?

W: No. Not at all, but I know the Church of England, especially, is complicit in everything that's going on, totally complicit.

B: Okay. And you know this because of the close relationship between senior figures in the Church of England and the group that you met with in the City of London?

W: Absolutely. You don't need a forensic expert to find that one out. That's quite open.

B: Okay. Is this all fundamentally Masonic?

W: Absolutely. There's no question about that. Everybody is vetted through that process, through the Masonic process, and then they get to meet one another.

That's something that people need to understand. There are levels in Masonry. You know, most Masons don't really know anything at all, and they're out there doing good work for the most part and they get the benefit of a kind of "club," as it were. But that goes through various levels. Some people call it by "degrees" or whatever. But it's a Who's Who. That is -- who can be trusted, who can be brought together, who's holding power, who's likely to develop more power.

And these people attract one another and they get together because they all have a single cause. But it's not exactly like a Masonic cause, you know. It's something that can be likened to it, but not the same as it.

B: Could you explain that a little more clearly?

W: Well, I think the best way to explain this is: Masonry, is to my knowledge, is just a vehicle for these people. It allows them to come together quietly, in secret, behind closed doors, get to know one another, feel safe and secure knowing confidently that what's said in these meetings go no further than those meetings. So it's got that Masonic element to it, but this goes to an entirely different level altogether.

Now, the meeting that I'm talking about, I don't even consider these people to be a significant level -- significant enough for me at the time -- but they were discussing things that were already agreed upon and planned and dictated. They were really getting together to share information, to find out how well it was going and what was needed to keep it on track.

B: So things had already been decided at an even higher level than this. Is that what you're saying?

W: That was very clear. From what I heard, they weren't a decision-making group. They were like an action group. They were people who needed to come together now and

then to discuss together what needs to be done, or what is getting done, and what should be getting done. And then they disperse and go back and do what they need to do, as a result of these meetings.

B: Okay. And you attended one meeting?

W: Only one.

B: And in what capacity did you attend this meeting?

W: By sheer accident! I thought it was a normal three-monthly meeting because I looked at the e-mail list, which had familiar names on it, and I was on it. But by that time, because of the senior position I held within the City, I just thought it was quite normal for me to be earmarked for this kind of meeting.

So when I went to the meeting, it wasn't the same venue as before. It was a livery company venue, which is quite unusual, but not too unusual to wonder why. I went to this meeting and it was not the meeting that I was expecting. I believe I was invited... it was because of the position I held and because they believed that, like themselves, I was one of them.

B: So you were included because they already knew you. You were regarded as a safe pair of hands.

W: Absolutely. Yes. I was a safe pair of hands. I was a do-er. I was one of the people who, at my level within the organization, got things done.

B: Okay.

W: And I was regarded as that. Lots had known me for some time, even the most senior figures within them. I mean, it was first-name terms, that sort of thing. And I'd also been regularly invited to various functions, social functions, and things like that where I became familiar with some of them and some of them became very familiar with me.

So it was easy-going, quite professional, nothing out of the ordinary, although bells started to ring about what they were up to and what they were doing and the kind of decisions that they were making, which by and large, I *ignored*. It seems unusual, but there was a part of me that wanted to ignore what was going on.

B: Are you saying that in this particular meeting we're talking about, the people who attended the meeting were familiar to you, largely, and you'd attended other meetings with them before; but this was a meeting with a difference because it was in a different location and with a different agenda, although the delegates to the meeting were basically the same group? Is that what you're saying?

W: No, not exactly. I knew most of the attendees at the meeting, but not all. There were about 25 or 30 people were at the meeting. And it was looked rather informal, you know, people getting to know one another, re-acquainting themselves as people do. There was nothing unusual about that. It was when the subjects started to come up that my astonishment started to rise at what was being said.

B: Was it like a formal chaired meeting around a table, with notes and water glasses, and all of that kind of stuff?

W: None of the sort. There were no notes taken -- nothing. It was really a behind-closed-doors meeting with people talking over one another, some people holding the audience, spelling out what their concerns were, catapulting onto other things that they thought were of concern to them.

And then describing, which I can only say is the "timeline of events" that they had anticipated to be happening, to be on course, and lots of concerns because it wasn't. And what was meant to happen on the timeline that hadn't happened, and what actions were going to be taken for it to happen.

And this is where things started to get quite surreal -- because I'd never been in the company of people like this, talking like that.

Now, the group of people who I was most familiar with, the people who do the work within the City, they belong to various well known financial committees; some of them quite diverse committees, but they all belong to the same organization. These are people who go unseen; most people don't know who they are. I know them. I know them by sight, know them by name. I know them by what they do.

It was the other people who were there at the time that surprised me. Three others in particular. There were more people there who were at their type of level as well who I couldn't really identify, but three of significance, certainly.

B: Okay, now when was this meeting? Let's put a date on it.

W: Okay. We're talking 2005. It was after the May general election -- that's when Blair was voted back in again. That meeting definitely took place some time in June of that year.

B: It is okay to put on record that it was in June?

W: June 2005 is fine. Yes.

B: All right. Now I wonder then if you could spell out what it was that was discussed at that meeting.

W: Well, as I mentioned, I was quite surprised to see the amount of people who were there. The meeting ranged from several discussions covering several items or things that were happening at the world in the time, so there was quite a big discussion about security within the country. And one of those three key persons there has now assumed the role over this... is actually doing it now. He's there now. He's in that position right now.

The big thing at the time was Iraq. That was on their agenda, but also, surprisingly, there was lots of conversation and talk about Iran. And what surprised me and really raised my eyebrows, was mention, *open* mention -- this was people talking comfortably to one another, not arguing or shouting -- but talking *comfortably* about the Israeli reluctance to strike and provoke Iran into armed action. That was something that really raised the hairs on the back of my neck.

And it seemed as if the Israeli government was tied onto what was going on here and had a role to play which was being dictated outside Israeli borders. A year later, Israel attacked Iranian-backed Hezbollah bases in Lebanon.

And then the second thing that came out that I recall quite clearly was mention of Japanese reluctance to create havoc within the Chinese financial sectors.

I really couldn't understand why they were talking about that and why that had any importance. What I picked up from this seemed to be the Japanese government, or those in Japan, being coerced or ordered into doing something that would wreck or slow down the Chinese rise to financial power.

It was mentioned that China was growing too quickly and the main beneficiary of that growth was the Chinese

military, which was getting modernized, mostly through the money that they were getting from the world market.

And then things... and this is where I can't help but be subjective, Bill. Because at the time I recall I started to feel quite sick about what was being spoken about, and very anxious about what was being said.

I was on the periphery of this meeting and I could feel the anxiety just rise up inside me because this was stuff that was getting spoken about off the cuff. It wasn't getting *announced* to anybody. This was things that they already knew about.

So then there was open talk about the use of biological weapons, where and when they would be used, and the timing. And timing always appears to be crucial.

