

**Det britiske Imperium er fjendens sande ansigt; dette er en kamp, vi skal vinde.**

**LaRouche PAC Internationale  
Webcast,  
5. maj, 2017; Leder**

*I en tale for Udenrigsministeriets personale for to dage siden, forklarer han virkelig, på en meget rolig, omfattende og klarhjernet måde, udenrigsminister Tillersons synspunkt og – må man antage – også præsident Trumps, om, hvordan udenrigspolitik vil blive ført af Trump-administrationen, med udsigten til samarbejde mellem USA, Kina og Rusland. I Tillersons tale foretog han en slags spadseretur rundt til hele verden; og han forklarede, hvad Trump-administrationens politik ville være i disse forskellige områder. ...*

*Det, udenrigsminister Tillerson sagde, er, at vi ikke længere vil bruge såkaldte »vestlige værdier« som påskud for vores udenrigspolitik. At vi selvfølgelig støtter menneskerettigheder og alle de vigtige værdier, som den Amerikanske Revolution blev udkæmpet for, og som findes indbygget i Uafhængighedserklæringen og USA's Forfatning. Men, vi vil føre vores udenrigspolitik med den idé for øje, at vi har betydningsfulde partnerskaber, og at det ikke er vores opgave at diktere, hvilke værdier, de skal have i deres indenrigspolitik. Men derimod, at vi har meget reelle interesser, og at de også har meget reelle interesser.*

**Matthew Ogden:** Det er 5. maj, 2017, og jeg er Matthew Ogden.

Med mig i studiet i dag har vi Jason Ross, der i dag har gennemført et meget vigtigt interview, som vi vil vise nogle klip fra under aftenens udsendelse, med hr. William Binney, en meget betydningsfuld person. Jason Ross vil introducere ham senere i udsendelsen.

Men før vi kommer til det, så befinder vi os stadig i en nedtælling til konferencen om Kinas Bælt & Vej-initiativ, der starter ni dage fra i dag – 14. og 15. maj – i Beijing, Kina. Foreløbig har 28 statsoverhoveder meddelt, at de deltager i forummet, som Kinas præsident Xi Jinping vil være vært for. Vi ved, at Ruslands præsident Putin vil deltage som æresgæst. Og USA's præsident Trump kan stadig nå at meddele, at, ikke alene vil han deltage i dette forum, men han vil også tage imod den invitation, Xi Jinping flere gange har overrakt ham, om, at USA tilslutter sig denne nye udvikling med Bælt & Vej-initiativet, eller den Nye Silkevej.

Lad mig gå direkte til sagen og fortælle jer, at der er en meget signifikant artikel, der blev udgivet i *China Daily* for blot et par timer siden. Det er en af de førende, kinesiske, engelsksprogede aviser i USA. Denne artikel har titlen, »Trump opfordret til at deltage i Bælt & Vej Forum«. Jeg viser artiklen på skærmen for jer; og I kan se, at dette er et interview med fr. Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Hendes billede ses her i nederste hjørne, og artiklen indledes med det følgende:

»USA's præsident Donald Trump bør deltage i det forestående Bælt & Vej Forum for internationalt samarbejde i Beijing, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Institutet, en politisk og økonomisk tænketank.« Artiklen fortsætter med at citere Helga LaRouche:

»'Det bedste ville være, hvis præsident Trump personligt ville deltage i Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing', sagde Zepp-LaRouche i et interview til China Daily.

'Det næstbedste ville være endnu et personligt topmøde mellem

ham og præsident Xi Jinping umiddelbart efter, i Kina', sagde hun. [Det første var i Mar-a-Lago for et par uger siden.]

Zepp-LaRouche foreslog, at den økonomiske samarbejdsmechanisme, en af de fire søjler, der blev etableret under det første møde mellem de to ledere i Mar-a-Lago i Florida, kunne arbejde på konkrete forslag til gensidige investeringer, både bilateralt og i tredjelande, i sammenhæng med Bælt & Vej-initiativet ...

Zepp-LaRouche sagde, USA må tilslutte sig initiativet, der har udviklet 'en gigantisk dynamik' og er 'historiens største' infrastrukturprogram.

