

---

# I. ‘To Keep the Republic, Defend the Presidency’: LaRouche PAC Aug. 1 Forum

---

## Opening and Closing Statements of Roger Stone, Barbara Boyd, Bill Binney and Harley Schlanger

*We present here the opening and closing remarks at the live LaRouche PAC Symposium, “How to Stop the Ongoing Coup Against the Constitution and the Presidency,” on Saturday, August 1, 2020. The speakers were Roger Stone, Bill Binney, Barbara Boyd, and Harley Schlanger. The moderators were Michael Steger and Dennis Speed. The text is the edited transcript, except for Mrs. Boyd’s remarks, which are as prepared and also edited. The full 3-hour video is available [here](#).*



Roger Stone

**Roger Stone:** Thank you very much. I’m delighted to be here with you, and I’m particularly delighted to be with a very great man and a truth-teller—Bill Binney. What we now know is that the investigation into me by Robert Mueller’s dirty cops was not even approved until October of 2017. In other words, three months after Mueller’s forces knew that there was no collusion between the Russian state and the Trump campaign. This is further proof that my prosecution was a completely political prosecution. If you read the first four pages of my indictment, it lays out the fundamental

premise that the Democratic National Committee had an online hack by Russian intelligence officers, and that the data that was stolen was passed on to WikiLeaks. It is on that basis that my trial ended up in front of Judge Amy Berman Jackson.

In other words, the prosecutors—rather than take the chance of random selection of a judge in the D.C. Circuit—insisted that my case was related to the case that they had brought against I believe it is 17 alleged Russian intelligence officers who they claim hacked the DNC. That case has never even gone to discovery; that case will never go to trial. So, as far as I’m concerned today, it’s an accusation on paper. We’ve seen no evidence that accusation is correct, but the Mueller team insisted that my case was related to that case, and they guaranteed the court that they would introduce in my trial, evidence collected in that case. They did no such thing, and they provided us with no such evidence in discovery that came from that case.

So, this was a ruse to guarantee that I would be tried before the most hostile judge they had. One who had already violated Paul Manafort’s civil liberties by putting him in solitary confinement prior to his being convicted of any offense whatsoever, effectively gag-ordering him. They also placed a gag order on him which he did not contest. So, they basically defrauded the court in order to forum-shop, to judge-shop.

Then when I wanted to disprove the underlying premise of their indictment, Bill Binney supplied my attorneys quite graciously with an affidavit. He laid out for them exactly how you would make the case that the DNC had not been subject to an online hack by the Russians or anyone else. Technologically we’re lucky that I can run my email today, so I’m not a very technological

person, but I understood that the timing here was everything.

In other words, if the Mueller investigation was a stool with three legs, and the first leg was the Steele dossier, by the time my indictment came there were already questions about the validity of the dossier. And by the time I went to trial, it had been completely debunked. No one believed it was real based on enormous public events. The second leg of the stool would be the so-called Russian troll farms. The problem with that is, no one really believes that \$100,000 worth of very poorly written Facebook ads had any impact whatsoever. As the judge in that case directed Robert Mueller, you couldn't even tie the company that posted the troll farm alleged postings on Facebook to the Russian government. So, the second leg of their stool was knocked out.

There was only one leg left, and that was this bogus argument that the Russians had hacked the DNC. Of course, even if that were true—I don't believe it is; Bill Binney can speak to this far more eloquently than I can—they could also find, after going to multiple Federal judges and magistrates and claiming that they had probable cause to charge me with treason, espionage, conspiracy against the United States, cybercrimes including unauthorized access to a computer, cybercrimes including the receipt and dissemination of stolen data, money laundering, millions of rubles in violation of the foreign campaign contributions ban, mail fraud, wire fraud, aiding and abetting a conspiracy, accessory to a felony after the fact. They had eighteen individual crimes they said I could be charged with. The only thing they didn't include was the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

And of course, once they defrauded the courts and got full access to all of my emails, all of my text messages, all of my paper records, all of my computer records, and at least the chain of my phone calls, they found no evidence of any of those crimes. They found that I had no collusion with the Russians. In fact, they learned the only Russian I had met in 2016 was an FBI informant that they sent to come talk to me.

He approached me about purchasing dirt on Hillary Clinton. It was a very short meeting; it lasted about 12 minutes. I said, "I'm not interested," and I left. That, of course, is glossed over in Mr. Mueller's report. But I was able to locate one of nine informant visas signed by the head of the FBI office in Miami, under which this gentleman got into the country. When he approached

me, he used the name Henry Greenberg, clearly not his real name. I can't pronounce his real name, but suffice it to say, his real name did not appear in the Mueller report; this is glossed over entirely. Beyond that, they could find no evidence whatsoever that I knew about the source or content of any of the WikiLeaks disclosures prior to their being released.

In essence, what they did was to criminalize perfectly legal political behavior. This is very much like what they did to Lyndon LaRouche. Lyndon LaRouche was really prosecuted because he irritated the Bushes, because he contradicted them in public. And he did so during the New Hampshire primary, and he did so with great effect. And I can tell you now that he and his supporters worked very closely with Ronald Reagan's campaign and those I was involved in, because we both had a mutual distrust of the Bushes. The Bushes are not Republicans; they're not conservatives. In fact, they have no ideology other than the ideology of money and power. Their agenda is to create wealth for themselves and their cronies. So, they're crony capitalists except for when they're dealing with communist nations; then they're not capitalists.

So, I really believe that Lyn's real sin, other than challenging the orthodoxy of his day, having a broader vision than the vision of the neo-cons, was his epic campaign for President in which he embarrassed the would-be President, George H.W. Bush. Bush was an exceedingly vindictive man, not as vindictive as his wife, however. But they were definitely scorekeepers. If you look at those involved in the prosecution of Lyndon LaRouche—Bill Weld, Robert Mueller—these are all Bush family factotums. In fact, Bill Weld's father was partners with Prescott Bush in the banking enterprise which financed the armament of Nazi Germany.