And then there was more talk centered on how Iran must be engaged militarily in order to provoke the desired military response from *China*.

There was a clear expectation of goading Iran into some sort of armed conflict with the West, with China coming to the aid of Iran. Through this goading, either China or Iran would use a tactical nuclear weapon of some sort.

And, as I mentioned, these people weren't making decisions. They were discussing something that had already been planned, so they were simply sharing their information between themselves. And it became clear as these discussions went on that the central issue of this meeting was when the balloon would go up -- when all this would happen.

Other talk centered on dealing with finances, resources, protection of assets, and a control of these resources and bringing in outlying assets. And I can go through this chain of events with you now, Bill, if you like.

B: I'd be really happy to go into as much detail as you feel you can.

W: Okay. Now, as I previously mentioned, they needed either the Chinese or the Iranians to be guilty of the first use of nuclear weapons in order to justify the next stage.

Now, I've already added, and this is anecdotal, so it can't be confirmed. But my information coming through in this meeting, and from elsewhere, positively indicates that the Iranians do indeed have a tactical nuclear capability right now. They're not *developing* it. They've *got* it.

B: Some say they might have got it from the Russians, maybe. Do you have any idea about that?

W: I believe it's from the Chinese.

B: From the Chinese... okay.

W: It's because the Chinese technology has been, for many years, used in their missile systems. They're getting missile technology also from the Russians as well, but this is mostly ground-to-air missile systems, that sort of thing -- defensive weapons. Tactical missile weaponry -- that technology is coming via China.

B: Do you have some expertise in this subject from your own military background?

W: Yes, I do.

B: Okay, so this means that in this meeting where you were hearing this information, you were able to hear this wearing your military hat, with your military experience, and understand strategically and tactically what it was they were talking about and why.

W: Oh, absolutely. I could have even stepped in and corrected their terminology because I believe they were getting it wrong, but they were just describing it the best way they could.

B: Right.

W: So yes, I do have quite a deep knowledge of those types of weapons, and weapons systems in general.

B: Weapons systems in general; sure. Okay, back to where we were, that was a little footnote that you put in there, saying that you felt, anecdotally, but you're also confident in that opinion, that Iran did actually have a current nuclear capability.

W: Yes, if I can put this in here, Bill, before this escapes me... it's anecdotal in the sense that the discussion didn't mention that Iran *didn't* have them. The discussion leant toward the Iranians *having* that type of weapon and not having them. I think the distinction would have been made there -- if they didn't have them. It wasn't mentioned that they DIDN'T have them. It leant towards them having such weapons already.

B: I understand. Now, I don't want to get you off track, but there's the potential analogy with the Iraqi situation, where Western governments and military, whether they really knew the truth or not, were certainly telling the public that the Iraqi military capability was far greater than it really was. Is it possible that there was some delusion here with respect to Iran's capability? Or do you think they really did know what the Iranians have and could do?

W: Making a comparison with Iraq is a natural thing to do. However, in this context, I think it could mislead.

The backing that Iraq got during the Iran-Iraq War was mostly Western. And of course "Western" we must include Israel, so the likelihood of Iraq getting a nuclear weapon that they haven't produced themselves, but getting it imported to them, would be extremely low.

Now, the other side of the coin is Iran. Now, Iran is being continuously backed by China and then later by the Russians; and also by other countries too. The military market is quite an open one and in that we can even include the French, who quite independently export their weapons out wherever they can.

B: Yes.

W: Even in defiance of conventions in place about the sale of weapons abroad. But this goes a bit beyond that. We're talking about a country that's being *used* quite well by another country throughout the revolutionary period -- where they have been seen as an enemy of all the Western states, and also the Gulf states as well.

B: You mean, you're referring to Iran being used by China?

W: China. Yes. They're both using each other, of course. China's economy is skyrocketing. I don't know if it's reached its plateau now or not, and I'm not talking about that. But the amount of weaponry and the level of technical expertise that Iran is receiving from the Chinese military -- it seems inconceivable that nuclear weapons haven't been included within any package that goes there; whether that comes under the direct control of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards or jointly by the Iranians and the Chinese. One can't be sure.

But I go back to what I said before, that at that meeting, the assumption was -- and it was quite clear -- that the

Iranians HAD such weapons in their possession because it wasn't mentioned to the contrary.

B: Understood. And what you're going to go on to talk about is how this cooperation between Iran and China was going to be used as a way to get at *China* -- because China's the main target. Is this correct?

W: That's correct. China has been the main target since at least the mid 70s -- and again, this information it's through third parties so I can't give you any direct first-hand evidence of this -- but it's always been China. It was always China that is to be the big one in this timeline.

B: Mm hm.

W: It's China that they're after right now, and it's all about how to coerce and create the scenario where this type of -- well, it's going to be war, Bill; there's going to be a war -- how this can be realized and how it can be made credible to everybody here living in the West?

And the way it's going to be made credible is by a state like Iran being used as a patsy to use a nuclear weapon in order to elicit an exchange.

B: And the whole justification of this, then, is to provide or to trick China into a war, with what reason?

W: China will then come to the aid of Iran, very quickly. And what we're talking about is these "Roads to Jerusalem," as it were. And it should be no surprise that the Chinese have got their own "Road to Jerusalem," so to speak, because that's where the oil is -- their lifeline -- and that's where their power could be extended far more than where it is at the moment.

B: I didn't understand what you meant there by *Jerusalem*. Was that a metaphor, talking about Iran?

W: Yes. It was my metaphor. Although I haven't mentioned it to you previously, you know, they talk about "the road to Jerusalem," as it were. People like Benjamin Netanyahu use it quite a lot. Obama has used it. The Chinese president has actually used it, I believe, too. Hu Jintao, his name is. They've actually used this metaphor.

B: I didn't know that.

W: Yes, they have. It's where that road lies. Does it lie through Tehran, going one way? Or does it lie through Tehran again, coming the other way?

B: Okay, so you're using it basically as a metaphor for a desired goal, something that's reached and attained.

W: That's right.

B: Okay. So what you're saying, then, is that there's a long-term plan which has been decided quite a while ago to set up the situation, to set up the chessboard, the global chessboard, so that there *will* be a war with China. This is what you're saying.

W: Yes, in a nutshell. You've got it. It's a whole series of events, and a lot of them have been realized. And again I can only emphasize that time seems to be critical.

B: What has happened, and what is yet to happen, and what is the eventual roll-out plan that they want to happen if everything that they wanted were to occur?

W: Well, the plan is for the fuse to be set off in the Middle East again, in a way that would make the previous conflicts in the Middle East look like playground scraps.

It will involve the use of nuclear weapons and, again, it's to create an atmosphere of chaos and extreme fear, not just in the West but throughout the world, and to put in

place what I've mentioned as unified totalitarian Western governments; and to do this China needs to be taken out, politically and socially, for this to happen.