'Kun, hvis USA går med i dette initiativ, vil der være en måde, hvorpå geopolitik, der har forårsaget to verdenskrige i det 20. århundrede, kan overvindes', forklarede hun. 'Når de institutionelle kræfter i USA først indser, at det er mere i amerikansk industri, jobs' og samfundets interesse generelt, end det er at stå uden for initiativet, kan en potentiel Thukydid-fælde, eller en krig over brændpunkter, undgås.'«

Artiklen fortsætter dernæst med at sige, »'Kinesisk samarbejde i opbygning af USA's infrastrukturbehov ville være med til at foryngre den amerikanske økonomi', sagde hun.

'For de kinesiske og amerikanske nationaløkonomier er gensidigt komplementære', og Zepp-LaRouche sagde, de gensidige investeringer på dramatisk vis kunne stige med samarbejdet inden for initiativet.

Et sådant win-win-samarbejde ville ikke være begrænset til bilaterale investeringer, men kunne helt naturligt føre til joint ventures stort set i hele verden, i betragtning af opsvinget for økonomiske forventninger, forårsaget af initiativet, tilføjede hun.«

Så dette er altså en signifikant artikel, der blev udgivet i

dag i *China Daily*, og det sker i sammenhæng med denne nedtælling til Bælt & Vej-topmødet. Men det er vigtigt, at Helga Zepp-LaRouches ord samtidigt nu også bliver læst af de engelsktalende læsere i USA – læserne af *China Daily*, der er en meget læst publikation; og der har også været en meget signifikant udvikling fra udenrigsminister Rex Tillersons side. I en tale for Udenrigsministeriets personale for to dage siden, forklarer han virkelig, på en meget rolig, omfattende og klarhjernet måde, udenrigsminister Tillersons synspunkt og – må man antage – også præsident Trumps, om, hvordan udenrigspolitik vil blive ført af Trump-administrationen, med udsigten til samarbejde mellem USA, Kina og Rusland. I Tillersons tale foretog han en slags spadseretur rundt til hele verden; og han forklarede, hvad Trump-administrationens politik ville være i disse forskellige områder. Men han startede med at gøre noget meget signifikant, og han har virkelig fået en masse kritik fra nogle af den transatlantiske, atlanticist-presse, kunne man kalde det. *The Atlantic* havde faktisk en lang artikel, der angreb udenrigsminister Tillersons verdenssyn. Men det, han gjorde, var, at han, i meget klare vendinger, afviste den 'humanitære interventionisme', der er blevet en del af amerikansk politik under både Bush' og Obamas administration. Man kunne kalde dette for »Tony Blair-doktrinen«; Tony Blair forklarede, i en særdeles berygtet tale i slutningen af 1990'erne, verden efter tiden for den 'Westfalske Freds principper'. Dette blev Bush- og Obama-administrationens doktrin; at gennemtvinge såkaldte »amerikanske demokratiske værdier« over resten af verden, som et påskud for at gennemføre regimeskifte og 'farvede revolutioner'. Det blev til det, som Susan Rice og Samantha Powers gennemførte i FN, og det var i realiteten påskuddet for, eller ideologien bag, utallige operationer for regimeskifte og hemmeligt finansierede farvede revolutioner, der er blevet ført i hele verden i løbet af de seneste 10-15 år.

Det, udenrigsminister Tillerson sagde, er, at vi ikke længere

vil bruge såkaldte »vestlige værdier« som påskud for vores udenrigspolitik. At vi selvfølgelig støtter menneskerettigheder og alle de vigtige værdier, som den Amerikanske Revolution blev udkæmpet for, og som findes indbygget i Uafhængighedserklæringen og USA's Forfatning. Men, vi vil føre vores udenrigspolitik med den idé for øje, at vi har betydningsfulde partnerskaber, og at det ikke er vores opgave at diktere, hvilke værdier, de skal have i deres indenrigspolitik. Men derimod, at vi har meget reelle interesser, og at de også har meget reelle interesser.

