

## GOING TACTICAL

BY STEVEN M. GREER MD

As the cancer of terrorism metastasizes around the world, we would do well to pause and analyze how we got here – and how we might resolve the problem.

Currently, no world leader is actually addressing the roots of the problem, and presenting any meaningful solutions. To date, the US and world community have been engaged in purely tactical responses to a growing, intractable and predictable problem.

The asymmetric nature of terrorism in particular and guerilla activity in general makes a tactical solution ultimately unattainable. There is much talk that the current war on terrorism and other actions by the US and its allies are an effective strategy to resolve the problem. But in reality, it is a near-term tactical reaction to a larger and more fundamental problem that remains neglected.

This is not to say that tactical actions are of no value, or are always wrong. But such actions must not be confused with a meaningful strategic analysis and concomitant strategic plan to correct the underlying problem.

While there can be no sane defense of terrorism, religious fanaticism, murderous actions and the like, we must nevertheless frankly look at why the problem exists.

There have always been religious fanaticism, strife, and murderous fiends ready to sow mayhem for this or that ‘ism’. But the current world – wide proliferation of terrorism, directed at all things ‘western’ is fueled by a history currently much ignored by the main-stream media and world political leaders.

To wit: The West has overstayed its welcome in much of the world, and especially in the oil rich mid-east. This statement should not be confused with isolationism, but rather points to a dominant and at times bellicose presence. It should be remembered that Osama bin Laden et al. were actually allies of the US in our proxy support of ‘freedom fighters’ against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. That Saddam was our ally, after the Iran hostage crisis. And that the wealth, power and capabilities of many a despot in that region and elsewhere has been fueled by one thing: Oil.

For decades, US strategic national interest (apart from the Cold War) has been centered on securing a stable, steady and growing supply of cheap oil. Oil wealth gave Saddam and company the means to acquire weapons of mass destruction – and gave the mid-east region a central role in strategic affairs.

The first Gulf war against Saddam Hussein occurred because Saddam wanted the oil-rich fields of Kuwait – and because we wanted to protect Kuwait and Saudi Arabia who are ‘vital national security interests’ (read: oil). Our long presence in the region subsequently inflamed nationalists and religious fanatics, and our once-ally Osama became our mortal enemy.

The real tragedy in all of this is that we have not needed oil, coal or nuclear power since at least the 1950s – and most likely long before that. Replacements for oil, and technologies to greatly increase the efficiency of the internal combustion engine, have existed for decades – only to be ruthlessly suppressed.

Does anyone actually believe that we would have a long and over-bearing presence in the mid-east were it not for oil? (Israel is a separate but related situation and does not wholly apply to this analysis).

If so, why are we not in central Africa, South America or many other hot spots?

President Bush, in his 2002 State of the Union address, as well as many other national leaders, has said that it is a matter of our national security to become independent of imported oil. But how? Generally, our dependence is growing, and digging a few more holes in the ground in Alaska or elsewhere in the US will hardly affect the equation.

The recent multi-billion dollar “Energy Bill” passed by the Congress is really a sop to big oil. It does not contribute to any meaningful solution and in many ways compounds the problem.

In February of 2003, just before the US went into Iraq, a friend of the Bush family told me “...of course, this is really about securing the second largest oil field in the world, and everyone knows it.” Initially appalled, I listened as this gentleman explained how, with China rapidly industrializing (along with India) that our strategic interests required that we ‘liberate’ the Iraqi oil fields, and get them up to maximum production. Of course, Saddam was a monstrous dictator – but there are many monstrous regimes in that part of the world, and human rights abuses abound. But Saddam – he was blocking the full access to maximum development of the Iraqi oil fields. And that was the unpardonable sin.

Witnesses available to The Disclosure Project ([www.DisclosureProject.org](http://www.DisclosureProject.org)) as well as a substantial and growing body of scientific evidence establishes that the world’s dependence on fossil fuels and nuclear power is a contrived arrangement. The Big Lie that we have no other options and therefore must continue to find new sources of oil, and protect vital western interests related to oil in the Mid-east, must be exposed and put to rest. Granted, a multi-trillion dollar component of the global economy is now, sadly, dependent (or shall we say addicted) to oil, but this can be no excuse for the lack of bold leadership. The multi-faceted crisis of terrorism, petro-fascism, environmental decay, global warming, and the widening disparity between wealthy and poor nations has its roots in our dependence on oil and the excesses and abuses of power related thereto.

Promising developments in the area of so-called zero point energy and quantum vacuum energy, as well as more prosaic breakthroughs in internal combustion engine efficiency, have been ignored or actively and ruthless suppressed for decades. (See [www.SeasPower.com](http://www.SeasPower.com)) The public, the media, environmental organizations and the international community must urgently investigate these matters and take decisive steps to support civilian efforts to bring to full application these new energy solutions.

A clandestine and highly illegal group exists that has actively suppressed these technologies – even up to the present hour. More than one scientist with whom we are now working has been threatened, had his work sabotaged or confiscated and generally terrorized into a paralyzing silence. This, while we march into one oil war after another.

This operation, a hybrid trans-national entity that has shadowy ties to the military, intelligence, laboratory, corporate and institutional communities (and yet is controlled by none) operates like a highly functional organized crime group, and has ruled by terror for decades. Indeed the Big Terror is the one that remains unacknowledged and unchallenged, while we dash around the world chasing the blowback from our failed, decades-long policy of oil dependency.

Having personally met with members of Congress, senior intelligence officials and senior Pentagon officers (all of whom are convinced such a group exists) I have witnessed first hand the fear this group engenders. But we have reached the point in our civilization that the risks of giving into fear, and refusing to act decisively, will cost us dearly.