B: So what they're doing here, they're killing two birds with one stone. They're using this as a justification to create what many on the internet have called the One World Government, except that's not including China. You're talking about the Western nations in lockdown alliance against this new threat.

W: It's specifically the Western nations, but I think we've also got to include Japan in this too.

B: And how about Russia? Where does Russia stand?

W: I believe Russia is a player, but I've got no evidence. For some reason or other Russia really doesn't get a look in here; and it's just an assumption of mine that that Russian government that's in place at the moment is hand-in-hand with the controlling players that are here in the West.

B: Hm. So you're saying that because in this meeting that you attended, Russia wasn't mentioned as a major factor.

W: No, none at all. The only way it was mentioned is that the whole idea is to create a condition of chaos throughout the world. It would mean the later use of biological weapons, widespread food shortages, which will affect vulnerable countries across the globe, followed by mass starvation and disease.

The only mention that Russia gets in here is an odd one which I can't explain and maybe someone else can. I can't really get my head around this. But within this meeting it was mentioned: "to cause the Chinese military to attack Eastern Russia". Now, I can't qualify that and why that was mentioned at the meeting - I just don't know.

B: Okay. So just to go back to what I mentioned a minute ago, about two birds with one stone. One goal here, then, is to establish a united alliance of Western countries with a kind of totalitarian "emergency war footing", heavy control aspect to it. And the other aspect is actually to light the fire of this war, which will result in all kinds of chaos and presumably an enormous number of people dying somewhere.

W: Yes.

B: The Chinese population? Or everyone on the planet? Is this part of the population reduction plan? What did they say?

W: Well, there was talk about biological agents being used, described as being flu-like and it would spread like wildfire. Now, they didn't mention it at this meeting, but I know now that it will attack people genetically, not everybody together. How that would happen... I'm not a geneticist, I really don't know. One can only assume that it's linked to DNA in some way.

B: Mm hm.

W: And the differences that are found in DNA. These differences have been identified and the viruses can be made that could kill a person off and do it quite quickly.

B: And so the viruses are genetically targeted is what you're saying?

W: Yes.

B: Genetically targeted for racial type, or more specific even than that?

W: Racial type. I can be quite definite on that. They're talking about *extinction* of a whole part of the human race, doing so genetically.

B: Really? Did they mention that in this meeting, in those terms?

W: Not exactly. Those are my terms. But this is how it was mentioned, and this is my recall of it and how this came out and how I've interpreted it.

B: Okay.

W: But that's what it most definitely alluded to.

B: Are they talking about getting the Chinese out of the way because they're an inconvenient major group that's not playing ball with the global plans? Or are they talking about this as an excuse to thin down the entire world's population, including that in the Western countries?

W: Well, it's a very good question and as far as I can see, it's a hypothetical one. Again, I can't give you an answer to that one. From a personal point of view, it definitely appears to be a thinning of the world's population and it's getting it down into a controllable size for this government that's going to come, in order for them to have the control that they wish for. Otherwise, they wouldn't have it.

It even sickens me to speak about this now, it really does. It sickens me no end that they would go ahead and do this sort of thing; that such things have actually been spoken about. They're bringing the population down to what they coldly believe to be a "manageable level".

B: Can you reference in this meeting that you attended to those levels, or the numbers, or the percentages, or anything tangible that you can remember?

W: Yes. They're talking about half.

B: Wow. That's a lot of people.

W: Yes. It is.

B: Okay.

W: That's bringing it back down by half.

B: So that's more than the Chinese, then. That answers that question, doesn't it?

W: Well, in a nuclear exchange -- and I believe there will be a limited nuclear exchange -- there will be some sort of ceasefire. That was spoken about; they anticipated a quick ceasefire, but not before millions had already died, principally in the Middle East.

So we're probably talking about Israel here, the population in Israel being sacrificed. Also places like Syria, Lebanon, possibly Iraq, definitely Iran, you know, the towns and major cities, power plants and so forth, that sort of thing. And then a ceasefire before it goes full-out.

B: A cease...? Wow. Sorry, I'm interrupting you, I do apologize. A ceasefire before it goes full-out?

W: Yes, it's like some sort of game of poker where they already know what hands are going to be dealt. They know what's going to be dealt. They know that scenario could be brought about and that scenario can be ended again with a ceasefire. So we'll have the ceasefire, and it's during this time of the ceasefire that events will start to really take off.

B: Do you know how?

W: Yes. This is when biological weapons will be used.

B: Oh...

W: This will create the conditions where biological weapons can be used. And here you've got to imagine a world, now post-nuclear war, or limited nuclear war, in chaos, financial collapse, totalitarian governments coming into place.

B: And a lot of damage to infrastructure.

W: People living in total fear and panic -- this is what's going to happen next. You'll have a scenario... and this again was talked about, and I can go into some detail about how people will become more controllable with no one coming out in contention about what's going to happen because their own safety and security has now been placed firmly in the hands of those who are saying they can protect it best.

And it's in this ensuing chaos of a post-nuclear exchange that these biological weapons will be deployed in such a fashion where there will be no structure, no safety-nets, for anybody to counter this type of biological onslaught.

And it should be mentioned, for those who are not aware, that biological weapons are just as effective as nuclear ones; it just takes a while longer -- that's all.

B: Yes. Now, the deployment of the biological weapons following the ceasefire, is that something that happens covertly, like all of a sudden people will start getting ill and no one knows where it came from? Or is this an overt weapon deployment that would be very obvious?

W: I don't think it would be overt, because the Chinese people are going to be hit by the flu! So there'll be a worldwide flu epidemic, perhaps, with a country like China -- or China, because China is mentioned -- being the one that's going to suffer most.

B: Okay. Now, if you were a Chinese military commander, what would you do in this situation? Presumably you would retaliate.

W: Yes, indeed. The type of retaliation the Chinese armed forces could provide is not the same as those that are held in the West. The type of weapons that the West can deploy very, very quickly far outstrips anything that's within the technological grasp of the Chinese armed forces at the moment -- although they're getting better as time goes on.

But when I'm talking about China, we're talking about the People's Liberation Army, the People's Army, getting together quite quickly, and you're talking about mass movements of troops somehow into zones where they can engage with their opposite number.

And in this type of exchange that's going to be nuclear... that's why I mentioned right at the very beginning... there will be a conventional war to begin with, then it will quickly go to nuclear with either Iran or the Chinese being provoked into first use, is because they won't be able to be in a position to defend themselves properly against what the West can deliver conventionally without going nuclear first.

B: Okay. So the Chinese are going to be obliged to go into a preemptive strike.

W: Yes, all their options will be taken away from them... the retaliatory options will be taken away from them quite quickly and they wouldn't have time to recover.

B: Okay, now, what you were describing there was the situation before the ceasefire, when China was going to be provoked into using nuclear weapons.

