

Hunting and Prosecuting Crazy Spooks to Save the Nation

The following is the edited transcript of presentations made by LPAC's Barbara Boyd and Bill Binney, former Technical Director for the National Security Agency, on the LaRouche PAC Fireside Chat for November 27, 2019. The full 90-minute audio of those presentations, and the discussion that followed, is available [here](#).



Rather, what Ritter does, is, he tracks out the whistleblower's entire career; and it is one which, if you go through it, should raise the hair on the back of your neck. You will realize, as you read it, that Lieutenant Colonel Vindman probably was the leaker, and if indeed, he could get away with testifying before Congress as the leaker, without anybody saying “Bo-

Barbara Boyd: The word “bombshell” has definitely been overused in the recent period by the mainstream media, but Scott Ritter published a real bombshell, an actual one, in *Consortium News* dated today. For those who don't know who Scott Ritter is, he is a member of the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS). He was the actual whistleblower reporting that Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction, way back at that particular phase of our descent into the maelstrom. In his [article](#), “The ‘Whistleblower’ and the Politicization of Intelligence,” Ritter gives a very thorough exposé of the bogus whistleblower who has triggered this latest stage of the coup, and does so without ever having to name his name.

He has some fun with that at the beginning of his article in *Consortium News*, where he says: Of course, everybody knows who this person is, but I'm not going to name him, or I'm not going to go by the scant stuff we already know about him in terms of scandalous headlines—i.e., that he worked with Joe Biden in the Obama National Security Council, and that he was sent there with specific orders from John Brennan.

Peep” really, and going after him—although the Republicans tried to—then you understand the strength and the threat which this actual coup poses to people.

I go back to a very famous conversation which occurred between Rachel Maddow and Senator Chuck Schumer, way back at the beginning of this entire affair. If you can recall what Schumer said to Maddow at the point where the President was really going after the intelligence community for the first time in terms of his campaign, Schumer said, “You just don't do this. He's really stupid to be doing this. You know, the intelli-



Another phony Trump impeachment inquiry hearing, this one featuring Lt. Col. Alexander Vindman, on November 19, 2019.

gence community can get you six ways to Sunday.”

Now, Ritter, in his article, strikingly tells the reader:

As I shall show, such actions [the politicization of the intelligence community] are treasonous on their face, and the extent to which this conduct has permeated the intelligence community and its peripheral functions of government, including the National Security Council and Congress itself, will only be known if and when an investigation is conducted into what, in retrospect, is nothing less than a grand conspiracy by those ostensibly tasked with securing the nation to instead reverse the will of the American people regarding who serves as the nation’s chief executive.

Little Bo Peep

So, what does he tell us about the whistleblower? First of all, he tells us that the whistleblower is an extremely young man; in other words, the guy who has put our republic at risk is an extremely young man. His first service in the intelligence community occurs in the Obama administration. Ritter goes through at great length exactly how this guy was trained, and what he lived through. He lived through the so-called shift in our relationship with Russia, where basically the plan was to cultivate Medvedev at the point that he was President, and Putin was not, to soften the relationship with Russia.

That crashed, of course, because the United States had absolutely nothing to offer, other than gamesmanship. When Putin returned to power in 2012, essentially that is when the games began, in terms of the joint effort by the British and the United States to overthrow Putin, with Ukraine as the major “prize” as they called it, in that battle.

In July of 2015, the whistleblower was detailed to the National Security staff at the White House and was named the director for Ukraine on the National Security Council. That’s how he ran into Joe Biden. And the deployment of that young man to undertake Ukraine policy for the NSC at the White House was specifically approved by then CIA Director John Brennan. In other words, Brennan had to specifically forward this guy to this mission. So, he was very high up in the White House; he was reporting to Susan Rice, the National Security Director under Obama, with very little in between him and Rice.

So, you see why he has to be called to testify. Number one, the FOIA requests have come in and they show that Alexandra Chalupa, the person who led the Ukrainian intervention into the 2016 election on behalf of Hillary

Clinton, met with this guy—met with the whistleblower 27 times at the White House. This guy was in a key post for Ukraine and Russian operations at the point that Susan Rice was unmasking everybody in the Trump transition, trying to find their back-channels to Russia.

