

# Robert Mueller er en umoralsk, juridisk morder: Han vil gøre sit job, hvis I giver ham lov.

## LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 29. sept., 2017.

Vært Matthew Ogden: God aften; det er den 29. september, 2017. Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg William Wertz fra *Executive Intelligence Review*. Vi vil diskutere den netop udkomne specialundersøgelses-rapport; dossieret med titlen, »Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin; He Will Do His Job if You Let Him!«



Fig. 1

Jeg viser rapportens forsidebillede her på skærmen [Fig. 1]. Som I ser, så er rapporten nu tilgængelig; den er allerede blevet cirkuleret i over et døgn. Den er allerede i hænderne på folk i hele USA, og man kan se den her: [lpac.co/ytdos](http://lpac.co/ytdos) (LPAC's hjemmeside; EIR-rapporten findes som pdf på vores hjemmeside).

Rapporten er delt op i tre afsnit og følger tråden af personen Robert Mueller igennem tre af de mest berygtede forbrydelser i de seneste 30 år. For det første, de falske anklager og retsforfølgelsen af Lyndon LaRouche – LaRouche-sagen; for det andet, det aggressive bedrag af det amerikanske folk mht. sandheden om begivenhederne den 11. september, 2001, som

dernæst blev brugt til at lancere en række krige for regimeskifte; og for det tredje, det igangværende kup imod den siddende amerikanske præsident, mens vi taler. Og I vil se, forhåbentlig i løbet af denne udsendelse – og vi opfordrer jer til at læse hele dossieret – at tråden til Robert Mueller kan spores hele vejen igennem disse afgørende, historiske vendepunkter. Hvis man trækker i denne tråd, vil hele dette apparat, hele denne operation, blive optrævlet.

Will Wertz er her i dag for at fremlægge nogle af rapportens punkter i en overordnet gennemgang, og for at guide jer gennem rapportens indhold og komme med nogle refleksioner over hvert af disse tre, afgørende knudepunkter, som detaljeret dækkes i rapporten. Og, forhåbentlig også for at lokke jer og tilskynde jer til at læse og studere denne rapport i detaljer. Jeg vil lade Will gå i gang, og vi vil vise noget materiale på skærmen undervejs, men vi vil gennemgå noget af indholdet fra rapporten.

**William Wertz:** Tak. Matt. Skønheden i denne rapport – som er noget, der omgående må handles på for at redde denne republik og præsidentskabet og bevæge verden ind i et Nyt Paradigme, som det defineres af den kinesiske politik for Ét Bælte, én Vej, og som er blevet vedtaget af mange lande i hele verden, inklusive Rusland, og som USA er blevet inviteret til at tilslutte sig – er, at den identificerer dette angreb på præsident Trump og det amerikanske præsidentskab over en længere tidsperiode; og hvor det fundamentale spørgsmål er, om verden fortsat skal være domineret af et bankerot, finansielt imperiesystem, der kontrolleres af briterne, eller om vi i stedet bevæger os ind i et Nyt Paradigme, baseret på princippet om fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Det er det fundamentale spørgsmål. Dette er noget, som Lyndon LaRouche har kæmpet for i årtier. Tilbage i 1971, den 15. august, fremlagde han meget klart de alternativer, der ligger foran menneskeheden, og foran dette land, med Nixon, der annoncerede første fase, anden fase, af nedtagningen af Bretton Woods-

systemet, som Roosevelt havde indsat efter Anden Verdenskrig. Han (LaRouche) sagde dengang, at vi har et alternativt valg; alternativet er at satse på en politik for økonomisk udvikling på global skala, eller også vil vi blive konfronteret med et forsøg på at gennemtvinge en fascistisk, økonomisk politik i Schachts tradition, som ville resultere i massive dødstal over hele verden. Med 'Schachts tradition' refererer jeg til Hjalmar Schacht, finansminister under Adolf Hitler, der kom til magten med hjælp fra sådanne folk som John Foster Dulles og briterne.

Det, LaRouche gjorde i 1970'erne efter denne vurdering, var, at han fremlagde mange absolut afgørende udviklingsprogrammer. I 1975 var han fortaler for skabelsen af en International Udviklingsbank. Senere krævede han oprettelsen af en Nationalbank i USA efter samme principper som Alexander Hamiltons Første Nationalbank. Han præsenterede udviklingsprogrammer for områderne i Stillehavsbækkenet og det Indiske Oceans bækken. Han præsenterede et program ved navn Operation Juárez, for Mexicos udvikling, som en model for Nord-Syd-relationer gennem udveksling af mexicansk olie til gengæld for amerikansk teknologi. Senere præsenterede han programmer for den Eurasiske Landbro i samarbejde med sin hustru, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og som senere udvikledes til Verdenslandbroen. Briterne var totalt modstandere af denne politik – totalt. Vi vil få at se, at dette har været en kamp under hele perioden 1970'erne og 1980'erne og under hele 11. september-perioden, og frem til det aktuelle angreb på Trumps præsidentskab. Det har været en kamp mellem Det britiske Imperium, som har intervenseret i USA for at forhindre, at USA gik i denne retning, som Lyndon LaRouche har forsøgt at styre USA i; og som LaRouche er på randen til at styre USA i, i dag, og som er årsagen til, at briterne er så bange!