W: I think it's best to look at this in stages. So we're talking about a conventional war of sorts; that war then eliciting the use of a nuclear weapon either by the Chinese or by the Iranians.

B: Okay.

W: Probably more likely by Iran, to stop it going any further. Then we're talking about an exchange of weapons and then a ceasefire before we have something that's no longer confined to a geographical area.

B: What does that look like? Is this global? For instance, are you talking nuclear weapons on American territory, in Europe, and so forth?

W: No. Global nuclear war wasn't mentioned.

B: Okay.

W: It was just purely geographical, Middle East.

B: Okay. So actually some people would refer to this as the Armageddon war, the war that's been prophesied.

W: Yes. That's right. For those who are looking down those roads, you know, it certainly highlights a time where this sort of thing is going to occur. But probably not the way they thought, because I can't emphasize this too much: people in general are going to be placed into such a state of panic and fear that they're going to wish for a strong government everywhere.

They won't call them totalitarian governments; they'll be military governments with the civil government still there but in a redundant mode. The military will call the shots - - the same way as a general does in Afghanistan, or previously in Iraq. The general in command takes over the scene. He makes the calls.

So we have to imagine the same sort of thing within a country where you've got a military-based civil government, calling the shots, with the so-called elected government almost redundant. The military-based government will provide the security for the people who are living in these countries who have yet to be affected by this type of onslaught.

B: Okay. What's the timing for this series of events, as best you know?

W: As best I know... 18 months. It's definitely before 2012.

B: Okay.

W: Or around 2012, sometime in that year.

B: Now somebody reading this will ask: *Okay, so this is what they were discussing in 2005. How can you know that this plan is still on track, that things haven't changed radically, that they haven't abandoned it completely, that there hasn't been some big U-turn or epiphany here?* What makes you so certain that this is still on track?

W: Because of the events that have taken place since 2005. I think that's probably the most coherent way to look at it. We've already had a so-called financial collapse. It wasn't a collapse at all. It was a *centralization* of financial power. That's happened. It's certainly happened in the United States. It's most certainly happened in the United Kingdom. It's most certainly happened in France and in Germany. So all the key players in the Western world centralized their financial assets.

B: Was this talked about in the meeting?

W: Yes! It took up quite a large part of that meeting about how it was going to happen. Bear in mind where

the meeting took place -- in the City of London. The City is the financial hub of the world, beyond any question.

B: So what you're saying then is that all of these things have happened according to their roll-out of this plan.

W: That's right -- and all the preparations that need to be in place before this type of conflict takes place, that's already been put in place too.

B: Such as what? What are you referring to?

W: Well you're talking about key figures taking over. Let's take a good example here and this is one that probably most people in the United Kingdom are unaware of, is that the British private security industry employs somewhere in the region of 500,000 people, which is far more than the UK military. The UK military is far smaller than that. The UK military is only a couple of hundred thousand. You're talking 500,000 people working in private security industry at the moment.

Now prior to 2005, there was no regulation for that. There was no training for them. There was no unification of that force of people. And behind the scenes -- and this is something people should be able to be aware of, especially living in the UK -- there was the 2001 Private Security Industry Act.

Now, that act meant that anybody working within the private sector had to undergo certain training. They also had to be police-checked. It makes a kind of civilian sense for people who are working in areas of such security responsibility should be police-checked.

These police checks... everything gets found out. It's not just if you've committed a crime or not. Believe me, you can find out far much more about that individual through a police check.

And then there's training. This training is all about managing conflict: what to do in times of conflict, how to manage it, how to control it. And then they're taught how to use controlled force. It extends from there.

B: So you're talking about handling problems of civil unrest and so on. This is all a setup for that.

W: Indeed. You can take the protests that took place after the 2003 invasion of Iraq, here in the United Kingdom and in Western Europe and also in the States, but mostly in Western Europe. It was almost like a mass uprising against the war in Iraq. That won't be repeated again. It won't be.

But the people in this industry need to be lawfully empowered in order to do their job because they'll still be working protecting assets, so they'll still be doing their job. And at the moment as we speak the Security Industry Association is seeking and receiving more powers on top of the powers that they've already been given. They've already been licensed to operate legally within the civilian environment. Now they're getting the additional police powers they need.

It's not just for those in the British security industry; it's also those who are called "civilian enforcement officers": parking attendants, that sort of thing; community police officers; those who are aiding the police in order for them to do their job, they're getting powers commensurate with the responsibilities that's required to enable them to do the job effectively. So we're talking about powers of arrest; powers of detention; we're talking down those lines. And that's going to happen.

B: Is this happening in other Western countries as well, do you know?

W: Well, it's already occurred in other Western countries, places like France and Germany, where you've got several police forces working together. You don't have one police force, as it were, that you could identify and say: *Well, they're the police.* They've got other agencies and they all carry similar powers.

But those powers within the UK security industry just do not exist at the moment. They already exist in the United States and it's a United States model that's principally being used here.

B: Okay. Now, before you got into those details, we were talking about the timeline -- and I was asking you about what was your response to somebody who wanted to know how you could be so sure this was more or less on track, even though the meeting you attended was four years ago.

W: Almost five years ago now.

B: Almost five. Yes.

W: Yes. All I can say, Bill, is that just take on board what I've mentioned, and if it does ring any bells with anyone - - the veracity of what's said can then be checked by themselves if they wish to do so.

B: Yes.

W: Not everything's hidden. They can't possibly hide everything, and then they can put the pieces of the puzzle together themselves and then they'll find out that it's quite credible.

B: Yes. I have to admit, it *is* very credible, which is very sobering. Right at the start of our conversation, you said that... this is my paraphrase... you said that this was a race against time from their point of view. *Why?*

W: There's lots of things going to be happening within the next few years and it's all to do with power. Some of it, I don't fully understand myself, to be honest with you. But from what I do understand, there is quite a lot of power-brokering going on, and it's principally that those who have been in control of most of society for not just hundreds of years, but for thousands of years, wish that control to continue. And in order to do that, a sequence of events has to be manufactured in order for that to happen. What I've just described to you is probably the first part.

So we're going to head into this war, then after that... and I can't give you a timescale for when this is going to happen... there will be a geophysical event taking place on Earth which is going to affect everybody.

Now, by that time we will all have been through a nuclear and biological war. The Earth's population, if this happens, will be drastically reduced. When this geophysical event is going to take place, then those remaining will probably be halved again. And who survives that is going to determine who takes the world and its surviving population into the next era.

So we are talking about a post-cataclysmic-event era. Who's going to be in charge? Who's going to be in control? So it's all about that. And that's why they're so desperate for these things to happen within a set timeframe. Otherwise they'll lose out.