*(Udskriftet fortsætter på engelsk:)*

So, I'm going to play for you this short clip from the beginning of Secretary Tillerson's speech; and you'll see that it sets up a very important context in which, in a second clip which I'll introduce to you, he discusses the future and the hopeful potential future of our relationship with China. But first, here's the first clip from Secretary Tillerson's speech:

[begin video]

SECRETARY REX TILLERSON: Guiding all of our foreign policy actions are our fundamental values. Our values around freedom, human dignity, the way people are treated. Those are our values; those are not our policies, they're values. The reason it's important I think to keep that well understood, is policies can change; they do change, they should change. Policies change to adapt to the circumstances. Our values never change; they're constant throughout all of this. So, I think the real challenge many of us have is, [as] we think about constructing our policies and carrying out our policies, is how do we represent our values? And in some

circumstances, if you condition our national security efforts on somewhat adopting our values, we probably can't achieve our national security goals or our national security interests. If we condition too heavily that others must adopt this value that we've come to over a long history of our own, it really creates obstacles to our ability to advance our national security interests and our economic interests. It doesn't mean that we leave those values on the sidelines. It doesn't mean that we don't advocate for and aspire to freedom, human dignity, and the treatment of people the world over; we do. We will always have that on our shoulder everywhere we go. But I think it's really important that all of us understand the difference between policy and values. In some circumstances, we should and do condition our policy engagements on people adopting certain actions as to how they treat people; they should. We should demand that. But that doesn't mean that's the case in every situation. So, we really have to understand in each country, or each region of the world that we're dealing with, what are our national security interests? What are our economic prosperity interests? Then, as we can advocate and advance our values, we should; but the policies can do this. The values never change. So, I would ask you to just, to the extent you could think about that a little bit, I think it's useful. Because I know for me, this is one of the most difficult areas as I've thought about how to formulate policy. To advance all of these things

simultaneously is a real challenge. I hear from government leaders all over the world, "You just can't demand that of us. We can't move that quickly, we can't adapt that quickly." So, it's how do we advance our national security and economic interests; and on this hand, our values are constant over here. So, I give you that as kind of an overarching view of how I think about the President's approach of America First.  
[end video]

OGDEN: So, with that, Secretary Tillerson brought an end to the Blair-Bush-Obama doctrine of color revolution, regime change, and so-called "humanitarian interventionism." This is the beginning of a new doctrine which is still being defined, but coming out of the Trump administration foreign policy. Now Secretary Tillerson did make very significant trip a few weeks ago to China; where he met with Xi Jinping and other very high-level officials. And this was in the weeks preceding Xi Jinping's visit to the United States, where he had his bilateral summit with President Trump at Mar-a-Lago. It's very significant, as we count down the days between now and this forum for the Belt and Road Initiative in Beijing, that there is a new policy doctrine being formed in the Trump White House, in terms of the relationship that the United States will have towards China. Obviously, none of this is yet determined, but there are definite changes in process. I'm going to play for you now another clip from Rex Tillerson's speech; where he begins by talking about the North

Korea situation, but as you'll hear, he immediately brings up the role that China and also Russia are playing in terms of collaborating with the United States to resolve that situation and also other situations around the world. Then, you'll hear him get a little bit more into detail about what the potential for a relationship between China and the United States over the coming half century, as he discusses it, can become.

[begin video]

SECRETARY TILLERSON: So, as all of you clearly understand, when we came into the State Department, the administration came in, was sworn in, and was immediately confronted with a serious situation in North Korea. In evaluating that, what was important to us and to me to understand was, first, where are our allies. So engaging with our allies and ensuring that we and our allies see the situation the same. Our allies in South Korea, our allies in Japan. Secondly, it was to engage with the other regional powers as to how do they see it. So, it was useful and helpful to have the Chinese – and now the Russians – articulate clearly that their policy is unchanged. Their policy is a denuclearized Korean peninsula. Of course we did our part years ago; we took all the nuclear weapons out of South Korea. So now we have a shared objective; and that's very useful, from which you then build out your policy approaches and your strategies. So many people are saying, "Gee, this is just the same thing we've tried over and over. We're going to put pressure on the



regime in Pyongyang; they're not going to do anything, and then in the end, we'll all cave."