Tilbage i 1980'erne spillede Lyndon LaRouche en afgørende rolle i udformningen af den tiltrædende Reagan-administration. LaRouche var ophavsmand til det **Strategiske**

**Forsvarsinitiativ**, som Reagan senere annoncerede i marts måned, 1983. LaRouche var også modstander mod briterne i krigen om Malvinas-øerne (som briterne kalder Falklandsøerne), og han krævede en gennemførelse af Monroe-doktrinen imod briternes kolonipolitik dér. Som et resultat mødtes LaRouche og hans hustru i 1982 med Indira Gandhi; han og hans hustru mødte Indira Gandhi i april 1982 for at diskutere udviklingen af det indiske subkontinent og Stillehavsbækkenet. I maj 1982 mødtes han med José López Portillo (Mexico) for at diskutere Operation Juárez. Som respons på dette sendte Henry Kissinger, i august 1982, et brev til FBI-direktør William Webster med krav om en efterforskning af Lyndon LaRouche på en anklage om angivelig chikane af Kissinger for at være britisk agent. Der blev ligeledes sendt et brev den 27. august 1982 fra den britiske regering til FBI; som krævede en efterforskning af Lyndon LaRouche og hans organisation. Den 24. september 1982 skrev FBI, i skikkelse af chef for kontraefterretning, James Noland, et svar til briterne.

**Matthew Ogden:** Vi har faktisk en FOIA-udgivelse (FOIA: Freedom of Information Act) af dette FBI-memo, som vi viser på skærmen [Fig. 2]. I kan selv se det følgende citat, som Will vil læse.



Fig. 2

**Will Wertz:** Der står, og det er altså fra James Noland til den britiske regering: »Vi vil gerne gentage vores konklusion om, at, alt imens mange af NCLC's chikane-aktiviteter« – NCLC var Lyndon LaRouches organisation – »og de temaer, som NCLC's publikationer promoverer, såsom *EIR [Executive Intelligence Review]* ofte er favorable over for sovjetisk misinformation og propagandainteresser, så er der ingen direkte beviser for, at russerne dirigerer eller finansierer LaRouche eller hans organisation. Det er imidlertid helt igennem sandsynligt, at russerne (sovjet-russerne) har udviklet eller vil udvikle

kilder internt i NCLC, der befinder sig i en position, hvor de kan indskyde sovjet-inspirerede anskuelser i NCLC's aktiviteter og publikationer. Det er sandsynligt, at russerne vil forsøge at drage fordel af eller udnytte NCLC-meninge, der er parallelle til eller fremmer sovjetiske, udenrigspolitiske mål.«

Minder dette jer om interventionen på vegne af Storbritanniens Government Communications Headquarters – GCHQ – eller på vegne af MI6's Christopher Steele, for at forsøge at få en efterforskning af USA's præsident Donald Trump, for angiveligt 'aftalt spil' med russerne?

Alligevel skete der det, at præsidentens Udenrigspolitiske Råds Styrelse den 12. januar, 1983, krævede en efterforskning fra FBI's side. Robert Mueller kommer ind i billedet i 1982. Han blev en del af USA's justitsminister William Welds stab i Boston i 1982. Efter valgene i 1984 lancerede Weld en efterforskning af LaRouche; og i 1986 efterfulgte Mueller Weld, da Weld af George Bush – det var faktisk Ronald Reagan, der var præsident, men under indflydelse af George Bush, senior – blev udnævnt til at lede Justitsministeriets Kriminal-afdeling. Mueller bragte dernæst en vis John Markham ind for at udføre retsforfølgelsen af Lyndon LaRouche, der begyndte i Boston. Efter en razzia den 6. oktober, 1986 i Leesburg, Virginia, mod LaRouches hovedkvarter, hvor der var en trussel om, og en faktisk plan for, at forsøge at iscenesætte mordet på Lyndon LaRouche. Dette forsøg blev forpurret, men retsforfølgelsen fortsatte i de sene 1980'ere.