B: Okay. Let me play devil's advocate here, and talk to me from your standpoint of having quite a lot of in-depth military experience and familiarity with military thinking. Why is the war and the establishment of the totalitarian government, and the atmosphere of fear, and so on and so forth, why is all that needed if there is going to be a

major geophysical event, as you put it, which would further disrupt infrastructure, result in a lot of deaths, result in all manner of emergencies all over the world, earthquakes, tsunamis, goodness knows what. That alone would justify martial law in most countries and states of emergency and those same factions could easily justify assuming power in that kind of an emergency. Why is the war part of this scenario? I don't understand that.

W: I think you have to look at it from a different point of view. After a cataclysmic event, there will be little or no structure. And if there's no structure, that means a structure has to be put back in place.

A structure needs to be in place *before* that happens with some sort of certainty that it will survive what's going to come -- so that it can land on both feet the day after, and then remain in power and have the power that it's enjoyed previously.

B: So, it's a justification for strengthening the critical parts of the infrastructure actually in preparation for the cataclysm which in routine civilian times might not be so strong. This is what you're saying?

W: Indeed. And I'm going into an area where I can only give subjective views the same as any other person could, but the feeling, and it's a very intuitive one, is that they've got to get their act together now. They've got to get their powerbase properly in place. And the only way they're going to do that is to create the circumstances for that to happen, i.e., a conflict.

And we can all look back through history. Every war has achieved an aim. Besides the suffering, the human suffering that goes on, it's always achieved an aim. And the aim is always on the side of the victor.

So, we're looking at this totalitarian regime, which I believe is already totalitarian anyway. I mean, we do not have a democracy at all. Nobody's got a say. This has already been decided over and above anybody.

We don't matter, as it were. We really don't matter. *They* matter, and their power matters, and that's the only thing that's being thought about it. And I believe if you tapped into the mindset of someone who operates in that type of way, you'd understand what they're going to do and why they're doing it and why they want to control the endgame and be in power at the end of it, intact, because this geophysical event is going to be survivable.

B: Do you have any indications when this is? This implies, from what you're saying, that they're kind of expecting something to happen in 2012. Is this a 2012 event?

W: No, this isn't really centered around 21st December, 2012. I don't know what's going to happen on 21st December, 2012.

I've got strong suspicions that it's going to be something else, maybe something nice for everybody. I really don't know. But certainly around that time we're going to be in a conflict that's going to take as long as it takes. But we're talking about some years after 2012 when this geophysical event is going to take place. I've judged that to be in my lifetime.

B: Okay. So let me feed this back to you, this roll-out of events you describe: the nuclear exchange and the ceasefire, and then the use of biological weapons... what you're saying is that this is going to result in such chaos actually that it will take a generation of humanity to rebuild all of that. And during all of that time there will have to be some kind of a heavy totalitarian infrastructure

in order to cope with this on-going emergency and re-build. And then sometime in there, there's going to be this major geophysical event, but they've got to get started as soon as possible. Is that right?

W: That's correct. That's right.

B: Do you think that they know when this is happening? Or do you think they think it's just happening "sometime"?

W: Yes. I think they've got a good idea of when it's going to happen. I don't know when that is. However, I've got this very strong feeling that it's going to happen in my lifetime, say within 20 years. You could probably bring that back even further -- between now and ten years; between now and five years.

B: Hm.

W: You know, I really don't know. I wish I did know. It's something that I'd love to know, but we've now entered into that period where this geophysical event is about to take place, when we consider the length of time that's passed since the last one which happened about 11,500 years ago, and it happens round about 11,500 years, cyclically. It's now due to happen again.

B: Yes.

W: To what degree it's going to affect the world, one can only imagine, and I'm sure there's contingency plans in place right now for that event to happen because I believe that is widely known within these circles. They understand it's going to happen. They have a certainty of knowledge that it's going to happen. They may have a timeframe, and it appears likely that they have. Again, it's one of these things -- it would be inconceivable if they didn't know. I mean, the best brains in the world will be working for them on this. You know? And they know all about it, and personally, I don't.

B: Was this talked about in your meeting at all?

W: No, it wasn't openly spoken about. Let me summarize what was discussed at the meeting:

Iran will be attacked, possibly within 18 months. China will come to the aid of Iran, to protect its own interests. Nuclear weapons will be used either by Iran or China, with Israel provoking the first use. Much of the Middle East will be laid to waste. Millions will die within a very short period of time. And for some reason this is here, and I can't tell you why: China will move forcibly into parts of Russia to extend ceasefire lines. Thereafter, biological weapons will be deployed against China. China will "catch a cold".

And my own understanding is that there's some sort of malevolent ET alliance at work for 50 years by the UK and US and other Western powers, and this includes Japan.

And, again, when we talk about a malevolent ET alliance that's in the context of black projects, and this is an exchange of technologies that's been going on for some considerable time. So there is an involvement there, and that involvement I can't fully explain myself.

And I also understand that there are more humanitarian and altruistic ET entities working against this timeline and are somehow maintaining a precarious balance without taking any direct intervention themselves. And again, I can't fully explain that but it's a certain intuitive feeling that this is working and there's other aspects of my experience that's led me to make that statement -- but that's another story.

So what we're talking about is the Western powers seeking a 'perfect war' -- doing so throughout the 20th century right up till the present day, because this timeline goes way back. So we're talking decades or hundreds of years of time where this timeline has been in use.

And also I think it's quite important to associate the timeline with its other reference which I've heard several times now: it's called THE ANGLO-SAXON MISSION. I feel that's important to add because that may ring some bells with some people as I don't think it's been mentioned before.

B: I've heard that phrase before. I don't want to digress here, but the flag which I've got against that -- and actually which I'm really starting to understand and it's as chilling as it gets, from what you're saying -- that the reason why it's called *The Anglo-Saxon Mission* is because basically the plan is to wipe out the Chinese so that after the cataclysm and when things are rebuilt, it will be the Anglo-Saxons who are in a position to rebuild and inherit the new Earth, with no one else around. Is that right?

W: Whether that's right I really don't know, but I would agree with you. Through the 20th century at least, and even before into the 19th and 18th centuries, the history of this world has been predominantly run from the West and from the Northern region on the planet. Others have tried but failed.

And it's safe to say that World War One and World War Two were manufactured wars. I'm quite sure of that. And they were used as stepping-stones to get to where they are now. Any historian will tell you that if *that* didn't happen, *this* wouldn't have happened. We wouldn't have had the United Nations; we wouldn't have had the United States of America becoming a superpower in such a short period of time. They became a superpower within four years of war. And they ended up with nuclear weapons.

People, I feel, have got to bring this into their own personal agendas. The West becoming the predominant force in the world is there. It's beyond question.

B: Retrospectively looking back on it, you can see a sort of long-term strategy that extends over a number of generations even though one couldn't see the wood for the trees at the time.

W: That's the nature of people -- really. You know, we just live our own lives with those of our families and those close to us and do the best we can. It's not very often that we stick our heads above the parapet and have a good look around to see what's *really* happening. We're not very good at doing that, I'm afraid.