The recent terrorists attacks will be a fond memory compared to future events unless we collectively act to correct this situation. Even the Pentagon has recently warned of the possibility of a sudden, catastrophic climate change related to global warming that could plunge the earth into environmental, social and military chaos. Are we to sit by idly while the solution to this crisis sits locked away in illegal 'black' military and corporate projects -projects funded by US taxpayer monies and withheld by an entrenched kleptocracy hell-bent on control - at all costs?

Indeed, such thinking, driven by fear, greed and a myopic world and cosmological view, is bringing human civilization to the brink of collapse. The suppression of these earth-saving and life-saving technologies has gone too far, for too long – so much so that those responsible are on the verge of consciously committing planeticide – the killing of an entire planet.

At this point, Space Energy Access Systems, Inc. (SEAS) has identified scientists capable of developing technologies to completely replace fossil fuels. We estimate that a generation one version of such an energy generating system can be ready for widespread application in 12-36 months. But such an undertaking, requiring millions of dollars in basic research and development funds, remains unsupported by either the government or financial community. Why?

The public must demand that our representatives at every level investigate seriously these technologies and begin an environmental Marshall Plan to get see that new energy solutions are fast-tracked into widespread application.

To date, inventors have funded their own efforts, and have created proof-of-principle systems. But they are immature technologies so far not supported by the private financial community and the government granting process has been unresponsive. Would the public support such an undertaking – bypassing the corruption and inertia of government and large financial players? We may soon find out.

But one thing is certain: Unless we change directions, we are likely to end up where we are going...

No national or international leader has presented anything remotely close to a real strategy to address the nexus of intertwined problems related to terrorism, oil dependency, geopolitical tensions, environmental destruction and global warming. They GO TACTICAL and mistake this for a strategy. It is not. It is a sham and a poor excuse for decisive strategic planning and action. This action has been needed for half a century, but out of fear, greed, corruption and power politics has been tragically deferred. Now we are paying the price.

Even if we tactically succeed in temporarily delaying the progress of terrorists, we will yet be left with the core of the problem: Our desperate need for oil and lots of it. The zero sum game of energy supplies based on oil, coal and gas necessitates a disparity that places at least two thirds of the world's population in a state of perpetual poverty. Within this crucible, a thousands hells will be born, and it will not be ameliorated one iota by the current tactical response to 9/11, or the invasion of Iraq or even by establishing democracy in the Mid-east, laudable as that may be. The hard reality is that our civilization is on a terminal trajectory. We are at the crossroads of history

at which we either crash or fly into the future intact. Real leadership is required, and a meaningful strategy to phase in these new technologies in an orderly and rational manner is needed now.

I challenge every concerned citizen to bring this matter to the attention of his representatives and to those aspiring to lead us – whether at the presidential or congressional level. Do not let them off the hook. They have the solemn responsibility of leading if they aspire to be leaders. At every campaign stop, at every rally, at every town meeting, citizens should be present to present the facts and demand action.

We have abdicated our sacred obligation to provide for a good and sustainable future and allowed rogue and selfish interests to hijack our destiny. Will we persist in this madness?

The solutions to these problems exist. But the ‘special interests’ that would deceive the public and our leaders are enormously powerful and ruthless. Shills in the media ignore, censor or ridicule the subject. And an army of paid disinformation hacks, pretending to be scientists, ‘experts’ and the like stand ready to hammer down any meaningful solution presented to the world. The task is, therefore, daunting. But the consequences of inaction are so dire, so potentially catastrophic, that every effort must be expended to correct the situation.

In discussing this problem with a large coalition of scientists, inventors and energy researchers, we have concluded that progress requires a serious research and development effort of some tens of millions of dollars. But this is a rounding error in light of the tens of billions of dollars spent by the US alone for bogus energy research and the so-called energy bill of 2003. The public should demand that at least seed funding be provided for such promising new energy research.

The environmental and philanthropic communities need to study the promise of these technologies and provide the support and funding to move the current state-of-the-art into applications to solve the energy crisis and environmental cataclysm facing humanity.

For years, promising advanced technologies have been gobbled up by corrupt corporations or by the military/industrial/laboratory/intelligence complex. We must collectively vow to support and protect these technologies, brought to proof-of-principle development by the heroic and sacrificial efforts of many inventors. Let our efforts redound to the benefit of humanity, and let us resolve to withstand any test, make any sacrifice and expend every effort in securing the good and sustainable future that awaits humanity.

#### References:

Scott, Wm. B. To the Stars. Aviation Week and Space Technology/ March 1, 2004.

Stipp, D. The Pentagon's Weather Nightmare. Fortune/January 26, 2004

Schwartz, Peter and Doug Randall. An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States Security. October 2003. (report commissioned by the US Dept. of Defense – Available at: [http://www.ems.org/climate/pentagon\\_climate\\_change.html#report](http://www.ems.org/climate/pentagon_climate_change.html#report)).

From National Public Radio Living on Earth Segment Broadcast March 5th, 2004 on these issues a Dr. SCHRAG, Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences at Harvard University was interviewed. He noted the following after Steve Curwood's question:

CURWOOD: Why now all this attention to the question of abrupt climate change? The Greenland ice core samples that you told us about have been around for a long time, demonstrating that it didn't take more than a few decades to change a lot of temperature. And yet today, folks like the Defense Department, folks in Hollywood, are suddenly paying attention to the question of abrupt climate change. Why is that happening?

SCHRAG: I think there are powerful forces in our society that have a lot of economic stake in our current energy technology, and are resistant to change. And therefore have promoted the idea that this was just a theory, that climate change was just an idea that scientists had that they weren't sure about, and discouraged action on this front.

Steven M. Greer MD  
26 March 2004  
Albemarle County, Virginia