***Her følger resten af webcastet i engelsk udskrift:***

This prosecution was typical of Mueller's corruption. For instance, in Boston itself, the prosecution ended in a mistrial after government misconduct had been brought to light. The jury, when they polled themselves afterwards, having only heard the

complete prosecution case, unanimously said that they would have voted for acquittal. The judge in that case made the following statement: He said that the government had "engaged in systematic and institutional prosecutorial misconduct"; this is Robert Mueller. The case was then shifted to Virginia, and what they did there was that they had a judge in the so-called "Rocket Docket" who made it impossible for the defendants to raise the fact that the government had illegally put companies associated with LaRouche into involuntary bankruptcy. That was a very significant factor in undermining the defense in that case. After the case had resulted in convictions, the bankruptcy judge, Martin Bostetter, ruled that the bankruptcy was a "constructive fraud on the court." Ramsey Clark was the attorney for Lyndon LaRouche in the appeal.

OGDEN: Let's put this quote on the screen, too; we have Ramsey Clark's quote [Fig. 3].

WERTZ: What Ramsey Clark said was that "The LaRouche case represents a broader range of deliberate cunning and systemic misconduct over a longer period of time using the power of the Federal government, than any other prosecution by the U.S. Government in my time and to my knowledge." Later in another spin-off case in New York State, New York State Supreme Court Justice Stephen G. Crane said, "The actions of the Federal prosecutors raise an inference of a conspiracy to lay low these defendants at any cost." This is not just one judge. We're

talking about at least two judges, a bankruptcy judge, and the former Attorney General of the United States Ramsey Clark, who effectively denounced this so-called honest Robert Mueller for conducting one of the most incredible corrupt prosecutions in U.S. history.

If we look forward to the 9/11 period, Lyndon LaRouche wrongly imprisoned by this apparatus which was launched by the British and carried forward by the Bush administration. Bush was

President at the time of the trial and the sentencing. LaRouche

was out of prison and continued his fight for a policy of economic development; calling for a New Bretton Woods system to

replace the system which had been abandoned by Nixon in 1971.

He

was working, as he had in the earlier period, on negotiating in

the early 1980s with the Soviets for the National Security Council of the United States under Reagan for the SDI. He continued those discussions with the Russians, this time around a

New Bretton Woods conception under President Clinton. Clinton himself, before the impeachment proceedings were launched against

him, called for a new financial architecture at a speech before

the CFR [Council on Foreign Relations] in New York, along the lines of what LaRouche had advocated.

LaRouche was also at the end of the 1990s, he was warning about the campaign to create an Arc of Crisis around Russia – no

longer the Soviet Union, but Russia. He produced a video called

“Storm Over Asia” in which he developed precisely how this operation was being run against Russia. Then in January of 2001,

he warned that there could be some sort of terrorist action in the United States such as a Reichstag Fire [which brought Hitler into power], which could be engineered under the Bush administration. That's precisely what occurred on September 11, 2001.

Again, what do we have here? Mueller assumed office as FBI Director on September 4, 2001, just days before 9/11. What he did from that point on, was to carry out what Senator Bob Graham, who headed up the Congressional investigation of 9/11, has described as "aggressive deception."

OGDEN: Here's a clip from a press conference that Bob Graham did a little bit over a year ago at the National Press Club, where he discusses the role that the FBI played in stonewalling the Congressional investigation into 9/11; both in terms of the details regarding San Diego – that's what was contained in the 28 pages – but also in an even bigger case of cover-up, the details of the cell that was located in Sarasota, Florida. So you'll hear Bob Graham talk about what he called "beyond a cover-up, but an aggressive deception campaign against the American people."

✖ SEN. BOB GRAHAM

: It appeared as if the FBI was moving from a cover-up which I considered to be a passive withholding of information, to aggressive deception in the case of Sarasota – which is one of several examples. They rewrote the narrative; they said we've finished the investigation, and we



have found no connections. When in their own files, written by their own special agent who was from the Tampa office, incidentally, they had contrary information. They then, and have continued, to withhold that information, other than the 80,000 pages from the public. I consider to justify the categorization of being aggressive deception.

OGDEN: Then later in the same press conference, which you can watch in full there – it's [lpac.co/graham-press-conference](http://lpac.co/graham-press-conference).

But later in the same press conference, he talked about how the Deputy Director of the FBI actually detained him and his wife at Dulles Airport, and warned them to stop pursuing the truth about what was contained in these documents about the Saudi connections to 9/11. So, here's a short clip where he talks about that warning from the FBI to him and his wife.

GRAHAM

: The question is raised, "Why are you doing this? Fifteen years later, what difference does this make? Get

a life." I was told that by the Deputy Director of the FBI.