Well the difference, I think, in our approach this time, is we're going to test this assumption. When folks came in to review the situation with me, the assumption was that China has

limited influence on the regime in Pyongyang, or they have a limited willingness to assert their influence. So, I told the President, we've got to test that; and we're going to test it by

leaning hard into them, and this is a good place to start our engagement with China. So, that's what we've been doing, is leaning hard into

China to test their willingness to use their influence, their engagement with the regime of North Korea. So, that's North Korea.

Then if I pivoted over to China, because it really took us directly to our China foreign policy, we really had to assess China's situation – as I said – from the Nixon era up to where we find things today. We saw a bit of an inflection point with

the Beijing Olympics; those were enormously successful for China.

They kind of put China on the map, and China really began to feel

its oats about that time; and rightfully. They have achieved a

lot. They moved 500 million Chinese people out of poverty into

middle class status. They've still a billion more that need to

move. So, China has its own challenges, and we want to work with

them and be mindful of what they're dealing with in the context

of our relationship. Our relationship has to be one of

understanding that we have security interests throughout Northeast Asia and security interests throughout the Pacific, and we need to work with them on how those are addressed. So, that gets to the island building in the South China Sea, the militarization of those islands, and obviously we have huge trading issues to talk with them about. So, we are using the entire of the visit in Mar-a-Lago, which was heavy on some issues with North Korea, but also heavy on a broader range of issues. What we've asked the Chinese to do is, we want to take a fresh look of where is this relationship going to be 50 years from now? Because I think we have an opportunity to define that. So, I know that there have been a lot of dialogue areas that have been underway for the last several years with China; we have asked China to narrow the dialogue areas and elevate the participants to the decision-making level. So, we outlined four major dialogue areas with China; and we've asked them to bring people who report directly to the decision maker, which is President Xi. So for the first time, we are seeking — and it so far appears we will get — people at the Politburo level and at much higher levels of the government in China to participate in these dialogues, so we can reframe what we want the relationship to be and begin to deal with some of the problems and issues that have just been sort of sitting out there stuck in neutral for a while. It's a much narrower — as we make progress, those things will result in working groups where we can

get after solving these things.

We're going to have the first meeting of the diplomatic and security dialogue, which is chaired by myself and Secretary Mattis with our counterparts here in Washington in June.

We've

put it up as kind of top priority. The second one is economics

and trade, which is chaired by Treasury Secretary Mnuchin and Commerce Secretary Ross, and it's well underway also.

So, that's kind of the new approach we're taking with China, is elevate; let's kind of revisit this relationship and what is

it going to be over the next half century. I think it's a tremendous opportunity we have to define that. And there seems

to be a great interest on the part of the Chinese leadership to

do that as well. They feel we're at a point of inflection also.

So, that's China.

[end video]

OGDEN: Let me just reiterate a couple of the points that you heard Secretary Tillerson just make. He said it's time for

us to take a fresh look at where this relationship is going over

the next 50 years. What will that relationship be 50 years from

now? We have the opportunity to reframe what that relationship

will be, to revisit that relationship, and to examine what it's

going to be over the next half century. We have a tremendous opportunity to do that, he said, and there's great interest on the part of the Chinese leadership to do that as well. They feel

that we're at a point of inflection.

Now, just because this is a significant point to always include the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played in creating the vision, in laying out the vision which is really creating the pathway forward for what is the future, in 2005, Lyndon LaRouche published a book which was titled {Earth's Next

Fifty Years}. Not coincidentally, Mr. LaRouche's point in this

book, which he presents in a very profound and philosophically developed way, was that we've really reached the point where we

need to view the potential for a great powers relationship.

Between whom? The United States, China, and Russia; and also India, but most importantly this three-power relationship between

the United States, China, and Russia as a potential collaboration

to begin to envision a system of inter-relationship between nations based on mutual benefit between those countries. And the

development of the planet through – and he lays this out in detail in this book – the Eurasian Land-Bridge, or the New Silk

Road as he calls it, has the potential to bring mankind into a new mode of history. A new chapter of history where wars are something of the past; great wars are no longer fought between countries over narrow national interests. In fact, the mutual benefit of these great projects, which are represented by what China is now doing, is the potential for peaceful coexistence between all cultures; a dialogue between civilizations, and as the opportunity to pave the road towards a new chapter of human

history.