In any event, to move on, my trial was really something else, because the Special Counsel's office leaked on a regular basis, and therefore for the 16 months prior to my arrest, you would see stories predicting that I would be charged with all of those various big-picture crimes—treason, espionage, being the go-between between WikiLeaks and the Trump campaign. There is an assumption that WikiLeaks is a Russian asset. I still argue that is unproven; that is a claim by [former CIA Director] John Brennan, we don't know that to be a fact. Assange denies it; I doubt it. There is no evidence to prove it.

And then, much was made of my twitter direct message exchange with the persona of Guccifer 2.0. Now,

the interesting thing about this is that I did have an exchange with this persona. I can't tell you if it is a person, a group of people, or whether it is no one at all. But I myself released the full context of the exchange in early 2017. It's benign; it shows nothing. It's basically patter. There is no evidence of collusion, cooperation, working together. No exchange of documents other than some ridiculous voter targeting study which he sent me, which I frankly didn't even open because it was so mundane. I turned this over to the House Intelligence Committee at the time that I voluntarily testified.

It proves nothing, but the timing of it does prove something. The exchange between the persona of Guccifer 2.0 and me, took place in late October of 2016.

In other words, long after WikiLeaks had already released all of the documents they had regarding the DNC or Hillary Clinton, making collaboration or coordination or collusion chronologically impossible, unless of course I owned a time machine. So, you have the actual text which proves that it is benign; you have the timing, which proves that it is meaningless; but then lastly, I'm not certain whatsoever that Guccifer 2.0 is, in fact, a Russian asset. That's an assertion from John Brennan. There are many assertions from Brennan that are not true.

Again, most of what I have studied in terms of forensic evidence, would lead one to the conclusion that Guccifer 2.0 as an entity is more likely an asset for American intelligence, and that no actual Russian intelligence asset would be nearly as clumsy as this one appears to be. In other words, there are purposeful fingerprints, or thumbprints, left everywhere to try to give you the impression that this is a Russian entity. I'm not sure that's true, but it certainly hasn't been proved in any court of law.

Therefore, it was interesting to me, literally the day after my commutation by the President, which was an act of both justice and mercy, because the judge in my case was absolutely intent on incarcerating me immediately in a prison in rural Georgia, despite all of the legal precedents in every circuit in the country, including D.C., over the previous 30 days in which people who were convicted of nonviolent offenses were moved to home confinement, or had their sentences reduced to time served.

Despite the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Prisons regulations which had been put out in April by Attorney General Barr that mandated that those convicted of nonviolent crimes be moved to home confine-

ment to protect them from COVID-19; despite my age and health—we made very substantial submissions to the court under seal—I have suffered from asthma and other respiratory problems my entire life (I'm also a vigorous 67); and despite the fact that the judge refused to acknowledge that there were active COVID-19 in the Jessup, Georgia prison where they wanted to send me.

And on top of the fact that that very prison only two weeks before I was to go there, had released a serial rapist, a child pornographer, a pedophile, and an armed bank robber, to protect them all from COVID-19.

I was not surprised when our emergency motion to Judge Jackson was denied. In fact, when she learned that the government would not oppose that motion on my part, she demanded that they explain themselves. They simply said, well, our position is consistent with the Department's current policies. I immediately appealed that to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, and 20 minutes before the President signed the commutation of my sentence, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against me, 3-0. So much for the rule of law. That's why I say the President's act of commutation was an act of mercy, as well as of justice.

If you'd been watching the news this morning, you'd know that some of the charges against the Boston Marathon bomber were thrown out, because of juror misconduct. Juror misconduct which is very similar to that that took place in my trial, where the jury forewoman, without any question whatsoever, was posting in 2019 on both Facebook and Twitter, beginning on the day I was arrested, attacking me; and attacked me again subsequently, actually posted a link to a piece about my indictment, and also attacked President Trump throughout the year, among other things, saying that he was a racist, and all of his supporters were racists. These postings were on a private setting during jury selection; they were on a private setting during the trial; and they were deleted after the trial.

So, when the judge rejected our motion to vacate my verdict and provide for a new trial, she said it was my lawyer's responsibility to know about this. I argued there was no way to know about it; we did our due diligence; this material was not available online at the time. And when asked specifically in the hearing about the story to which the juror had linked about me, the judge directed her not to answer the question, and actually said, "Just because Ms. Hart"—that's her name—"linked to a story, doesn't mean she actually read it."

Yeah. Also, when asked whether or not her com-

ment that all of President Trump's supporters were racist meant that I was a racist, the judge again stopped her from answering and said, "There's no evidence that Ms. Hart," a Democratic activist, a lawyer who ran for Congress, "there's no evidence that she knew that Roger Stone was an associate of Donald Trump's prior to being selected as a juror in this trial." Well, if that's true, then she had to be living under a rock.

The jury make-up itself was entirely hostile to the President. It included not one military veteran; it included not one single Republican, not one single independent, not one single union member, nobody with less than a college education, but a majority of the jurors with post-college educations; at least three lawyers who had previously worked either for the FBI or the Department of Justice, or some other prosecutor, people who worked in a left-wing think tank, a person who worked for a Democratic political action committee. This was a hanging jury to say the least.

So you not only had the active sabotage by the jury forewoman, who lied her way onto the jury, but the judge then decided in a hearing that she would not call every juror back, she would just take a sampling. But in her sampling, she just happened to choose the juror who the day before had written an op-ed in the *Washington Post* saying how great the decision had been in my trial, and how it was unaffected by politics.

This was a Soviet-style show trial. As you said in the beginning, they would not allow me to have Bill Binney testify at my trial. They would not allow us to submit any forensic evidence that would disprove their underlying theory. They would not allow me to argue selective prosecution. In other words, Mueller lied.

