
I. There Was No Russian Hack

SOVEREIGN REPUBLIC OR IMPERIAL SURVEILLANCE STATE?

William Binney Makes His Case to the World: There Was No Russian Hack

PROLOGUE

“There are no mysteries, there is only blindness.” So, once remarked the ancient Greek composers of classical tragedy, and classical grand strategy, as well. “Russiagate” was not only a hoax, but a multiply-connected, multi-national intelligence operation deployed against the Trump Presidency even prior to the nomination of Donald Trump to represent the Republican Party. The recent demand by the President, that “former” British intelligence agent Christopher Steele be extradited to the United States, to be then tried and, if convicted, sentenced to jail, deserves not only consideration, but vigorous action in pursuit of the truth.

Consider the case reported five years ago by two German psychologists, Bruno Waldvogel and Hans Strasburger, of a patient identified only by the initials “B.T.” The patient was first said to suffer from cortical blindness, possibly as the result of a traumatic accident. “Her health records from the time show that she was subjected to a series of vision tests—involving lasers, special glasses, light shined across a room—all of which demonstrated her apparent blindness,” Sarah Kaplan of the *Washington Post* reported.

The problem, however, was that nothing was actually physically wrong with her eyes. There was another factor. The patient suffered from multiple personality disorder, and upon further investigation, it was found that when she, a woman in her late thirties, took on the personality of a teenage boy, she could see quite well. Her mind had constructed a psychological “light switch” so powerful that she had even used a seeing eye dog for years, but that condition of “physically objective” blindness was able to be

changed, once the root psychological causes were discovered.

“Why do you keep blaming the British?” Even with all that has been identified, by *EIR*, otherwise through various documents, including the roles of British Military Intelligence employees like Christopher Steele, Sir Richard Dearlove, Robert Hannigan, Sir Kim Darroch and others, many Americans, perhaps even the majority, are “perplexed” by the role that the British are playing in this latest episode of their seventy-five-year-old assault on the Presidency. They just can’t “see it.” To enable them, and all others so perplexed, to see the truth, and therefore see what they must do about it, is our purpose in presenting the work of William Binney, Barbara Boyd, and Kirk Wiebe “in conference,” Thursday, July 23.

What follows should allow you, after you have read it, and as you speak with others and reproduce in them, what you have come to know, to help the truth to ascend to its rightful place in the consciousness of all Americans, and all people throughout the world. It should also allow you to determine: Is it because of a lack of the presentation of the truth, or is it because a personality change is required on the part of our citizens, that the Constitution of the United States has been allowed to be threatened by a foreign force, as expressed in what Mark Carney, former Governor of the Bank of England, lyingly referred to as “financial regime change” in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, one year ago? To paraphrase: “You shall know the truth, and the truth shall let you see.”

The following is the edited transcript of the opening remarks at the [press conference](#) by William Binney, Barbara Boyd, and Kirk Wiebe on July 23, 2020.

William Binney: The problem is that I can't seem to get the forensics evidence into a court, or into the mainstream media—the evidence for refuting Russiagate. The point is that we looked,— in the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS), we've a bunch of technical people, including Kirk Wiebe and I, and some others, and some affiliates that were in the U.K., who also joined the analysis process. And we were looking at the files posted by WikiLeaks, because the allegation from the beginning was that Russia hacked the DNC [Democratic National Committee] and gave the emails to WikiLeaks to publish—which they did, they published. So, we looked at those emails to see if there was something there that might give us some idea of how WikiLeaks got that data.

Well, in all the 35,813 emails that they posted, in the three batches, one downloaded, according to last modified times, on the 23rd of May, and another on the 25th of May, and one on the 26th of August of 2016. Now, all those files, all 35,813 had a last modified time that was rounded off to an even second. So, they all ended up in even seconds. Now, if you know anything about data processing and data storage and things of that nature, there is a program, that was quite common in the past, using what's called FAT file formatting, File Allocation Table formatting, which is a processing that, when doing a batch process of data and transferring it to a storage device, like a thumb drive or a CD-ROM, it rounds off the last modified time to the nearest even second. So that's exactly the property we found in all that data posted by WikiLeaks. Now, that said, very simply, this data was downloaded to a storage device, a CD-ROM, or a thumb drive, and physically transported before WikiLeaks could post it. So that meant it was not a hack.

So, no matter how you look at it, we're looking at the forensic evidence that says the DNC emails were not hacked, they were downloaded and physically transported to WikiLeaks.