FEMALE REPORTER: Just one follow-up. You were pretty much harassed by the FBI when you tried to go further in your inquiries. Since you went public, have you heard of anybody else

who had that kind of treatment from the FBI?

GRAHAM: No. This was a situation which occurred in 2011 as all this information about Sarasota was starting to come out. My

wife and I flew up from Miami to Dulles to have Thanksgiving with our daughter who lives in Great Falls. We were met at the airport by two FBI agents. They said that an official of the FBI wants to talk with you about the Sarasota situation. Well, I was encouraged; feeling that maybe some of the questions that we'd been asking were now going to be answered. So, we drove with the two agents to the office at Dulles which the FBI has. My wife was put in one room, and she was given as entertainment the FBI training manual. If you want to know some arcane aspects of FBI training, she's fully prepared. I was taken into another room, with the Deputy Director of the FBI, a young female FBI agent, and a middle-aged lawyer from the Department of Justice. Essentially, the message was, we've done this complete investigation; everything that's known is known, and you need to get a life. I pointed out what he didn't know was that I had actually read two of the investigative reports by their agent, which contradicted what they had said publicly and what he had just said to me privately. He said, "Oh, you don't understand. One, that wasn't a very good agent." Well, the idea that has there been an investigation by the FBI in its history that was as important to the American people as full knowledge as 9/11? And the very fact that they would say they had sent as an investigation into what I think was an important component of the total picture, someone that they declare to be less than a fully

capable person was itself revelatory. And then he proceeded to say, "And we have other information that puts what you read in context. And you will see that in fact what we have said is true." So, I said "Fine. Could I see the information that will put it into context?" And he pointed to the young female agent, and directed her to assemble the files. We arranged a time to meet at the FBI office for the District of Columbia. So, a few days later, I showed up for our meeting, prepared to read these files. The Deputy Director was there, and he said the meeting is cancelled and we're not going to reschedule. And, since I knew who the agent was who had been described as less than competent; and I had called him to try to have a telephone conversation, and he said "I know you've been calling Agent 'X'." Stop calling him, because I've told him to not take your calls." That was the last of any official character meeting that I had with the FBI. [END VIDEO]

OGDEN: There are more details concerning Mueller's direct involvement in this kind of stonewalling around the Congressional inquiry into 9/11; telling Bob Graham and his other investigators not to fly out to interview one of the known personalities in San Diego. They disobeyed those orders and did it anyhow. But just parenthetically, immediately after this press conference that Bob Graham did in Washington D.C. at the National Press Club, a

fight

erupted around the so-called JASTA bill – Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism – which would allow the 9/11 families to sue Saudi Arabia for their role in financing and coordinating the 9/11 attacks.



CNN coverage.

Yesterday just happens to be the one-year anniversary of the major victory – you can see on the screen here [Fig. 4] – of the Senate override of Obama’s veto of this JASTA bill, which was absolutely dramatic. This was a rally in front of the White House [Fig. 5] of 9/11 families and activists, asking the Congress to override Obama’s veto; and then next [Fig. 6], this is an article in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers.

“Senate Poised To Override Obama Veto.” Then this is the final picture [Fig. 7], this was actually in the cloakroom immediately after the Senate cast their votes. The cloakroom of the U.S. Senate. I had the pleasure to actually be there in the gallery with the 9/11 families when the U.S. Senate overrode Obama’s veto of the JASTA bill. That was the CNN coverage. This was obviously a major victory, parenthetically. But it’s part of the story, and the role that Bob Graham had to play in going directly head-to-head with the FBI and others in the Executive Branch who were trying to cover up and protect the Saudis in the 9/11 case.

WERTZ: Now, there are, along with the statement from James Noland that I read earlier, in response to the British government’s request back in 1982 for an investigation of Lyndon

LaRouche, there were two other attachments which were declassified. The one basically was an attack upon LaRouche for having opposed in what they called the Falkland Islands, but which is the Malvinas Islands. LaRouche did that from the standpoint of the Monroe Doctrine. The second was they objected to the LaRouche Movement revealing that the policy of the British was to promote the Muslim Brotherhood. If we look at the period after 9/11, in which Robert Mueller is carrying out this "aggressive deception" as Senator Graham puts it, to cover up the role of the Saudis. When you're talking about the Saudis, you're talking about a satrap of the British; that's what you're talking about in this situation.