Well, let's start at the beginning—Comey lied, Clapper lied, Brennan lied, McCabe lied, Page lied, Rosenstein lied, Mueller himself lied, Hillary Clinton lied. All these people lied to Congress, although the difference between me and them is that they lied about material things. They lied about things of consequence.

For example, James Clapper said there was no metadata collection program on American citizens. We now know that that's false. Where is Mr. Clapper now? He's on the ethics board at UPenn, [University of Pennsylvania] when he's not being paid six figures by CNN.

So, I was not allowed to argue that.

Then, the most stunning motion of all by the government: Stone is not allowed to raise the question of misconduct by the Special Counsel, the Department of Justice, the FBI, or any individual member of Congress.

That is patently unconstitutional under *Kyles v. Whitley*, but more precisely if you stop and think about it, why would the government want to prohibit the introduction of evidence of misconduct unless they knew that there was misconduct at hand? Unless they knew that would be a makeable argument, if you will?

It's also interesting that they added members of Congress to this motion that was granted by Judge Jackson; I'll tell you why. I now believe that, based on the wording of the specific questions on which I was charged with making misstatements, all of which were asked by one Congressman, Adam Schiff, which is odd because every member on this panel, both Republican and Democrat, was given their time over my five-hour voluntary testimony, to ask questions.

It is abundantly clear that the Special Counsel, having obtained my emails, then in violation of law, shared those emails with Adam Schiff, who then crafted very tightly-worded questions that were "gotcha" questions; none of which were particularly revelatory, but all of which were a lock, as it were. Then Schiff asked these questions; I made misstatements, again I argue that they were immaterial, and therefore there was no intent to deceive. Then Schiff, in violation of both the House rules and the law, shared my classified testimony with the Special Counsel, when then crafted this very contorted indictment for lying to Congress.

How clever. Unfortunately, Schiff couldn't help but crow about it, so within 24 hours, he went out publicly and said Stone will be charged with perjury before the House Intelligence Committee. A, that's a violation of the House rules; he's not supposed to discuss my testimony at all, never mind characterize it. But secondarily, one wonders how he could possibly know that so far in advance.

There's a great piece at *RedState*, which I commend to you, in which they have taken the indictment against me and deconstructed it. It was written by Andrew Weissman. He's so clever that he left his metadata tags on the original draft. And it is extraordinarily contorted and contrived and largely fabricated, because they had to come up with some crime. They throw in witness tampering, which is ironic because Randy Credico, the witness I've been accused of tampering with, had simply said, "Oh my God! All of my progressive friends are going to know that I inadvertently helped elect Donald Trump. I'll be a pariah, what shall I do?"

I suggested that he assert his Fifth Amendment rights. In fact, we have email and testimony that Mr.

Credico threatened to shoot another witness who went to the grand jury, an exculpatory witness who supported my version of events. Threatened to shoot him in the head if he contradicted Randy's testimony before the grand jury. We also handed over 30 pages of text messages that proved indisputably that Credico was my source for the very limited knowledge I had of the WikiLeaks disclosures. That would be that they were politically significant, in fact, explosive, and that they would come out in October.

There you have it, the sum total of what I knew. Not exactly a state secret. But the Mueller investigation chose to ignore multiple exculpatory witnesses and the 30 pages of text messages, which interestingly enough, Credico himself had never supplied, but we supplied to the prosecutors. In fact, we supplied them the day before 29 jack-booted FBI agents stormed my home at 6 a.m. in the morning to arrest me. That scene, as you know, was basically orchestrated for CNN. I now know from looking at the security camera footage, which the FBI cleverly forgot to take with them, that the CNN camera crew showed up exactly 14 minutes before the FBI.

I do not hold, and did not hold a valid passport; I don't own a firearm, although I do strongly support the Second Amendment. And thanks to CNN and MSNBC, I think I'm universally recognized. So, the idea that I was a flight risk, and therefore this heavy-handed, Gestapo-style raid had to be staged, is ridiculous; proven by the fact that three hours after, when I was arraigned, the government asked for no cash bond for my release. Proving yet again that they didn't really believe that I was a flight risk.

So, one has to assume that this over-the-top extravaganza, which cost the taxpayers \$1.1 million—29 FBI agents, 17 armored vehicles, a government helicopter, 2 government amphibious units replete with frogmen. This was like the D-Day invasion; completely unnecessarily. It was staged either to intimidate me, clearly unaware of my Sicilian heritage, or to send a message to other witnesses that they should go along unless they wanted the same treatment.

I do have to point out one aspect of this, and that is, the government's surprise witness was Steve Bannon. Steve Bannon swept into the courtroom, kind of looking like an overweight Johnny Cash on a three-day bender. He took the stand and said under oath that he had discussed WikiLeaks and Julian Assange in virtually every telephone conversation we had in 2016. It

was a riveting moment. I think it helped seal the guilty verdict. The problem was that in his sworn testimony before the House Intelligence Committee, which was classified at that time, but has since been declassified, he denied under oath that he ever discussed WikiLeaks or Julian Assange with me, ever, on any occasion.

In fact, Adam Schiff made it very definitive: "Before you joined the campaign, while you were at the campaign, after you left the campaign, before you went to the White House, when you were at the White House, after you were at the White House, did you discuss these matters with Roger Stone?" "No," says Bannon. Pretty clear to me that he either lied there under oath, and that's the very crime I was charged with, or he lied on the stand. Knowing the facts, I can tell you: he lied on the stand.

So, the idea that he is one of us, that he is fighting the Deep State, is disproven not only by his conduct in my trial, but I can tell you definitively that every major neo-con that has joined this administration—I'm thinking of H.R. McMaster, or Rex Tillerson and worse—was there with the advocacy and the patronage of Steve Bannon. The idea that he is against the neo-cons is a contrivance. He is a bad actor, who would have been perfectly happy to see me die in a COVID-19 infested prison, but for the enormous courage of Donald Trump.