He was in the National Security Council overseeing, in all probability, the whole set-up of General Flynn to force him out. He is the guy who is suspected of leaking Trump’s Mexico and Australia phone calls, which were leaked right after Trump’s first meeting with Putin. If people recall, what actually scandalized the U.S. in



UN/JC McIlwaine



courtesy photo

The then Ambassador to the UN and soon to be National Security Advisor, Susan Rice (left) in 2013, and Democratic National Committee contractor and staffer, Alexandra Chalupa.

telligence community was that Trump insisted, again, that he wanted to make peace with Russia. So, that’s the background. This guy was suspected of illegally leaking information. Yet McMaster, who’s the National Security Director after General Flynn is fired, makes this guy his personal assistant.

So, this guy is a deputy to the National Security Director of the United States; he has access to everything.

Now, on May 10, Sergei Lavrov and Ambassador Kislyak met with Trump in the Oval Office. People may remember that meeting, which was plastered all over the place in the media, with reporters saying “See, see, see? We were right about Trump and Russia.”

Scott Ritter, in his article, makes clear that this guy is the one who leaked that meeting. And everybody suspected it inside the White House; they tried to get McMaster to authorize an investigation of him as the leaker, and McMaster adamantly refused to authorize a formal investigation of this guy.

He then ascends, becoming the Deputy National Intelligence Officer for Russia and Ukraine, which is

where he sits now. He ascended to this post under former director Dan Coats. It can't be emphasized enough, that this is who the whistleblower is: the Deputy National Intelligence Officer for Russia and Ukraine, sitting there at the top level of the United States intelligence community.

Ascension to Untouchable

Now think about that; just think about that. What's being told to the Republicans is, "You cannot ask about this guy." It's obvious why; it's obvious that this guy ran—on behalf of the intelligence community of the United States and the British—the whole Ukrainian intervention into the election. This guy is who Lt. Colonel Vindman leaked the July 25 phone call to, which is at the center of the impeachment hearings we're actually now preoccupied with as a national preoccupation.

If you're thinking clearly, you realize the implications of this. The whistleblower's attorney said in January of 2017, "Now the coup begins." It's gone through several phases. We are now down to basically real time in which those people who are disloyal to the President are coming out of the woodwork and making themselves known. There is a flimsy attempt to actually keep us from knowing who they are. The point here is that this is not some electoral strategy or something like that; the very heart of our Constitutional republic is at stake now, at risk from the people who think they know better than the voters who voted in 2016. It is the very problem which Attorney General Barr said was actually a seditious attempt to overthrow the government of the United States; Barr called them out.

British Element in U.S. Foreign Policy

We will soon have the report from Michael Horowitz, the Department of Justice Inspector General, and it's something I want Bill to speak to, because I believe that in part, it will be a cover-up insofar as it doesn't address the fundamental premise of how this all started, which is exactly what Bill Binney has proved. Which is that there was no Russian hack over the internet of the Democratic National Committee; ergo, there was no substantial interference by the Russian government

into the 2016 election. There was, however, substantial interference by Ukraine, and by all of the people who have become so sacrosanct—Lt. Colonel Vindman, the whistleblower himself, and the State Department people who just testified about who engineered the coup in Ukraine and who didn't want the new President, Zelensky, to even get into office.

They wanted Poroshenko; that was the deal. That's who they installed; that's who they wanted to create a permanent vassal state, as Zbigniew Brzezinski dictated a long time ago, for waging war with Russia. Those are the parameters of what we're facing. But the very fact that this President is fighting, and the very fact

that others are now joining him in that fight—including ourselves—means that for the first time really since Franklin Roosevelt's death, we have an opportunity to expose the British element in United States strategic policy. We have a chance to return the United States to the foreign policy of John Quincy Adams; i.e., we're the city on the hill and we lead by example, because we develop our own country. We don't go abroad seeking monsters to destroy; we refuse to be an empire.

It gives us a huge chance to completely reshape how we deal with intelligence and the intelligence process within the government itself; because this process is thoroughly rotten to the core. Here you've got someone who is inexperienced, but

ambitious; trained in the school of the CIA of John Brennan, which brought national disaster upon us. We, the United States, ended up with a policy of assassination by baseball card, under President Obama—assassination by drones throughout the Middle East, versus any kind of sane foreign policy. And moreover, as most people know, we've spent trillions and trillions of dollars on behalf of becoming the policeman of an empire; but it's not our calling. Our calling goes back to what our founders saw as our national mission.