What follows 9/11? Regime-change wars. What follows 9/11 immediately is Tony Blair's sexed up dossier claiming that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction; which, as it turns out, he did not have. And which the British undoubtedly knew he did not have. Once again, British intervention. And after the invasion of Iraq, you had the effective creation of ISIS; you had then under Obama, continued regime-change policies under the name of the Arab Spring, which was just a policy of bringing the Muslim Brotherhood to power in such locations as Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, and Syria. As Lyndon LaRouche said after the assassination of Qaddafi, the reason they assassinated him was that they were in a hurry to move into Syria, as part of what

he

had earlier described as the “Storm Over Asia”; an effort to encircle Russia and to ensure that a New Paradigm does not emerge.

A critical point in this narrative really is in the period of 2013-14. I should just say, Mueller stepped aside as FBI Director on September 4, 2013; and as you know, he was replaced

by James Comey. James Comey, it should be remembered, was the Deputy Attorney General under Mueller from December 2003 until August 2005.

In the year 2013, President Xi of China went to Kazakhstan, and he announced the Chinese commitment to the Silk Road; a policy which had been advocated for a significant period of time

by Lyndon LaRouche and his wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who is well

known today as the Silk Road Lady. The Chinese have an immediate

appreciation of the role that she has played in advocating this

policy.

In the next year, you have the Ukraine coup – February 2014; orchestrated by Obama and by the British and the French, among others. But the basic idea here was, again, encirclement

of Russia, in this case with a bunch of Nazis, which is what the

Maidan consisted of.

On July 16, 2014, as the dossier that Barbara Boyd has authored on Mueller indicates, you had the BRICS organization meeting in Brazil, and what they formed was the New Development

Bank. Remember, LaRouche had called for an International Development Bank, back in 1975: This whole policy that LaRouche

had advocated over these decades, at that point was in the

process of coming into existence, and it was at point, particularly following the coup in Ukraine, that the operation against associates of Trump's began, that is, even before he announced for President. We now know, that contrary to the lies

of James Comey and [then Director of National Intelligence] James

Clapper, there was wiretapping of associates of President Trump.

We know for a fact that the dossier indicates that Paul Manafort,

who became Trump's campaign manager when he announced for President, was wiretapped beginning in the year 2014; and this continued through 2016. It was discontinued for a certain period

of time, and then resumed into 2017 before Obama left office, including a time period in which it was known that Manafort, even

though he was no longer campaign manager, was speaking to President Trump. Manafort had a residence in the Trump Tower all

of this time.

Why was he targetted, initially? Well, because he had provided advisory services to the Yanukovych government [in Ukraine] – this was a duly elected government, which was overthrown unconstitutionally in 2014, by Nazis. So, of course,

that becomes grounds for investigating somebody whose client was

overthrown by a bunch of Nazis, by the Obama administration! The investigation begins there.

Also, in 2014, Michael Flynn was fired by Obama – why?

Because he had opposed the Obama Arab Spring policy, which gave

rise to ISIS, Michael Flynn said at the time. So you can imagine

that it is perhaps the case that surveillance of Michael Flynn

began at that time as well.

Now, what the dossier on Mueller goes through is that Mueller should be removed as Special Counsel, and there should be

an actual Special Counsel who investigates the crimes which Mueller aggressively deceiving the American people about, in his

investigation of President Trump. And I would also point out, think of the statements by various judges about the corrupt investigation and witch hunt directed at Lyndon LaRouche – well,

on June 15, 2017, Trump wrote: “You are witnessing the single greatest witch hunt in American political history.” And I would

say that, the precursor for this was the unprecedented witch hunt

against Lyndon LaRouche, but that President Trump is effectively

getting the same treatment as Lyndon LaRouche did then, from the

same sources, from the British.

Now, there are seven areas, that should be investigated – ,

OGDEN: We can put this on the screen here. We have the list of the seven actual crimes.

WERTZ: First, instigation of a coup against the United States by a foreign power.

So, although the charge is that President Trump, or his associates, colluded with the Russians, the fact of the matter is, that all the evidence shows that this entire operation has been concocted by the British, and been carried out by stooges in

the intelligence community under President Obama; who was particularly happy every time he visited Buckingham Palace.

Now what do we have as evidence? Well, the {Guardian} reports that as early as 2015, shortly after he announced for



President, that the British began to surveille Trump and his associates. And according to the public account – and this cannot be taken at face value; this investigation of Trump may have started earlier. The communications between the British and

[then CIA Director] Brennan or others in the U.S. intelligence community, could have occurred before 2016. The report in the {Guardian} says that sometime in the summer, Hannigan of the Government Communications Headquarters, the GCHQ, which is the

equivalent of our NSA, spoke with Brennan about allegations that

Trump was being influenced by the Russians or working with the Russians.