That kind of sums up where I have been. It has been not only a political, but a spiritual journey. I have one final comment. That is, in the discovery in my trial, we finally forced the FBI to admit that they had never inspected the servers at the DNC, and that they were relying solely on a draft redacted report by CrowdStrike for the assertion that the DNC had been hacked by the Russians. CrowdStrike said they essentially had a screen shot of the servers. That's kind of like having a photograph of the murder weapon. You can't really inspect it.

Once this fact came out and began to get picked up in the mainstream media, the government filed a sur-reply signed by Assistant Attorney Jonathan Kravitz which says, briefly, "Stone is incorrect. We have substantial additional evidence that the Russians hacked the DNC, but we cannot provide it because it is a matter of national security." I believe that is a fraud upon the court, and it is my intention to file a formal complaint with the Office of Professional Responsibility to get that very issue examined. With that, I'm delighted to be with you, and I'm happy to hear what others have to say.



LPAC-TV

*William Binney*

**William Binney:** Thank you very much. It's good to be here with you, especially you, Roger. I'm glad to see the President did exactly what he did do to pardon you. It was only just. After the sham trial that you had, and the fact that the judge wouldn't allow proof into the courtroom basically. Basically falsifying evidence against you, which is what they did to us after we left the NSA, trying to get the government to abide by the Constitution, especially when it came to U.S. citizens.

We knew they were violating it; they fabricated evidence against us, too. The difference is, Roger, I knew the type of people we were dealing with, and I was watching them, and I caught them at that fabrication, and I had evidence to charge them with malicious prosecution. I so informed them of that, and they ran away. But it just goes to show you that the people of the United States can no longer trust their government. Unless Barr and Durham start to take some action to really reinstate justice in this country, we're going to be moving on with a Department of Just Us, and we the people will never have an opportunity to get true justice.

But I would like to add one thing about Guccifer 2.0 that maybe wasn't clear in previous statements I made about the forensics of it. The Guccifer 2.0 data that we looked at, we clearly showed the speeds of downloads of that data to a thumb drive were possible, but it was not possible to send that data across the internet to Russia or anywhere else outside the United States, or even inside the United States to a lot of places. They couldn't get it because they didn't have these high-speed lines to carry that kind of rate transfer. We proved that.

Not only did we show the speeds that were involved, but we also showed that you couldn't do it. We tried to do our transfer from Albania, from Netherlands, from the U.K. The further east we got, the less speed we got.

We couldn't achieve the higher speeds going further east; it went down.

But after that also, we looked at the data that Guccifer 2.0 published, both on the 15th of June, the 5th of July, and the 1st of September. The two files he published on the 1st of September and the 5th of July 2016, if you look at them, and only looked at minutes, seconds, and milliseconds, you could shuffle them together like a deck of cards without conflict. That says the guy is playing a game with the data. He did one download, split it into two files, did a range change on the date and a range change on the hour, because he couldn't do it on the minutes because it crossed many minutes. And he couldn't do it on the seconds or milliseconds, because there are so many of those.

So, he could only do a range change on the date and the hour, which is apparently what he did, because those two files merge into one. That said he was playing with the data.

Then, on the 15th of June, he published some articles showing that it had Russian fingerprints in it. Well, our affiliates doing the research with us in the U.K. looked at that data, and found that five of those files they also found in the Podesta email documentation by WikiLeaks. That was posted on the 21st of September. That was at least the times that they had it, so the point was, those files that were in the WikiLeaks publication didn't have any Russian fingerprints. So, that meant Guccifer 2.0 inserted those fingerprints.


And then we went back to the Vault 7 material where the Vault 7 material said this program, Marble Framework, was a program that made it look like other countries did the hack, when in fact, the CIA did the hack. Well, they were able to mimic, or make it look like the Russians, the Chinese, the North Koreans, the Iranians, or Arabs did the attack. They could attack anybody and leave fingerprints making it look like someone else did it.

So, when you looked at it, that meant to us that Guccifer 2.0 was using some kind of program or process to insert those fingerprints into the data from the DNC. On top of that, in the Vault 7 material, it said that the Marble Framework program was used one time in 2016. Well, we think we found it; and that says to us that all the evidence we've been accumulating forensically from the outside is pointing back at CIA as the origin of Guccifer 2.0.

So, their entire allegation about you and the Russians and everybody, has a false premise to start with.

So, everything they introduce,— and the reason they went after you and also General Flynn was what lawyers call “fruit of the poison tree.” They set it up, they manipulated it, they contrived it, and they executed it. And you and General Flynn, and they tried to make us also, put us in jail under the Espionage Act by fabricating the evidence against us too. So, it’s really how can we ever trust the FBI until Barr and Durham really clean it up?

**Stone:** Agreed.



*Barbara Boyd*

LPAC-TV

**Barbara Boyd:** Clearly what happened to Roger here in his account of the case, is that he was basically treated by them as roadkill. Unabashedly so, to terrify everybody who is out there in the population who might consider joining the revolution which actually I would characterize as beginning in 2009, against globalization, which culminated in the election of Donald Trump, and the resistance to that election has been a continuing saga ever since then.

The idea of what happened to Roger is that every single argument which appears to be just, appears to be true, is simply discarded and we just run over. And then you’re gagged, and you’re not allowed to say what happened. It is a situation in which the intelligence community played the major role, no doubt about it. They had certain factotums out there like Adam Schiff, like Robert Mueller, like all of these people. But the essential message which is being sent here, and there should be no doubt about it, is if you step out of line, we have the means to come after you. What are you going to do about it?

That’s what the entire sort of type of this prosecution is all about. In the case of Lyndon LaRouche, we could talk about that, and I will be fully prepared to

discuss that in the questions and answers. But it’s very similar. Ramsey Clark described it as being in all of his experience the most meticulous process of planning to get somebody that he had ever seen. And that speaks a lot in terms of the experience of Ramsey Clark, because it was a period which began with a British government demand for LaRouche’s head in 1982. It’s explicit.