I'm a good example. I've been involved in so many things, I've just got my head down and just got on with what I was doing, ignoring what was going on, possibly subconsciously denying what was happening until I really had to say something about it.

B: Yes. Just on a personal note, it must be quite hard living with this personal experience that you've had of being party to these conversations and knowing that this isn't just some fantasy because you heard these people talking about this, laughing about it.

W: Well, it was quite informal. I mean, they were very comfortable talking about this.

How can I describe the people who I'm talking about better? The people who I'm talking about are people who exude power. They elicit fear. They demand obedience and by God do they get it! And by the way they talk they're dictating to the so-called elected governments

that we've got in Parliament or in Washington or in Berlin or in Paris. These people exude that kind of power, and beyond that what can I say?

I'm sure other people have come across characters like that in their lives. There's not a compassionate bone in their body. They do not resonate any spiritual warmth whatsoever. They're cold, they're calculating. To use a phrase that's common here, "butter wouldn't melt in their mouth".

B: A lot of people out there speculate that at some level, maybe not at the level of the people who you were meeting with in the room, but at some level, in this behind-the-scenes government that is orchestrating this entire plan, lies a non-human intelligence.

And one of the arguments for that is that it takes an enormous amount of long-term thinking, strategic cunning, to plan going over many generations, which is the result of an extremely high intelligence just to play this chess game on such an enormous scale. So some people, myself included, suggest that this must be a non-human intelligence that's behind this.

W: Yes. And my perception is that this intelligence is incredibly logical, without any empathy, without any love, care, understanding or compassion. They're cold and calculating and logical beyond any logic that we could muster normally. They go well beyond that -- they're such supremely intelligent people. These are people who can produce answers to really difficult questions without blinking an eye. They are very, very bright people, but bright only in the sense that their logic is extraordinary.

B: What can ordinary people do? How should they react? How should they think? Do you personally feel that this is inevitable? Do you think we're all doomed in some way?

W: No, absolutely not. I've often thought about this, Bill, and this of course is a personal view: We will endure. But to endure, from one person to the next, is not to work for them anymore. It's to stop working for them. It's not to react violently against them because they'll win. They would love that to happen, then it gives them an excuse. They breed on fear and violence -- the reaction from fear. That would be like bees to honey for them. They would *love* that to happen.

What's needed is non-violent reaction: simply just not doing the job for them any more. To give a comparison, Bill. There was a man who history has largely ignored. He was a Frenchman, by the name of [Jean Jaurès](#). It's always surprised me why this incredible character has never entered the history books. He's quite well known in France in some circles, but not widely known.

He predicted the First World War happening. He wanted the International Workers' Movement to not comply with the royal families and aristocracy, and when you read about him you'll find this out yourself. Just a couple of months before the outbreak, when the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand took place in Serbia, Jaurès was assassinated in a French café. They killed him. He was shot dead, and with him went that movement.

Prior to World War One, he saw the writing on the wall. He saw the aristocracies and the royal families of Europe pitting themselves against one another, in a big battle. He knew that France and Germany, the United Kingdom were all industrialized nations. He further realized that being industrialized, the next war will be an industrial war where millions of people might be killed.

He formed a movement which some have termed as communist. It was the International Workers' Movement, and it's got nothing to do with politics. His idea was for the ordinary person not to do anything, not to go to war, just stay at home and they wouldn't have the war they wanted.

I personally believe that if non-violence is adopted and people become more awake to what's happening, then these people very, very quickly lose the power that they've got. They feed on power. They feed on fear. So if you take these elements away from them they become powerless. They need us to do what they're doing. They can't do it on their own even though they'll be damn dangerous in any event, but they can't do it all on their own.

And that would be my message is just to wake up a bit, see what's happening about us, put our heads above the parapet and without fearing to do that, without feeling afraid, take a deep breath, have a look around, see what's happening, and then people will soon realize: *Oh yeah. Okay. This is where we're gonna go. This is where we're heading and there's not much I can do about it.* But they can!

As I've said, it's not to react violently. And if people are in positions where these people need them, just don't work for them. Just stop working for them. Take your labor away because they need the troops who are going to do this work. We're not just talking about people in the military. We're talking about every civilian member in all the populations right across the globe. Just say: *No, because this is not us. This is not what we want to do.*

And it's making that choice. It sounds ridiculously simple. I think the execution of it *is* that simple and it's well within our power as human beings, conscious living, breathing, human beings who have a shared compassion for one another to do that. Because if we don't, they'll carry on and then they'll realize their endgame.

B: Do you think, from your own military experience, that there are enough people in the military who are saying: *You know what? I didn't sign up for this. I'm not going to do this.* Or do you think that they'll buy into all the justifications that are being set up at the moment?

W: Well, by and large the Western military is not a conscripted army. It's a professional army, and it prides itself on its professionalism. It prides itself on acting on behalf of the people who elected the government who sent them out to do the job that they're doing. It's a very difficult question to answer. And of course, these troops are superbly trained and they believe, they wholly believe, as I did when I was in the military, that you're doing the job for all the right reasons.

If it became clear to people who are in such professions -- this is not just the military; we're talking about the emergency services, the police, all those who've made their way into the security industry, we're talking about all these people. If enough voices were heard, then those in the military who have not achieved any significant rank, who have no particular stake in the game, will then wake up themselves just as soon as anybody else.

But it's got to be borne in mind that the Western powers have professional military services, and it's a difficult thing to do to make it clear and let these guys and girls know that they're not fighting the right people.

B: Sure. Let me ask a different question. Was there reference to "safe or safer places to be"? Physically, I mean.

W: No. None at all.

B: Nothing like the southern hemisphere is okay, the northern hemisphere is going to be a problem? Nothing like that?

W: No, not at that meeting. That wasn't mentioned at all.

B: Okay. Another question I'd like to ask you, and it's a fascinating one to debate among people who are tuned in to this whole area, is a personal one: why do you feel that the benevolent ETs, and I'm *sure* that they exist, why do you think that they don't step in to say: *Okay, guys, normally we're hands-off, but this is getting serious here and we're not going to allow this to happen.* Is that possible? Why do they maintain such a distance?

W: Well, first things first. "*These benevolent ETs*" -- I don't actually like calling them "*ETs*"... I believe that these people are us and we are them.

B: Yes.

W: They've been around for a lot longer than the regime that's in power at the moment. This present regime, this power-based regime, some have called them reptilians, and I've got no problem at all calling them that because that's exactly what they're like -- totally cold-hearted. They've been around much, much longer and they're the ones who have really made humanity what it is today.

Interventions? I believe they've been intervening in the best ways that they can. But we're talking about very spiritually evolved beings, as the human race is very spiritually evolved -- maybe that's why we come back here so often, back to this planet.

But for these people who are us and we are them, as I mentioned, they don't see time the same way that we understand time here within the physical world. For them, 11,500 years ago was a blink of an eye. It was nothing, and they already know what the endgame is going to be. They believe, as I believe, that this regime that's in power at the moment who wish this total dominance over the Earth and everything that's in it, are not going to win. They're having their time now and their time is about to end.