But the point is, it was the GCHQ which was directly involved – according to public accounts in the {Guardian}, in prompting Brennan to create a six-intelligence agency taskforce

to investigate Trump, {during} the Presidential campaign!

And I think the only other case of this kind of thing, was what happened to Lyndon LaRouche, because Lyndon LaRouche was running for President, back in 1988, and the investigation of him

was launched while he was a Presidential candidate in the United

States, and – really, actually, an indictment during the Presidential campaign, which is completely unprecedented.

Additionally, you have the Christopher Steele dossier:

Christopher Steele is allegedly an “ex” MI6 agent. He headed up

the MI6 Russian desk in Moscow, until 2009. In 2009, he left that position and formed Orbis Business at the same time period

Fusion GPS, a U.S. company which was involved in commissioning Steele’s dossier, was also created. And these two companies were

working together since at least 2010 when they signed a

confidentiality agreement between them as a shield for revealing

what was actually going on.

So you have the circulation of the Christopher Steele dossier – and they didn't just produce this for Hillary Clinton.

They were briefing the press! They were giving direct briefings

to the press; they were giving it to John McCain who then gave it

to Comey, and so forth. They were actively circulating this unverified, so-called "intelligence" against Donald Trump, who was a candidate for President, then became President.

And it's very important to understand that Christopher Steele, it's public record that he worked with the FBI's Eurasian

Organized Crime Unit in New York City, from at least 2010. The former head of the FBI's Eurasian Organized Crime Unit in New York City is none other than Andrew McCabe; who for a while, after Comey was fired, was Acting Director of the FBI, and is still Deputy Director of the FBI. And it's believed that McCabe

was the person who was working closely with Christopher Steele.

It came to light, for instance, that the FBI actually offered to

pay Steele \$50,000 to continue with his research, although the FBI's been stonewalling on the details on that.

So what you have here is completely a British operation directed at Trump and his associates; and I'll get to this in terms of the wiretapping.

And it's also believed that the Christopher Steele dossier provided the roadmap for the FBI's investigation, and also may have been used for getting ,” FISA [Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court] surveillance authorization directed at people

such as Manafort.

Second crime is false reporting of a crime: And that's precisely what has occurred in the case of the allegation that the Russians hacked Podesta and the DNC. It has been documented

thoroughly by numerous sources that this was a leak by an insider, and not a hack by the Russians. The most definitive proof of this is the memorandum put forward by the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS). And these are top-notch former NSA, former CIA agents such as William Binney and Ray McGovern. They prove forensically that it could not have

been a hack over the internet; it had to be a leak onto some sort

of memory device, because of the speed involved [in the data transfer].

This has been submitted to Mueller; he's done nothing on it. It's been submitted to the President with the idea that he should

ask Pompeo of the CIA to get to the bottom of this. We don't know if anything's been done along these lines.

They also show that at least the Guccifer 2.0 claimed hacking, attributed falsely to the Russians, when in fact there

was cutting and pasting to put the Russian language on the alleged hack trail. This is something which the CIA has the capability to do under Brennan; it's called the Marble Framework.

Assange of WikiLeaks has denied that this came from the Russian

government. He recently met with Congressman Dana Rohrabacher,

and said that he was willing to provide testimony which would definitely establish that this was not a hack and that it was not

given to him by the Russians. Rohrabacher (R-CA) has been trying

to meet with Trump in order to present this evidence, but it's

been blocked, according to him, by the staff at the White House.

Craig Murray, a U.K. former ambassador to Uzbekistan, has said it was a leak and he knows it personally, because he met with a person that he said was the leaker.

Seymour Hersh was taped in a discussion, without his knowing he was being recorded, and he indicated that he had sources who

indicated that Seth Rich, a DNC computer technician, may have been the person who carried out the leak.

So all of this information is not being taken into account, in continuing with the narrative that this was a Russian hack, and you're supposed to believe that.

Then you have the third crime, which is an attempt at entrapment of Donald Trump, Jr., Manafort, and Jared Kushner, among others, in a Trump Tower meeting. The British hand is all

over this: The person who set up the meeting and sent the emails

to Donald Trump, Jr., which misrepresented the purpose of the meeting, was one Ron Goldstone, a British national. It should also be pointed out that one William Browder, who testified before Congress, in this case against Fusion GPS, because they were lobbying against the Magnitsky Act, which was the subject of

the discussion at the Trump Tower. This was a person who renounced his U.S. citizenship in 1989 and became a British citizen.

So again, what we're dealing with here is a complete British operation. It's just transparent that that's the case. But this

was a deliberate attempt to try to set up a situation which would

involve the Trump immediate circles, in attempting to get information on Hillary Clinton allegedly coming from the Russians.