We didn’t know that until long after the appeals in the case had taken place; we suspected it, most certainly. And then it was orchestrated through the George H.W. Bush administration, as Roger speculates, there was open hostility there, as I’m sure George H.W. Bush held that LaRouche’s intervention in New Hampshire played a significant role in Ronald Reagan assuming the Presidency. And George H.W. Bush was not someone who could forgive or forget that. This is a guy, after all, who Seymour Hersh has documented in a story which has been completely quashed, was not above sending people out to actually assassinate people he considered his foes.

### **Where Did It Begin and How To End It?**

When we talk about the keystone myth of Russia-gate, that a Russian hack of the DNC’s servers resulted in the WikiLeaks publications which occurred in July and October of 2016, it seems like we are talking about discrete events. There are two foundational legends in this psyop against the population and the world, the Russian hack story, and the dirty British dossier, promoted and circulated by MI6’s Christopher Steele, it is claimed, around April of 2016.

It seems like, a few brave men in official Washington, *Fox News*, the *Daily Caller*, other conservative outlets, will allow Steele’s dirty fake gossip sheet, to be eviscerated and prosecuted, but the big lie exposed by Bill Binney cannot be touched. Julian Assange will be forced to die in Belmarsh or a similarly brutal American prison without ever telling the story about how he actually came to possess the DNC and John Podesta emails. If the present coup against Donald Trump succeeds, Joe Biden will be crowned the Barack Obama Administration 2.0, an administration of violence-prone technocrats led by a senile and shrunken old man, without any real disclosure of Biden’s vicious role in the coup being conducted against Donald Trump.

Exactly why is that?

Maybe people did not notice that the British government had already dispatched its finest, right after Donald Trump’s election, to declare Christopher Steele

an unreliable rogue operative who had already been banished from the Queen's table.

They didn't notice that Christopher Steele destroyed all his notes on election day. They also didn't notice that Christopher Steele has recently re-emerged in the pantheon of British intelligence Mandarins, this time insisting that Boris Johnson and Theresa May had actively covered up Trump's ties to Russia and that the British elite has been largely captured by the Chinese, backed by the highest levels of British intelligence in these allegations. They didn't notice that, instead of being arrested and prosecuted, Christopher Steele has been lavishly supported all of these months by the conglomerate of Silicon Valley billionaires, called the Democracy Alliance, which has also provided significant funding to Black Lives Matter.

Can it be accidental that Steele's bona fides have been restored and he re-emerges just when Boris Johnson has announced industrial mobilization policies modeled on Franklin Roosevelt's for Britain to emerge from the COVID depression? It is most definitely not. And, Donald Trump is beginning to do the same.

I want to suggest that the reason why the Russian hack story is being allowed to survive is because its exposure would lead directly to the actual perfidies of our so-called intelligence services and those they have compromised in the Congress and elsewhere, and pulls the curtain back on the actual forces controlling "discrete events." As Friedrich Schiller said in his remarkable works on universal history, and as Lyndon LaRouche thought in his own examinations of the present and the past, processes and dynamics produce events, fundamental axioms about the nature of mankind and the universe, shape completely how events unfold.

And right now, we are in the most decisive battle we have been in, ever since the American population began to reject globalization shortly after Barack Obama was inaugurated in 2009, and Lyndon LaRouche, appropriately, crowned him with a mustache reminiscent of a certain German Führer.

And what I want to emphasize today is that this battle can be won by this population, provided we don't buy into the way they want us to think.

In the larger story, boldfaced in Bill Binney's encounters around his marvelous invention of Thin-Thread, the elites in the United States, used 9/11 to set up a surveillance police state, much more elegant than

those employed by other nations. Like the Roman Empire's pantheon of religions, it sets forth a table of controlled choices for those participating, allowing them to "choose," "right" or "left," "traditionalist" or "radical," and induces them to think that they are choosing "freely." Discussion of "events," always in the present, with little reference to the past and virtually none to the future, about which you are allowed to freely opine, not understanding that any opinion within this framework is axiomatically false, is the coin of their realm.

Bill Binney told you, in the movie, *The Good American*, how our intelligence services were privatized as corporate behemoths beginning with Ronald Reagan's Executive Order 12333, and how they proceeded to set up a system of surveillance and information warfare both for profit and for control of public opinion and modern hybrid war, here and abroad. In parallel, following the crash of the dot-com bubble, Google, in 2002, began using ads as a primary source of income in the new financial universe they were creating. If you think about it, their new economy is an economy built on mining and ultimately controlling the raw materials of human behavior. You can see more clearly what it means when you click that incomprehensible Terms of Service Agreement, without understanding a word of it, and open yourself to 24-hour-a-day surveillance.

Now, in reality, I believe it can be conclusively shown that the events which have occurred in the United States beginning in or around November of 2015 or before, are modeled upon events which occurred in Ukraine in 2014 and we are very close to blowing the whole story.

By that, I don't mean to employ the expression that the color revolution, run by NATO, British intelligence, the FBI, CIA and U.S. State Department, in Ukraine in 2014, has come to the United States, as some type of empty slogan, or that the pink pussy cat hats worn in the Women's March in January of 2017 is the be-all and end-all of intelligence analysis. *The Guardian*, this morning, carries a story that GCHQ in Britain was the first to warn about Trump's ties to Russia in or about November of 2015. In reality, that warning was part of a project seeking to neutralize all radical or resistant elements on the right or the left in upcoming advanced-sector elections, with the U.S. presidential election the primary target.

I mean to say the very same Obama Administration

operatives responsible for the coup in Ukraine were determined to elect Hillary Clinton at whatever cost in order to take the final steps in perfecting their surveillance state and surveillance capitalism at a time when they knew that the economic model of globalization, constructed when the Berlin Wall fell, had already failed, as of 2008. It was and is a desperate gambit. They were desperate to maintain their power and had chosen the myths of catastrophic climate change and wholesale suppression of any form of dissent, right or left, as the means to allow them to reduce the world's populations to the level they considered governable, even willing to provoke wars to that end.