So again, this was {Earth's Next Fifty Years}; this was published in 2005 by Lyndon LaRouche. So, it's the ability to envision what the future must become which creates the

opportunity for competent and clear-minded leadership. I think you saw in a very real way the influence of that on what you're now seeing at least in an exploratory way from the U.S. State Department and Secretary Tillerson. What he also brought up which is very important, is that China has succeeded in lifting 500 million people out of poverty in just a very short amount of time; through great projects and investment into their own population. That's half a billion people. What Helga Zepp-LaRouche had to say earlier, when we were speaking to her and Mr. LaRouche, is that we have to continue to beat the drum in terms of President Trump reciprocating what has been offered by President Xi Jinping in terms of the United States participating in this New Silk Road dynamic. This is the logical and obvious answer to President Trump's question: How are we going to spend \$1 trillion in the United States on developing the infrastructure and putting people back to work with real skilled, productive, high-paying manufacturing jobs? Well it must be done in collaboration with China. There's no way that can be done without reciprocating Xi Jinping's offer to join this New Silk Road dynamic. So, I'm going to remind people that about a month or two ago, the LaRouche Political Action Committee issued a pamphlet. I'm going to display that on the screen for you right now. It was titled "America's Future on the New Silk Road." So, you can see the cover of that pamphlet right here. The subtitle is "LaRouche's Four Laws: the Physical Economic Principles for

the

Recovery of the United States.” You can see in the Table of Contents what this pamphlet includes. So, there’s an introduction, which is called “A New Era for Mankind”; then you

have Lyndon LaRouche’s document, the “Four New Laws to Save the

United States Now.” Then you have four chapters which elaborate

each of those four points. One is, restore Glass-Steagall; this

is a fight we’re really in the midst of right now, and it’s coming to a head. Two, a new Hamiltonian national bank.

Three,

credit for increased productivity; and four, a crash program for

fusion and space.

That pamphlet has several full-spread maps included in it;

and I’m going to just show you a few of those. [pages 4-5]

First

you have “China’s New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative: First Steps towards the World Land-Bridge” And this sort of shows

what the elements of the Belt and Road Initiative as it exists right now are across Eurasia. It includes the

China-Mongolia-Russia corridor, the China-Pakistan corridor, the

New Eurasian Land-Bridge, the China-Indochina corridor, the

Bangladesh-China-India-Myanmar (BCIM) corridor, the Maritime Silk

Road, including ports and shipping lanes and so forth; and then

also China-Central and West Asia.

So those are the projects, as Helga LaRouche called it, the

biggest infrastructure project in human history, that’s what is

now on the table. And those are the heads of state and

government that are going to be attending this summit in Beijing next weekend. This affects the entirety of the populations of this area of the world. So that's what exists now. If the United States wished to join this, there are several very concrete projects which could be included: This map [pages 8-9] is titled "U.S.A. Joins the New Silk Road: An International Recovery, Working with China To Build America." Very significantly, high-speed rail and magnetic levitation – look at what China has done with high-speed rail development in China, and compare that with the pathetic state of rail in the United States. It also includes reviving our industrial corridors, the so-called "rust belt" development corridors, which include not only transportation but also energy development and so forth. Along those development corridors, you could have new cities. It's called "New Renaissance Cities," because the cities have to be centers of culture and education and art, and science and research. And then very importantly, the Bering Strait connection. So as we develop the high-speed rail in North America, it can connect to what's being built in Eurasia. And then finally, the third full-spread map in that pamphlet [pages 20-21], is called, "The Full World Land-Bridge: Expanding China's New Silk Road, A Global Infrastructure Economic Platform." And these are some other projects which are sort of third-party projects, which the United States and China could be working together on for the benefit of other areas of the world: Very importantly, a new Marshall Plan for the Middle East, this

is how we should resolve the crisis in Syria and Libya and Iraq.