If we can just seize this moment—and it will not be an easy thing to do; this is a shooting war. As soon as you come out and expose it, you're going to be shot at. John Solomon, as everybody knows, has revealed more than a lot of other people about the real Ukraine intervention into the election. He's been essentially removed from



White House/Pete Souza

President Obama and his CIA Director John Brennan.

the newspaper *The Hill* and is being slandered every day. Rudolph Giuliani is facing a criminal investigation in all probability. The *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, all of these media are spending full time shooting at the people who can actually expose this, in the hopes that Bill Barr, and more importantly, the citizens of the United States, will chicken out from the fight.

But it's a fight we can win, and that's what I want to impress upon people tonight. So, that's how I'm going to open.

Evidence That Tells the Real Story

Bill Binney: I'll begin with the problem that I saw stirred up with the whistleblower. The fact that the phone call occurred on the 25th of July, and then the DNI Inspector General modified the criteria for accepting complaints from firsthand knowledge to simply hearsay. Then on the 12th, the whistleblower submitted his complaint; in the meantime, he worked with Rep. Adam Schiff and his group. But then the Inspector General passed the report to Congress.

My earlier experience with the report that we had filed with the Department of Defense Inspector General, was pretty straightforward. We had filed a complaint and he sent about 12 inspectors to come out to the NSA and investigate our complaint. He didn't automatically assume that the complaint was correct; he came and investigated the thing.

In other words, this Inspector General [investigating the whistleblower] did something under the table; he had some agreement with somebody to make it possible for this to happen. This is the part of the corruption that starts right up there at Director of National Intelligence Clapper's office. So, he needs to be included in this investigation; and it needs to clarify a lot of things for how Inspector Generals have to operate. They need better procedures; they don't have a really good procedure right now. Obviously, it's not working.

The Inspector General (IG) at the Department of Defense, by the way, is the one who gave our names to the FBI as likely candidates for leaking the classified program, the warrantless wiretap program, to the *New York Times*. This is, of course, false. The FBI knew that at the time, so did NSA; but it fit their plan of getting retribution against us for the complaint we had previously filed. So, at any rate, that's a separate story, but it gives you an idea of the procedure of what Inspector Generals are supposed to do. In the case of the whistleblower, the IG did not investigate, so I'm very suspicious of who got to that Inspector General to make him

do that, or is he a part of this cabal for the coup against President Trump?

I would also point out, and this is kind of important, because I filed an affidavit in the Roger Stone case, basically saying that I had forensic evidence that the DNC emails posted by Wikileaks were not a hack by the Russians, but were downloaded to a local storage device and transported physically before Wikileaks could post them. I also said the same thing about Guccifer 2.0. I could prove forensically that the data he posted was downloaded too fast to have gone across the internet; that it couldn't be a hack, so it had to be a local download. This was clearly provable, and we demonstrated it by actually doing some tests on the World Wide Web to see how well we could do.

It proved that the best we could do in our transfers was a little over 12 MB per second. That was less than a quarter of the capacity of the highest speed transferred by the Guccifer 2.0 material. So, that made it perfectly clear that that wasn't a hack, either; it was some local download being posted out there to try and confuse people into thinking it was in fact a hack when it wasn't.

Then, of course, we could look and see that his July 5th material and his September 1st material—the two batches that Guccifer 2.0 posted on the web—if you ignored hours and minutes, you could merge the two files into one continuous file without any conflict at the millisecond level. So, that meant that this guy is playing with the data; so he's playing with the data, and he's playing with us. He's a total fake from the beginning.

I put all of this in my affidavit going to the Federal court for the Roger Stone case. But here's what the judge did, and I'm very suspicious about this judge and what her involvement is here. The judge would not permit any entry of any information about the Russia hack. She said that's out of the question; when in fact, that was the grounds for getting a warrant to go after Roger Stone. It was based on that. So, everything they've gotten is what is called legally, "fruit of the poison tree." Yet, that judge would not let that information into the case in the court.

This is the same thing all around. No one on the Congressional committees or Mueller, none of them ever asked for any of the evidence. The only one who did was the President, and he asked me to go talk to then CIA Director Pompeo at the time; which I did. I brought that up, and I even told him how to get the evidence. They never asked me for it, physically from me, but it's in the public domain; anybody can get it. So, this whole thing is a charade, and there are an awful lot of people behind this.