In Ukraine, people remember the so-called riots and police actions in Kiev which killed many people as a subject of continued investigations. They have, with the rare exceptions of George Eliason, Max Blumenthal, and Ben Norton, paid little attention to the information warfare and psyops which controlled that military operation of government-overthrow and subsequent civil war. They have paid little attention to the installation of neo-Nazis, terror, and murder, as the means for immediate subjugation of those who resisted the coup, an operation run directly by Joe Biden and which Joe Biden and members of the U.S. Congress have continued to showcase and worship to this day. No one seems willing to touch the neo-Nazis and the Azov brigades run through Obama and Biden when considering the media's portrayal of Joe Biden as a "nice, but befuddled old man."

People often say, "Why won't the media cover this? Why are they in lock step, for the most part?" In Ukraine, a military intelligence operative from the United States, Joel Harding, perfected the art of information warfare as the central aspect of the coup d'état. No, and I do mean, no, independent portrayal of events was to be allowed for that population. The media was in total lockstep with the overthrow apparatus. It was not an independent force; it was the primary instrument of sedition. Similar operations like this had preceded Ukraine in Iraq.

In Ukraine, an Atlantic Council information warfare specialist by the name of Dimitri Alperovitch, who others might know as the leading force in an organization called CrowdStrike, worked with a variety of hacking groups who used their talents in psyops against both the incumbent Ukrainian government and in a hot hate campaign against Putin and Russia.

In Ukraine, a woman by the name of Alexandra Chalupa, coordinating with a gentleman by the name of Eric Ciaramella, working as an aide to Joe Biden, and her sister Andrea Chalupa, ran something called "DigitalMaidan" which coordinated with the very powerful and ridiculously neo-Nazi Banderites in the Ukrainian diaspora in the U.S. and Canada to provide money and bullets for the Ukrainian coup and subsequent civil war.

In Ukraine, a man by the name of Paul Manafort, tried to steer the incumbent government toward a compromise, having learned much about the entire U.S. operation.

In Ukraine, the U.S. State Department, FBI, and CIA employed a gentleman by the name of Christopher Steele of British intelligence in their information warfare operations.

When Donald Trump threatened to win the election and openly sought collaboration with Russia on new international arrangements, this apparatus, inclusive of British intelligence, elements of the Pentagon, the State Department, the CIA, and, belatedly, the FBI, were turned against him, directly from the Obama White House. At the same time, they had already turned against Bernie Sanders and the incipient revolt on that side of the aisle, a revolt rooted in the bailout and the deliberate deindustrialization and complete class stratification of the U.S. economy fully witnessed by the population as of 2008. The "Russian hack" revealed that side of the conspiracy, the side of the conspiracy meant to silence the "left" and create a permanent divide within U.S. culture, where independent and rebellious forces are mobilized violently, but against one another.

A little-noticed keystone event in this was the November 24th *Washington Post* story by Craig Timberg, which smeared virtually every progressive or right-wing publication in the U.S. as a tool of Russian propaganda. Joel Harding, the guy who perfected total information warfare in Ukraine, was a key operative in that operation, along with a slew of people who worked directly for the Atlantic Council and Ukrainian intelligence. Since that time, many if not most of these publications have been shadow banned or driven out of existence in the continuing coup against Trump. Some of them simply jumped on the anti-Trump band wagon for purposes of financial survival.

There is a deep poetic truth in President Trump asking the incoming Ukrainian president Zelensky

about whether the DNC server was in Ukraine in that infamous call which the House of Representatives used to impeach the president. For example, just think about this. On July 25, 2016, three days after WikiLeaks published the first trove of DNC related documents, Michael Isikoff published an article in *Yahoo News* which, in retrospect, is both a complete lie but also a complete coverup.

Isikoff worked with Alexandra Chalupa and Christopher Steele in their attacks on Trump as a Russian agent, with Paul Manafort being the first public target. Their operations were actually put into motion in late 2015.

The *Yahoo News* article tries to say that the DNC first knew they had been hacked in May of 2016 when Alexandra Chalupa received a message from Yahoo saying her account had been targeted by “state sponsored actors.” The message, Isikoff says, “triggered high level concern within the DNC, given the sensitive nature of her work. That’s when we knew it was the Russians.” Chalupa, of course, was collaborating directly with Ukrainian intelligence on behalf of Hillary Clinton, to swing the election against Trump. She continued that work, but not under direct DNC auspices. According to the DNC’s own subsequent account, CrowdStrike was already inside the DNC computers at the time of Yahoo’s alleged warning to Chalupa, as was the U.S. intelligence community.

There is great hope in all of this. Because this president has stood his ground against more and more of the decadent, stupid, and deadly apparatus which has plagued this nation ever since the unpunished assassination of John F. Kennedy has been brought into daylight. This week in Washington, Senators Johnson and Grassley continued to link the Ukraine operations against Trump with the Obama/Biden intelligence operations in Ukraine in a letter they sent demanding documents from the State Department, CIA and Director of National Intelligence.

The key to blowing this up is not with some Barr and Durham report down the line. The key to blowing this up is with you. A great deal has already been revealed, enough to tell you what is going on. No more information is really needed. The question is, what are we going to do to dismantle the nascent surveillance and police state and revive our economy with a President who is willing to do this?

You have the power to overturn all of this provided you reject the event-focused, opinion-based propa-

ganda operations which are meant to profile and cull you. You have the ability to demand the truth based on the type of thinking which our founders employed in founding the republic. It is the Socratic search for truth, looking for the longer-term causes of present events, in both the past and the future, which will save us, and your willingness to act on your discoveries, rather than countenance your fears.



LPAC-TV

*Harley Schlanger*

**Harley Schlanger:** As you’ve just heard, we now know an enormous amount about who carried out this coup attempt, and how they did it. But I think to win the fight, we have to go one step further, which is that we have to get at what is the alternative policy orientation that they were trying to stop. That is, what is the intent of the coup-plotters. And to get at that, I want to take a couple of examples, that show the parallels between, as you’ve heard, the parallels between the LaRouche case and the Russiagate case, but in particular, moments of identification of the policy issues that are underlying the fight.