And then we had the other issue with Guccifer 2.0. Now, Guccifer 2.0 came out shortly after Julian Assange announced that he had emails on Hillary Clinton and so on, and the DNC. Well, when you looked at the material, which we did, looked at all the material that



Schiller Institute

William Binney

Guccifer 2.0 posted and said, “here are the hacks that I did on the DNC”; he claimed he did one on the 5th of July and one on the 1st of September 2016. When you start looking at that, and we looked at—the files he posted gave you a series of files with file names, the numbers of characters in the file and a time-stamp at the end of the file; then the next file, the number of characters, and time-stamp and so on, for I don't know how many files, thousands of files. We looked at all those files and said, OK, we ran a program to calculate the transfer rate of all that data, be-

cause all you have to do, is look between the two time-stamps, the file name, and the number of characters in the file, and take the difference between the times, and that's the transfer rate for that number of characters. We found that the variations ran from something like 19 to 49.1 MB/sec—that means 19 to 49 million characters per second. And that, we said, the international web and the worldwide web would not support that rate of transfer, not for anybody who's just a hacker coming in across the net trying to do it; it won't support that kind of transfer.

And some people thought that that was wrong, that it could be done, and so, we said, “OK, we're going to try it.” We organized some hackers in Europe to try to transfer a data set from the U.S. over to Europe to see how fast we could get it there. And we tried it from Albania, and Serbia, a couple places in the Netherlands, and London, a data center. Well, we got various rates, but the highest rate we got was between the data center in New Jersey and one in London, and that was 12 MB/sec, which is a little less than one-fourth the rate necessary to do the transfer at the highest rate that we saw in the Guccifer 2.0 data—which meant: It didn't go across the net!

So, in fact, the file rate transfers were nowhere near the maximum rate that we could do. And so, we said, “OK, if anybody has a way of getting it there, let us know, and we'll help you try to do that.” And so far, no one has ever come forward to dispute either the facts on the DNC data last modified file times, nor the transfer rates for the Guccifer 2.0.

Plus, there's another factor,—there's two more, actually: With Guccifer 2.0 data, the 5 July data and the 1 September data, if you ignored date and hour, they could merge like you're shuffling a deck of cards. The

holes in the 5 July data timing were filled by the data from 1st of September! That said, to us, that Guccifer 2.0 was playing with the data, separating them into two files, saying he made two different hacks and doing a range change on the date and the hour on the one file. So, that to us was also an indication of fabrication on the part of Guccifer 2.0.

Then, there was another factor: When Guccifer 2.0 put out some files on 15 June of 2016, with the signatures saying it's a Russian hack, our fellows in the U.K., looking at the data, found five of those files at a minimum—I don't know if they are through looking yet—but they found five files that Guccifer 2.0 posted on the 15th of June, with Russian signatures, saying the Russians did this, because of the signatures. They found the same five files posted by WikiLeaks from Podesta emails—and they did not have the Russian signatures. So that meant, that Guccifer 2.0 was inserting Russian signatures, to make it look like the Russians did the hack.

Well, if you go back to the Vault 7 release from WikiLeaks again, from CIA, and you look, they have this Marble Framework program that will modify the files to look like someone else did the hack. And who were the countries for which they had the ability to do that in the Marble Framework program? Well, one was Russia, the others are China, North Korea, Iran, and Arab countries. Well, to us, then that means that the fabrication of the insert of Russian signatures, means that somebody modified the file to make it look like that, which fits the Marble Framework definition of doing that kind of activity, which thus says, all of this Guccifer 2.0 material is pointing back now to CIA as the origin of it.

That's the basic evidence we have, and none of it points to Russia. In fact, we can't even find anything that points to Russia. When in fact the Mueller report and the Rosenstein indictment named some, what they call, trolls for the Russian government, the IRA, the Internet Research Agency out of St. Petersburg, in Russia, they named it in a court document, and well, the IRA over there said we are not in any way associated with the Russian government, and so they sent lawyers in to challenge that in a court of law, here in the U.S.! And the court charged the government to prove it. And they couldn't. They couldn't even prove anything. And so, the judge basically reprimanded them, and said you are never to mention the IRA as any way affiliated with the Russian government again! So, their whole case was falling apart! Everything. It looked like the Guccifer 2.0 data was a fabrication, the alleged hack and so on,

all fabrications.