Fourth area: Felonious leaks of intelligence by the Obama

administration. This has to do with the unmasking, which was completely out of control, or I guess you could say it was under

very directed control by the Obama administration officials. For

instance, it's been revealed that Samantha Power, the Obama UN ambassador, requested 260 unmaskings of U.S. citizens in the course of 2016. And she even tried to get even more unmaskings

before the inauguration of Donald Trump. What reason does she have to be asking for such intelligence, from the standpoint of

being at the UN?

Obama National Security Advisor Susan Rice, it is known asked for many unmaskings, in this case, her National Security Council records were transferred to the Obama library, so that justice could be obstructed, because records at the library are

sealed for a number of years.

This is a deliberate policy of targetting U.S. citizens, particularly Trump associated by the Obama administration, and those are two such cases.

You have also the attempted J. Edgar Hoover-style sexual blackmail of Trump, by Comey: This is the fifth area that should

be investigated. Comey met with Trump in Trump Tower on Jan. 6,

2017; he met with him alone. Other people had come to the meeting, but he asked them to leave and then met with Trump alone, and presented him with an aspect of the Steele dossier which claimed that he had been involved in sexual perversions in

a hotel in Moscow. Trump has reportedly asked for an immediate

investigation of this fraudulent dossier, which Comey refused to

do.

But this is the kind of thing that J. Edgar Hoover did to many, to Martin Luther King, Jr., and to many others, as a means of terrorizing and controlling people to go along with a policy desired by J. Edgar Hoover's controllers, which is also the case with respect to Comey.

A sixth area for investigation is the wiretapping of Trump associates, and then the lying by Comey and Clapper to the U.S.

Congress. Clapper in particular was asked, was there a FISA ordered surveillance of Trump or his associates? He said no. "Would you know about it if it had occurred?" "Yes, I would," and he left a loophole and said: Well, there may have been some other jurisdiction was carrying out a wiretap that I don't know about.

But this is what he said, and he definitively said there was no FISA Court wiretap, and yet, that's precisely what came out:

That Manafort, the campaign manager of Trump, was wiretapped and

he had a resident at Trump Tower, and this is precisely what Trump had tweeted on March 4th, 2017: "Terrible! Just found out

that Obama had my 'wires tapped' in Trump Tower just before the

victory. Nothing found. This is McCarthyism!" So that has to be

investigated.

And then the final thing in the dossier, is the attempted entrapment of the President by Comey himself, into an obstruction

of justice charge: So you have the head of the FBI who is acting

virtually as somebody who goes to a meeting with wires on, and goes back to his controllers at the FBI to consult after each visit with Trump. And then writes memos, which he illegally leaked to the press, and he actually said: "I thought that might

prompt the appointment of a special counsel." So he had the intention of getting a special counsel against Trump, on the grounds – one would be to claim that Trump asked him not to pursue an investigation of Michael Flynn; of course Trump didn't

do that, as indicated. He merely said, "I would hope that he wouldn't be prosecuted." And of course, as has been pointed out,

the President has the right to actually pardon somebody. So, as

Alan Dershowitz, the civil rights attorney, and Democrat, has said he had every right to say what he did.

And the other aspect is to say that somehow Trump was obstructing justice by firing Comey! So the attempt was set up

to get Mueller to be able to carry out this kind of an investigation against Trump.

Using methods of entrapment, lying throughout, what you had is a witch hunt against a President of the United States. It's

not the first time that the British have been involved in this,

and their stooges in the United States, but this is really unprecedented, with the exception of the witch hunt which was carried out earlier against Lyndon LaRouche.

And it's time that this be stopped! And that's the whole point of this dossier.

The dossier should be seen as a political weapon in the hands of the American citizenry. The issue here is what Benjamin

Franklin said after the Constitutional Convention adopted a Constitution. We have a republic, the question is, can you

keep

it? And the responsibility rests on the American citizen to use

this dossier to actually force the issue in the country right now, to stop this British coup.

Robert Mueller's full name, as the dossier indicates, is Robert Swan Mueller III. Our intention is to make this operation

being carried out by Mueller right now, to be his final swan song.

OGDEN: As we saw on the screen there, the question that was asked at the conclusion of this final section of the dossier is

the following: "{Have our intelligence agencies, actually instigated an Active Measures counterintelligence program illegally and against a sitting President?}" [emphasis in original]

So that's the question and as the dossier states a little bit later on: It's very clear that there has been a foreign government that has intervened to attempt to sway the U.S. electoral process and the U.S. democratic process, and that that

foreign government is the British government. And so if you follow the thread of Robert Mueller, not just in the attacks right now against President Donald Trump, but if you follow it back to the aggressive cover-up of the events of 9/11, and even

the prosecution and witch hunt against Lyndon LaRouche in the 1980s, you'll see if you pull that thread it will unravel a much,

much larger apparatus, and it will reveal a lot more.