B: On what basis do you feel that? This is very important for people reading this transcript because some people will be feeling numbed and shocked at the information that you've presented, thinking: *Oh God, we're really stitched up here.*

W: Yes, I think if you take it from the purely physical point of view. It doesn't mean that we've all got suicidal minds or something like that. We all want our lives; we all cherish our lives; everybody does. We love our lives and we want to experience them fully in all ways, in the best way we possibly can.

We're currently being prevented from doing so because of this regime, which is based in fear; it's all about fear. And the greatest fear that we've got physically is fear of death, and that's part of the greatest power that they've got over us, is this type of fear, this anxiety that they can raise or lower -- which they're doing all the time.

I can't think of a moment when this hasn't happened, when this fear doesn't come out and then we react to it the way that we do. It seems perfectly natural. But what happens when we don't, stop feeling this and say: *Well, it's only fear. We can get over this,* then that's tapping into who we really are.

I don't yet believe there are enough people around at the moment who know who they are. They define themselves by their own physical existence, which is all fear-based, and it's cyclical, and they just can't get out of it. And obviously they need to find their way out of it.

I believe, personally, that come this shift -- I call it a shift because that's what I believe is going to happen; the Earth's crust is going to shift round about 30 degrees, about 1700 to 2000 miles southwards, and it will cause a huge upheaval, effects of which will last for a very long time to come. But the human race isn't going to die off. We're still going to be here. It's who we are at the end of that -- is where my mind is. And as for this regime, that's where their mind is. This is why they're doing what they're doing because they want to be in control at the end of it.

Now, if we're talking about intervention, this is when there will be an intervention by the "benevolent ETs." The people who are really us, this is when it may happen, but I don't know. I've got a strong intuitive feeling it will, but at the moment the situation that we have right now is not conducive for that type of intervention. Not right now.

They don't feel it's the right time. And in any event, physical life is only a very, very small part of who we really are, so how much importance do you place on that, knowing that when you walk from this door into the next door, you're back home anyway?

So all that's got to be taken into consideration, and I'm sure there's people out there who could articulate this far better than I'm articulating this right now. I can only articulate this from a very personal point of view and that's what I feel intuitively might happen. And I say *might* knowing full well that I can be certain within my own self that that sort of thing *will* happen, and it's just the pain that we have to go through of reaching that point where this regime will no longer have the power that they've got.

People waking up, finding out what's going on around them and really having a good look, and raising their conscious levels as they've never done before, and then everything will click into place quite quickly. And when it does, the power that these people have will just fall off them like a towel, you know, just fall right off them, and they'll be exposed for what they are.

B: That's a very inspiring thought. Do you feel personally that... Let me specify a number of alternatives: That the whole war might not happen at all; that the whole thing will just fall apart? Or that all of this will fall apart after the war but before the cataclysm? Or that all of this will fall apart after the cataclysm and that the Meek will inherit the Earth, let's say?

W: Yes. This is an extremely good question. Let's consider two things: the first thing is the sheer determination on the part of this regime, for want of a better word, the sheer determination that they have to have this done. They're desperate. They're going full-out for this to happen. They're creating the scenarios, the in, the out. It's relentless; it's non-stop; there's no breathing space. And when there is breathing space, I mean, when people start to relax about things, something else will pop up to keep us within that grip of fear that they've generated.

That is a hugely powerful force that they have, massively powerful, and it should never be underestimated. It's the sort of thing that drives good, honest people around the bend, putting people early into their graves through

stress and anxiety. It's coming away from that and seeing it for what it is.

If there's enough people who can raise the levels of awareness and just see what's happening, then everybody else will bring their heads up. I think it only needs one or two people to put their head up and just say: *Yep. All's clear*, and everybody else will come up. Then you'll see them all around the world, in various countries, just a new feeling, a better feeling than what we've had before, and that's all about individuals empowering themselves by acknowledging who they really are.

And it's nothing mystical. It's nothing deeply cultish or anything like that. It's got very little to do with religion. It's all about the human spirit and the consciousness which we live through and that we all share and knowing that consciousness is undoubtedly shared by all of us -- but is presently suppressed. And we have to get past those suppressive forces in order to realize who we are. When that happens -- all else will follow quite naturally and that regime, dangerous as they are -- I can't emphasize this too much: These are damn dangerous people, extremely dangerous -- *their power will go*.

B: This is extremely close to what David Icke talks about. It's extremely close to what Dr. Bill Deagle talks about, and to what we've talked about a number of times.

W: Yes.

B: That there's a rise in consciousness going on on the planet, but they're desperately trying to close the lid and to accelerate their own plans so that they can put in place the iron fist of control. Things may get worse before they get better, but they're not going to win out in the end because consciousness transcends all the force and all the military might and all the strategic planning that they could put into place. And it's a question of that collective consciousness continuing to expand, as it seems to be.

And this interview here that we're doing needs to play a part in that. Because it's not about scaring people witless and having them all hide in bunkers with emergency food. It's actually about saying: *Listen, it doesn't have to be like this if we can be as big as we are, and as brave as we can be, and as strong as we can be, and realize who we really are*. And if enough of us do that, then this just isn't going to roll out like that.

W: That's right. I'm coming out saying exactly this. I realize I'm not saying anything that's unique at all, but as you're indicating, it's got to be repeated. People have got to be aware that there's hope, and things need not be the way they are. They never needed to be the way they are. It can be far, far better.

It's getting over the fear; it's this fear that people need to get over. We don't have to be psychiatrists or psychologists or anything like that -- they only deal with the mind. We don't have to be religious leaders or great spiritual thinkers to be aware of this, because we all have it within us. It's inherent within us. So it's a matter of looking into oneself and then becoming comfortable with who you are; then you'll have a knowing of what's going on and know that it's wrong. And everybody else... it will just spread.

Even those who've been indoctrinated into this regime of fear will not be able to resist it because to do so is just resisting themselves and who they really are. And it's a wonderful thing; it's what this universe is all about and what this whole experience is all about. And it will make these periods, these last so many thousands of years, be

just... not even a bad memory... just like: *Hm! Well, we've learnt from that.* Okay? And we'll make sure that doesn't happen again, and that these kind of characters who can produce this kind of fear, you know, don't ever get a power base here again.

So, yes, I think those days are coming and if it does happen in time -- and 'time' is one of those words that you use very carefully because this regime is very time-based, where the human consciousness isn't really concerned with time so much, but they definitely are because of the physical nature of the Earth. It does things at certain times. You know, we have seasons: spring, summer, autumn, winter. The shift that's coming is just like another season.

What's going to happen is geophysical change; it's another season, and a very aware humanity could most possibly take this in their stride and come out the other end of it very well indeed.