Now, when Lyndon LaRouche passed away in February 2019, Roger Stone was interviewed by Associated Press, and he said he was very familiar with the extraordinary and prophetic thinking of LaRouche. And he added that LaRouche’s ideas had an important backstage role in electing Donald Trump. Now, Roger alluded to this in his comments. I want to give you a couple of examples that are striking, that show what is the underlying policy fight, that Russiagate, Ukrainegate, the coup against President Trump, actually represents. I’ll start with the 1976 election campaign, when Jimmy Carter was running, and Lyndon LaRouche had his first presidential campaign, and through the period of 1980, when Ronald Reagan defeated Jimmy Carter.

LaRouche made an intervention on Election Eve, and what he did at that time, was attack two things, two aspects of the thinking of the establishment that were being brought in with the Carter Administration:

First, he attacked what was called the Paddock Plan for Mexico. Essentially, this was a Malthusian plan to reduce Mexico's population, along the lines of Henry Kissinger's National Security Study Memorandum 200, which was committed to a radical depopulation of the world's population.

At the time, people didn't realize that [William] Paddock was actually an associate of the person Lyndon LaRouche attacked, namely Zbigniew Brzezinski. Because it was Brzezinski who represented the geopolitical doctrines that were brought in with the Carter Administration, that led to the permanent wars that President Trump is trying to stop. Brzezinski had this idea of the "arc of crisis," which was how to use the Islamic populations, especially radicalized Islamic populations, in the arc that was under the Soviet Union and extended over to China.

And this was the geopolitical doctrine that goes back to the middle of the 19th century, what was called "the Great Game," which became the theory of Halford Mackinder on geopolitics. And that's what Brzezinski represented. And LaRouche, in that half-hour broadcast, expose both the Malthusian intent, and the desire to keep permanent warfare as the major element of U.S. policy.

Now, then let's go ahead to the Reagan campaign: There's a very important discussion that Lyndon LaRouche had with Ronald Reagan at one of the primary events in New Hampshire, and that's when Reagan became familiar, at least the beginning of his familiarity, with LaRouche's thinking. We played a leading role, as has been alluded to, in that fight. We put out a leaflet for mass circulation, entitled, "If You Like Carter, You'll Love Bush." And this had a devastating effect on George H.W. Bush in his campaign.

When Reagan came in, he was committed to the idea of avoiding war. Now, I did an interview with Roger yesterday, which will be out next week, where he talked about Reagan's idea of "peace through strength," so I won't review that here. But what became clear is that LaRouche's idea, of developing an anti-missile defense policy, that not only would protect the United States from incoming missile attack, but could be shared with the Soviet Union, that would eliminate

the desire of either country to launch nuclear strikes, would make nuclear missiles "impotent and obsolete." And this was Ronald Reagan's intent, President Reagan, when he adopted exactly LaRouche's SDI policy.

Now, unknown to virtually anybody at the time, LaRouche had already been deputized by the Reagan Administration to talk with the Soviets about whether they would accept this idea. They didn't. And this was when the "Get LaRouche Task Force" went into full force. The idea that LaRouche had access to President Reagan's policy, that he was involved in shaping internationally, a policy.

Now, combine that with the other issue that LaRouche was involved in in 1982: Dealing with Mexico and the debt crisis. He met with the Mexican President José López Portillo and drafted a program called *Operation Juárez*, which was a definitive attack on what, at the time, was the beginnings of the globalization policy to turn Mexico into a slave-labor encampment for U.S. corporations, while outsourcing U.S. jobs, outsourcing our manufacturing. LaRouche attacked this, and presented an alternative proposal for a reorganized financial system based on the ideas of the American System.

So, his attack on the geopolitics, on Mutual and Assured Destruction, on Brzezinski's "arc of crisis," as well as his commitment not just to defend the people of Mexico, but the entire developing sector from the rapacious looting of the International Monetary Fund and the major banks, this became the element which was the driving force behind the attacks on LaRouche. His commitment to that transformation of the world, from a new British Empire, where colonial regimes now would include advanced sector countries that would be looted, and instead, breaking that power.

Move ahead to the present period, to the 2016 election, I can give you many more examples of LaRouche's policies which were reflected in the campaign initiatives made by President Trump.

For example, this meeting opened with a video clip of Lyndon LaRouche speaking about the importance of a Moon and Mars mission. This has been adopted by President Trump. A very bold plan, to not only move people to the Moon, Americans to the Moon, but also to Mars. And just two days ago, an Atlas V rocket was launched which will take a rover to Mars to do experiments. President Trump has picked up on what John

Kennedy did and what Lyndon LaRouche has always promoted as the “extraterrestrial imperative” for mankind.

And part of this was the revival of scientific and technological optimism against anti-growth green fascism. LaRouche always attacked free trade, going back before NAFTA, to the establishment under GATT of the World Trade Organization, and this became a signature fight for President Trump, especially against Hillary Clinton’s gold standard, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which Trump withdrew the United States from, as soon as he became President.

Like LaRouche, President Trump has called for rebuilding American infrastructure, establishing new platforms of infrastructure, as part of an overall emphasis on reviving manufacturing. And importantly, after the 2008 crash, which Lyndon LaRouche had forecast more than a year earlier, LaRouche called for the restoration of Glass-Steagall. And this was included by President Trump in the Republican Party platform.

And finally, and extremely significantly, from what you’ve heard from both Roger Stone and Bill Binney—and what you just heard from Barbara Boyd on the exposé of the Ukraine coup—LaRouche has always been focussed on attacking those networks in the United States that use regime-change coups, proxy warfare, support for terrorism, and support for the austerity regimes of the International Monetary Fund, to prevent any nation from getting out of line. This including the coup in Libya, that was supported by Hillary Clinton; the Ukraine coup for which Biden was the chief operator of the Obama Administration in carrying out; and the attempted coup in Syria, which included the exposé by Michael Flynn, of U.S. involvement in training and arming Syrian terrorists.