This dossier follows that thread very clearly through these three crucial inflection points in our nation's recent history and the call to action is obviously to access this dossier which

we're making available and to circulate it as widely as



possible.

Will, you made the point that the context for all of this is much more significant than maybe even all of the mechanisms by which these crimes have been carried out. The context is what reveals and uncovers the true motivation behind this entire process, and I think if you take the connections between this dossier, which choose 1982 as a crucial year to examine what Lyndon LaRouche's activities were at that time – meeting with López Portillo, meeting with Indira Gandhi, proposing the Strategic Defense Initiative, and authoring {Operation Juárez},

and if you trace that forward to the announcement in 2013 by Xi

Jinping of the new Silk Road, the Eurasian World Land-Bridge, and

the new international financial institution of development that

that represents, that's the unifier for this entire period of history.

And despite the attempts, over and over, and over again, to derail that locomotive of world history, we've reached the point

where that is the prevailing dynamic on the planet. And the attempts to try to sabotage that and undermine it continue to fail. And so, this is the latest attempt in that, but to look at

what the motivation is – maybe you can just say a little bit more about what that context is.

WERTZ: I think the point is, in defeating this British operation which Mueller is spearheading at this point, we create

the conditions under which President Trump can move to join with

Russia, China, India in the development of the One Belt, One Road

policy. This is crucial in terms of reversing the

destructions

over the recent decades of our industrial capacity in the United

States; it's crucial in terms of developing world peace, solving

crises such as Korea, solving crises such as the terrorist onslaught in the Middle East and Northern Africa in particular.

That collaboration is crucial. Trump has signalled that he wants

to move with such collaboration.

And this is a longstanding fight to bring humanity together, operating on a common destiny of humanity, what John Quincy Adams

called a "community of principle among a family of sovereign nation-states."

The British Empire, as the Venetian Empire before it, has been opposed to that. It has operated under the geopolitical of

dividing nations among themselves, creating warfare such as we've

seen repeatedly over the last more than a hundred years, with two

world wars, and perpetual warfare ever since.

And so we're in a situation, where, as Lyndon LaRouche recently said, "Victory is within our reach," and you have to

understand this broad arc of history in order to have an appreciation of what's occurring in so-called contemporary

affairs. It's not what meets the eye: it's this broader

question – we've got a financial crisis in the world. The

system is overbloated and ripe for collapse; the problems of 2008

were never solved. And we have a solution before us which is New

Paradigm: Peace based upon economic development, cooperation

among nations for the purpose of promoting, as our Constitution

says, the General Welfare, not just of our own population, but of the population of the entire planet.

And I think that's the issue between the British Empire policy of geopolitics, versus the policy of a community of principle among nation-states, which is a U.S. policy; the policy

expressed by President Xi of China of a "win-win" policy, as opposed to a zero-sum game – this is what's at stake right now.

I think the American citizen, as this dossier concludes, has to

take responsibility, circulate this dossier! We're going to be

producing a leaflet and maybe multiple leaflets that you can get

from our site and then circulate throughout the country, to bring

people's attention to this dossier. We're not in a position to

produce a large number of these in hard copy, but we do have an

electronic version which will be available on the LaRouche PAC site.

And by doing this, we can create the conditions under which not only is the presence of the United States defended against this coup attempt, and it's very much like the Maidan in Ukraine

that's being attempted right now; what's being done to Trump is

almost precisely modeled on the Maidan that brought about the coup in Ukraine. But more broadly than that, by defending the Presidency was the chance of bringing about a different geometry

on the globe as a whole, and creating the conditions under which

we can move towards what the actual mission of mankind is:,

which

is not only to develop this planet Earth, but also to assert dominion over the Galaxy and eventually the Universe.

OGDEN: Well, thank you, and let me put on the screen, one more time, the cover page of this dossier, so you can get a look

at it, and we'll have the link here on the screen. You can access this dossier at [lpac.co/ytdos](http://lpac.co/ytdos). And again, the title: "Robert Mueller Is An Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will Do His Job

If You Let Him."

You'll find this report fascinating: You'll learn a lot about history, the history of this country over the last 30, 35

years that you did not know, I guarantee you. And you'll learn a

lot about what's going on right now. There's much, much more than what meets the eye.

Thank you for joining me, Will. And thank you for tuning in, and we encourage you, read the dossier and circulate it as widely as you can. And stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com)