In South America, a new inter-oceanic canal: This is on the books through Nicaragua. Also a South American transcontinental

railroad. The canal through the Isthmus of Kra, in Thailand, we

had a special presentation on that just a few weeks ago; this is

really moving forward, the Kra Canal. Refilling Lake Chad with

the Transaqua Project. This is one of the most important projects for the future of Africa; and then also in Africa, a Europe-Strait of Gibraltar tunnel.

So that's the pamphlet, "America's Future on the New Silk Road" and it's available on the LaRouche PAC website, and this is

something which we should be coming back to right now. It's very

important.

But as Helga LaRouche said, in our discussion, we have not yet reached the point of safety: We are still in the danger zone. There are so many hotspots which could blow up around the

world, and there continues to be a very real attempt, from the British Empire and from their allies inside the United States to

undermine and to destabilize the Trump administration for the very reason that you saw Secretary Tillerson state – we are no longer going to be the country which is the "dumb giant" implementing British Empire, divide-and-conquer policies in the

world. No longer East against West, but we are going to seek dialogue and we are going to seek cooperation with these countries.

So I think with that said, it sets up, I think, what we're going to discuss with Jason and I'd like to just let Jason



pick  
it up from there.

Jason ROSS: These projects you've discussed, this is something that can transformed mankind, like going to the Moon.

This is that kind of scale of change, in relations among people.

Ever since Trump was elected, there has been an ongoing attack against him of people whom you'd think had lost their minds, or

you were having a bad dream, except that it's really happening;

people who are repeatedly saying, they're not attacking trumps policies per se, – that happens too, of course, but what I'm talking about is the drumbeat about "Russia, Russia! {Russia, Russia! Russia!}" People saying that "Russia elected Donald Trump." That "Russia hacked the Democratic Party," "Russia hacked

John Podesta, Russia hired internet trolls; Russia has compromising blackmail material on Donald Trump – Russia, Russia, Russia!" "Russia caused Democratic candidates to shy away from the TPP." It's just complete nonsense!

Now, this is being done for two reasons. One as an attempt to delegitimize and throw Trump's administration out entirely, or, failing that, attempt to box him into an anti-Russia provocative type of policy, to show that he's not a shill or a stooge for the "man who's directing the entire world, Vladimir Putin," if you would listen to some people on MSNBC or other places.

So today I had the wonderful chance to speak with William Binney about this. Bill Binney was a covert, three-decade employee at the NSA. He resigned in 2001 as a top-level executive there; he resigned over the fact that safeguards against spying on American citizens were being overlooked, and that a setup was being made to allow a totalitarian, and as he put it, "an Orwellian state."

So, let's just go ahead and jump right in to hear what Bill Binney has to say about whether Vladimir Putin runs the whole world.

[begin video]

JASON ROSS: Let me ask you, Mr. Binney: What do you think about these claims. Did Russian hackers elect Donald Trump?

WILLIAM BINNEY: I wrote an article that was published in {Consortiumnews} on Dec. 12th of last year, that said this was all a big fabrication, simply because they weren't saying exactly

where the hack came from, and where the data out of the hack went

to! I mean, that's the whole point of what NSA has set up, in terms of copying and collecting everything in a fiber network inside the United States, and virtually everything in the world

on those fibers.

So that means – and they've got trace route programs by the hundreds, scattered all over the world. That means that they can

follow the [data] packets as they move through the network.

Now,

if somebody hacks into the DNC or Hillary or Podesta's email or

something, and they want to find out who it is, all they have to

do is use the IP address with XKeyscore as Edward Snowden said,

and they've got all the data to find out where the packets went!

But they haven't done that, you see. And even NSA who's the only

one that can do this – the rest of them are meaningless – if NSA says they've got data on it, then it's meaningful. If the rest say that we have high confidence, that's just pure

speculation. And it's something that's just pure garbage, that doesn't mean anything. Produce the evidence, they haven't produced any at all, so that's what I called it back in December of last year.  
[end video]

ROSS: Well, that's a pretty straightforward response on that, isn't it? Let's take up now the topic of the control over the domestic political apparatus that's exerted by an uncontrolled intelligence apparatus that collects material on everybody.