What LaRouche had always advocated was cooperation through dialogue. Isn’t this what President Trump said, when he said, it’s better to be friends with Russia than to fight with them? That we can cooperate, we can work together? And he actually started doing that, with the joint efforts against terrorism in Syria, and then furthermore with the open responses back and forth, between himself and President Putin on arms control, which was the major topic of their discussion at the Helsinki summit, which the media turned into Trump bowing down to Putin, but not challenging him for his role in Russiagate. It turns out, Trump and Putin

were right when Putin said there was no Russian hacking. And all of the media and all the politicians who attacked Trump and Putin were wrong! Have they apologized yet?

Now, as a platform, if you look at these proposals I just mentioned from LaRouche, which are echoed by the Trump campaign and Trump Presidency, they would completely overturn two aspects of the modern world: neo-liberal economic policies, which are designed to create a global casino economy, in which the upper 1% control the house and make the profits, and everyone else is the subject of predatory looting. We see this over and over again, with bubbles created, stock bubbles, derivatives bubbles, funny-money operations. And when they go bad, as in the mortgage-backed securities blowout in 2008, who gets bailed out? The homeowners who were cheated out of their homes, the 8 million or so of those? No. The banks get bailed out and the people are left with the bills.

Now, that’s the neo-liberal order. The other side of this is the geopolitical strategic operation, which includes attacking any nation which doesn’t submit to this policy.

Now, this is what the establishment saw in Trump’s campaign in 2016: a radical break with the policies of George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and a number of other, previous presidencies. In opposition to unilateralism, Trump proposed national sovereignty, and relations between sovereign nations.

The establishment believed Trump had no chance in winning. It turned out they were wrong. And that’s how Russiagate became what corrupt FBI agent Peter Strzok called the “insurance policy”: If they couldn’t beat him at the ballot box, they were going to destroy him, or minimally tie his hands so he could not proceed with an overturning of this global order.

Breaking the forces behind the coup is absolutely essential, but it’s not just exposing the evil and corrupt individuals and their illegal tactics. What we have to do, is pick up on this policy operation, the end of these endless wars, as President Trump continues to stress, is key to what he’s trying to do. And secondly, rebuilding America based on the American System, reviving industry, reviving science and technology, this is what will take us out from under the control of these City of London/Wall Street financial forces, and their military-industrial complex paid operatives, and bring us into a new era in which perfectly sovereign nation-states can

cooperate in developing a world in which poverty is eliminated, disease is brought under control, and man has an opportunity—all men and women of all countries—to explore space.

Thank you for the invitation to participate today.

## Closing Statements

**Boyd:** Sure. As I said before, we're at a stage of extremely decisive battle, which I think Bill correctly characterized in one of our latest meetings as very similar to the Civil War: We will determine in the next months, days, whether government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as Lincoln said, can continue to exist. That's really the issue, and it really is up to the people to mobilize themselves to ensure that that happens.

And as I've said before, the biggest enemy is fear. We have before us an enormous opportunity: Never before has so much of this apparatus, assembled in the wake of Harry Truman assuming the Presidency from Roosevelt, continued in an emphatic point after the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Never before have these people stood so exposed. And the question for all of us, is can we—starting today—mobilize the resources, a great deal of which is just educational material, you know, basically learning what it means to talk about the Constitution, to talk about what our forefathers actually believed, in terms of our economics; to talk about what Hamilton foresaw as the American System of political economy, and to demand nothing less than that level of thinking from our leaders, to not settle for any compromises at this point, which are pragmatic.

With respect to the coup which we've described here, absolutely, the entire apparatus which was involved in this, has to be identified and prosecuted. No deals! And the only people who can make that happen, the only reason why you're talking about a Barr or Durham report, is because the President and those who support him have actually stood their ground, to date! Otherwise, they would have succeeded in covering all of this up!

So, we're at the next stage of the battle and we have to win.

**Schlanger:** Just to follow up on that—look, fear leads people to pessimism, to sitting on the couch hoping that something will happen, but believing that

nothing will happen. I have so many people communicating with me regularly, who say things like, "It'll never happen." "No one will do it." "They're too powerful."

What Barbara just said: Take that to heart! They're not so powerful, and they're not so smart. They thought they could get away with this, because they thought the President would not fight. They thought the American people would accept the fraud. But as Lyndon LaRouche said right after the election, the election of Donald Trump was not just an American development, it was part of an insurgency worldwide. We saw it with Brexit, we see it with the fight in Italy. I see it here in Germany, with the collapse of all the political parties.

There's a moment where small people can start dreaming big, and acting in big ways. The only way to do that, is to give up the pessimism which is imposed on you! It's not natural! Look, Americans are naturally optimistic, that's why people came out and voted for Donald Trump. They didn't like to be lectured at by Hillary Clinton.

So, if we realize in ourselves, the potential to dream and to think big, we have to bring that out and to inspire that in others. And if we do it, we can save the country.

**Binney:** Well, I certainly agree with what Barbara and Harley have said. I would just like to add, that turning around this country starts with people. I mean, people don't realize the power they have! If, for example, they simply turned off all the mainstream media and looked elsewhere for their news, and media, and truth, you would never expect it, but the impact would be so great, in terms of their ratings, that they would scramble to try to get back into the goodness of truth and light. And that's what I'd say—otherwise, they'd go out of business.

And look at the *New York Times*, its diminishing circulation. When people turn it off, *they* either turn around, or they die. And that's the whole point of it. And that's how we could turn this whole thing around in this country.

Now, plus: People need to know for sure, that they never had to give up privacy for security! That was never the case. It was a lie from the beginning by those in power in this country, and they used it to gain power over everybody. And it is reversible, it is fixable, it can be fixed easily and without difficulty.