I know you mentioned about safe places for people to go. I really don't know. But from a personal point of view, I know where I should be, and where I should be is where I am right now. Whether it's safe or not is immaterial; it's where I should be right now, and I feel comfortable with that.

B: Yes. When people ask us that question about where they should be, we always reflect it back and point out that the answer is going to be different for every individual, based upon things that no one else apart from them can really know.

Some people may need to stay put; some people may need to travel, but the reason for that might be because they've got somebody to meet and something to do in some other location. It really depends on so many factors, not just a question of: *what's objectively safe and where should we hide?* It's got more to do with: *how can we best deploy all of the abilities that we have here and now to do whatever it is that we're here to do?* And that's going to be individual to everybody.

W: Absolutely. It is. I think the more aware that people become, the fear factor goes. We don't live in that fear, so what you previously feared may no longer be a fear for that individual or for that group of people, for that matter. It just won't be there.

That's not to say there won't be any concerns, there won't be any pain or things like that; of course there will. But on top of all that, the fears that we currently experience, the physical fears of the uncertainties and the unpredictable nature of things, will be gone -- they'll just go. We'll be left being the people who we are, and I think the human race as a whole is pretty damn wonderful.

B: Yes. That's a wonderful thing for people to take with them, something that we've often mentioned. There's a wonderful movie. It goes back to 1984, a Jeff Bridges movie called [Starman](#). The starman is an alien visitor who's here for peaceful purposes, trying to understand the human race because he's got caught up in a strange situation. And he's trying to get back home.

Towards the end of the movie he says: *Would you like to know what I find beautiful about your species? You are at your best when things are at their worst.*

I've never forgotten that line. It's got to do with the fact that what's marvelous about the human race is the ability to transcend problems and reach deep within themselves to produce the very best out of themselves in the worst situations. And of course, in the military that

kind of situation is almost a tradition, that under extraordinary pressure you have people behaving with incredible heroism, and it's that response to pressure that makes us wonderful.

W: Yes, it's more noticeable in the military because that gets reported out. Human consciousness and how we exist through this physical world is extremely resilient. A good point to consider is that we may think sometimes we've got a deadlock in ethical thinking about some things, but we don't really. Things simply differ from one person to the next which I think is another wonderful thing because it can keep conversations going for ever and ever, which is fantastic. The dialog we have helps us to understand ourselves so much better.

But it transcends deadlock, I think. It goes beyond that. It goes beyond what we know to be ethically right and so forth. It takes it to a different level when these things happen, when our resilience is tested to this extreme. We're all capable of doing very wonderful things and it looks likely, very likely, that we're on the cusp of where that resilience is going to be tested to the extreme.

I'm going to emphasize again that we're playing against very dangerous people, extremely dangerous people, incredibly powerful people. And I know from my own experience that not many people have had first-hand experience with that type of power and how it exudes, and how it affects one's person... it can make you very, very sick, make you ill to the point of breakdown. Or you join in with them, become subservient and be sycophantic to everything that they want to do, because the people who do work for them and do their bidding -- and there's quite a large number of them -- are incredibly obedient and incredibly servile. They're not what you call "free spirits" at all. You know, they've been taken in, taken in by them.

Maybe that's something that people should begin to be aware of, of the kind of power that they hold at the moment, and I don't think that's been fully grasped yet. People are trying to see in between the margins to find out what's going on and getting snippets of information, and those snippets are going to be very, very important.

But to act against them in any way, it can be quite disastrous. I've had that experience and I think many, many other people have too. So this is maybe why we should tell exactly who they are, should announce ourselves and be fearless about it. It's because of that fear... that's at the base of all that still exists.

B: Something that we spoke about earlier when we had a conversation a few days ago was there's a supreme arrogance in these people, which you've experienced at first-hand, which George Green described when we first met and talked to him about a year and three-quarters ago: He said: *They think they've won. They're not worried about anything any more. They're not trying to silence all the alternative media.* Not really, you know. It's not going to make any difference. What difference is a couple of voices going to make? The plan's still going to roll out. It's not going to make any difference at all, they believe, what you or I might say.

W: Well I go along with what George Green said. He's painted a far better picture than I could, because that's exactly what it's like. They are incredibly arrogant. Along with their other attributes that they have, there is that arrogance there. It's quite tangible. Yes. And they're just *comfortable* about what they're doing, totally comfortable. They're not hiding around and sneaking about. I mean,

these are quite open people, some of them, public figures.

B: Okay. Now, is there anything that we missed? Is there anything that you wanted to say but didn't have a chance to fully enlarge on? Is there anything you want to add that I haven't even asked you about?

W: There's still such a story to tell, I think, because I'm very aware that people need to see a decent level of credibility in what I've been describing to you, and I guess that's always a difficulty. But all I can really say is I've been aware of this timeline since the early '70s, too young to understand what it was at the time. In fact it seemed to me quite an exciting thing that was going on, and that was the first time I ever heard of the existence of the "Anglo Saxon Mission."

And details of what I know, I feel if I started mentioning names in particular and what was mentioned and where I was at the time, might compromise the Official Secrets Act, which I'm still party to in so many aspects. I say the military. Where it's in a civilian environment, then no; I feel happy talking about that.

I wish there was a way that I could describe other events, which you're aware of, and do so in a manner that would allow people to understand me far better than I've explained here. Then they'd see exactly where I'm coming from, where I've been, and what I've been through. I feel that then people could rationalize what's been said far better.

But I do feel that what's been said so far is enough for people, if they so wish, to have a look themselves and uncover a few stones. And if anything of significance does come out of it which other people can corroborate, that would be fantastic. That would be good, because evidence... You know, I know it's so crucial to do things like this, and there's no smoking gun as such. There's

only one person reporting something that happened five years ago, principally, but there is a much, much larger story around that which you are aware of, and we need to be extremely careful about where we go with that.

B: There are many people, of course, who do have access to the same information you do. This is something that is known by thousands of people in finance and the military and politics. It's widely known. It's a very small proportion of the world's population, but it's still very widely known.

W: Absolutely. Yes.

B: And something that we've always encouraged, and we say it again here, is that we encourage anyone who has experienced it first-hand or even at second-hand, any aspect of this, to please step forward and know that there's safety in numbers. Know that the more people who break ranks and have the courage that you have to speak out, the more will be heard, the more will be understood, and the whole thing will be like a gradually rolling snowball. The snowball *is* rolling. It's quite small, but it *is* rolling.

W: Oh, it is. It is. There'll come a time where names will be named if there's enough public support, and we will demand answers from those people.

So when enough fruit from the tree of evidence comes off, then these people can be properly challenged, and then we can see a far different story, you know, emerge from the one that people like myself are giving you. It'll become more real, far more real. We can do that. We can take people to task.

B: Okay. All right. This is very, very important. I want to close by saying: thank you for your courage, and thank you for your spirit.

W: Thank you very much, too, Bill.