[begin video]

ROSS: More recently about a little over a month ago you co-authored an article with Ray McGovern in which you wrote about Trump's response to this, that "his choice may decide whether there is a future for this constitutional republic. Either Trump can acquiesce to or fight against a deep state of intelligence officials who have a myriad of ways to spy on politicians and other citizens. And thus amass derogatory materials that can be easily transformed into blackmail."

[<https://consortiumnews.com/2017/03/28/the-surveillance-state-behind-russia-gate/>]

That's a strong claim. Tell us, how do you see the Trump response to this attack on elected government? And what should ordinary people do, to prevent such a policy coup?

BINNEY: Well, first of all, I think President Trump realizes what's been going on. A recent statement he made about, "there's an awful lot of spying going on on U.S. citizens and we

really don't know the extent of it, and we really have to find out what the heck" – he used the word "hell" – "what the hell is going on." Well, that means they're even keeping him in the dark.

Now, as the President of the United States, he's supposed to know all the sources of information that the intelligence community is using to produce intelligence for him, and he obviously doesn't know about this. But I've made it perfectly clear that the "Fairview program, Stormbrew programs, and Blarney

programs\* for the tapping of fiber networks inside the United States are the sources of information on everybody in the United

States, including representatives in the House and Senate; you know, even judges on the Supreme Court, Generals on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all Federal judges, all senior lawyer firms all

around, and all the journalists and everything; all that stuff is being captured and stored.

And what they're not talking about is, I've seen some arguments where they said, "well, as long as we're only using it

for intelligence and law enforcement isn't involved, you know, it's OK for us to do that." That was the argument I think that Judge Napolitano put forward, that they were using with the FISA

Court to dupe them into doing what they want.

And that's really what's happened: They've been duped, and so have the Congress, most of Congress. I mean the Intelligence

Committees I think were more aware of what was going on than the

rest of Congress. But they duped the rest of Congress! They made them all just play along like a bunch of sheep, "here's bell, follow the bell," you know? So our democracy basically

doesn't really exist the way it was originally intended. And the law enforcement, FBI, DEA, and others in the law enforcement community had direct access into the NSA data – they've had it all along! Director Mueller at the FBI said he'd been using the Stellar Wind, which is the domestic spying data, since 2001, he'd been using that, so; and that's direct access through their technology data center in Quantico, Virginia into the NSA data bases where they could look all the content and metadata of everybody in the country! And they could retroactively research them any time they want.

And they're using it to arrest people for common crime inside the United States. so, I mean, this is simply a destruction of the entire judicial process in our country and it's a fundamental violation of the constitutional rights.

And they've scrapped the Constitution, fundamentally.

I mean, that's why I said, when the Iraqis were struggling to put together a Constitution, I said, "well, why don't we give

'em ours, we're not using it." [laughter]

[end video]

ROSS: The discussion continued; we covered a lot of topics. The interview will be available tonight for you who are subscribing to our audio podcast, it'll be up this weekend on the website.

The other aspect to take from it, is, as he said in that article that he co-wrote with Ray McGovern, this is not something that will go away. Unless this apparatus is taken on and removed, cleaned out, this ongoing cloud of blackmail potential

and political coercion that exists above the level of elected government will continue putting pressure to oppose the kinds of

developments that we saw with what Tillerson put out, and with the pamphlet that Matt just went through. So it's not a fight that will go away. This isn't something that will simmer down and go cold on its own. It's a fight that's got to be won.

OGDEN: Absolutely. It's heating up right now. It's definitely not going away. Just earlier this afternoon, Sen. Rand

Paul sent out a tweet, where he said, "I have formally requested

from the White House and the Intelligence Committees, info on whether I was surveilled by the Obama administration or the intelligence community." So, to the extent that people are trying

to write off the claim from the Trump White House that, in fact,

Trump was wire-tapped or surveilled by the Obama administration,

now Sen. Rand Paul is asking the same question. He went on to say, "Did the Obama administration go after Presidential candidates, members of Congress, journalists, clergy, lawyers, federal judges? Did the Obama administration use warrantless 'wiretapping' – in quotes – "on other candidates besides Donald Trump?"

So, this is a real question. This makes Watergate seem pale in comparison.

ROSS: And some of the other specifics that have come out about this. There's the report that Susan Rice was the person, Obama's National Security Advisor, who outed Michael Flynn, or who made an "unmasking" request to get from the recorded calls with the Russian diplomat that, oh, that the person he was speaking with was Gen. Michael Flynn.

So you don't get much higher level in the political and

intelligence world than Mike Flynn, and if even his conversations are being listened to and unmasked in this way, you know, who isn't? Are the members of the intelligence community, are they being blackmailed in this way? This is the sort of thing that you say, what would Hoover have been doing if he all of these tools at his disposal? And the numbers back it up: A report just was released that there were almost 2,000 incidents of unmasking of American citizens, whose identities and communications were collected in a foreign or other intelligence collection process, that the Obama administration made that there were almost 2,000 requests to unmask and find out who were the Americans involved in these conversations.

OGDEN: And this continues to go back to the question of the role that British intelligence is playing, and obviously now it's been publicly admitted that, in fact it was GCHQ that was conducting the surveillance and channeling all of this intelligence into the U.S. because it's illegal under U.S. law to spy on your own citizens – so just ask the British to do it! And vice versa. So, this continues to be the persisting question. And the point that has to be asked, and this is the question: Will Donald Trump recognize that this the true face of the enemy, and that the British Empire have been attempting to stonewall and bulldoze the United States into becoming their “dumb giant,” in their attempts to set the world against itself and to continue to manipulate the international politics through this

geopolitical

model which they've been using since the end of World War II;  
or,

will we say this is the end of that so-called British-U.S.

"special relationship" and now is the time that we are going  
to

initiate a New Paradigm of international relations.

So I think that question gains more relevance as we look at

this speech that we played earlier today from Secretary

Tillerson, where he really did bring an end to this Blair

doctrine of using so-called "Western values" as the pretext  
for

regime change and color revolutions, and we see a potential  
for a

new relationship between the United States and China, new

relationship between the United States and Russia, and a new

attitude in terms of what our goals are in terms of our

relationships with the rest of the world?

So it's a war which continues, and this interview that you

conducted today, Jason, with William Binney is an important  
tool

for people to use. So I think people can watch the website  
for

that to come out, and as you said, it will be available to

podcast subscribers tonight in audio form.

So let's wrap up today's broadcast by saying that we are

nine days away from the opening of this Beijing conference.

This

begins one week from Sunday: The heads of state and government

will be arriving a week from today, a week from tomorrow in

Beijing. I guarantee you that the accommodations can be made  
for

President Trump to attend that summit if he so makes the  
decision

in the next few days. And as Helga LaRouche said, even if  
that

doesn't occur, the next best option would be for another



bilateral summit between President Trump and President Xi in the days and weeks following the Belt and Road Initiative summit. So we have that to look forward to, and over the coming days, we ask you to stay tuned to larouhepac.com, and continue

to do what you can do, to educate the U.S. population about the possibility of what would be our opportunities, were we to join

this Belt and Road Initiative. That pamphlet that I gave you a guided tour of is available on the LaRouche PAC website. We'll

make that available as a link

[<https://larouhepac.com/20170225/four-laws-pamphlet>] in the description of this video here today. And also you can watch the

full speech from Secretary Tillerson that's available on YouTube

and we'll make that link available as well.

[<https://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2017/05/270620.htm>]

So thank you very much for joining us, and please stay tuned to the LaRouche PAC website and the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel

for the full interview with William Binney, you can find the interview that Helga Zepp-LaRouche conducted with {China Daily}

on their website

[[http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2017-05/05/content\\_29219579.htm](http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2017-05/05/content_29219579.htm)]

– chinadaily.cn and that link is also provided in the description of this video.

So thank you very much. Thank you Jason for joining me here today, and please stay tuned to larouhepac.com.