And even if you looked at some of the testimony that came out from the CrowdStrike CEO, I think his name is Shawn Henry, he said, we had no indications of exfiltrating the data, but we had evidence that it was exfiltrated. Now, if he's talking about the last modified times, as an indication of exfiltration—which it was, but it wasn't from a hack, it was from a download. So that download, then, is an indication that it was done locally, as were the Guccifer 2.0 data, that couldn't go across the net—it was a download locally—all that stuff happened locally. In fact, some of the data on the Guccifer 2.0 material had all the timestamps indicating it was done on the East Coast of the United States; we had one in Central Time, and one on the West Coast, but most of it fell on the East Coast. So that implied that all this stuff was happening on the East Coast, and that really pointed, for us, pointed right back at CIA as the origin of all this fabrication.

Dennis Speed: OK, thank you very much, Bill. And so, everybody knows, there is going to be a time for people to ask questions, and we'll extend that as long as we can do that in this format.

I next want to introduce Barbara Boyd, who's an author and researcher for the LaRouche Political Action Committee (LaRouche PAC). Let me say something about this, Thirty-seven years ago, Lyndon LaRouche was involved in a back-channel negotiation with the Soviet Union. The discussion led to a policy being adopted by the Reagan Administration, called the Strategic Defense Initiative. Now, despite the fact that the senior director of the National Security Council, Norman Bailey at that time, had met with LaRouche, and had described LaRouche's organization as "one of the best private intelligence services in the world," shortly after that policy was adopted, LaRouche was put through a fierce federal investigative process by the Department of Justice—and former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark described that prosecution as a "broader range of deliberate and systematic misconduct and abuse of power over a longer period of time, in an effort to destroy a political movement and leader, than any other federal prosecution in my time or to my knowledge." Now, that might not be pertinent to you today, except for one fact: One of the key persons involved in that prosecution, at that time, was a man by the name of Robert Mueller.

Barbara Boyd is author of LaRouche PAC's 30-

page [report](#), “Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will Do His Job If You Let Him.”

Barbara Boyd: Well, with that introduction, let me just highlight some of the things Bill said, and some of the things which I think are really significant for our audience today.

Here we are in this summer which we could call “the summer of our discontent”: Our cities are aflame, we have a COVID pandemic, and yet, here we are, and we keep coming back to something which happened in the summer of 2016. And we keep pointing to it and saying, this is what you have to really look at. And the reason for that is simple: Once you go through something like this—I assume that General Flynn feels something like this right now; the LaRouche prosecution was like this; Roger Stone has just been through something like this—where the apparatus of government is aligned against you and your reputation is torn to shreds, and you’re accused of all sorts of things, just like the President has been accused right now, which are a lie, it’s very rare that you actually get the chance to come back on it, and you can dissect it and can show what the lie is.

And this particular lie, that Russia hacked the DNC, has been the sort of untouchable thing which nobody has wanted to get into around the Russiagate investigation. You see that we’re all satisfied with tearing apart Christopher Steele in several directions, the British agent who fabricated the dirty dossier; we’re not really satisfied in looking at *this* particular situation. Just think about it: All the things that have interceded ever since the summer of 2016, think about what was the content of what was in those WikiLeaks leaks—can you remember what was said in the actual documents? Or is your mind somehow transfixed in an argument about whether Donald Trump is an agent of Putin or not?

Basically, what’s happened here is that the VIPS, from December 2016, really, have been yelling about this, and saying, this makes no sense! Think back to December 2016, what was happening? The Obama Administration had declared that the alleged election interference was an act of war by Russia. John McCain was running around saying we should invoke Article 5



Schiller Institute

Barbara Boyd

of the NATO treaty; we should go to war over this. Barack Obama says, or has claimed, that the Obama Administration, as a retaliation for this, put a cyberworm into Russian infrastructure, which is probably, by most accounts, an actual act of war.

Bill Binney said from the beginning, if there was a Russian hack, the NSA would have it. Where’s the evidence? It has never been produced. And then, come May of this year, we finally get to look at what the Congressional testimony was

about this, way back in 2017—that is before Robert Mueller, that is before the continuation of this lie for over two-and-a-half years, and the beginning of this same lie being replicated right now into the same type of hacking lie about China. We only learn what CrowdStrike President Shawn Henry said, that the only people—other than Bill Binney—who actually forensically examined this to any extent,— and whether CrowdStrike examined this is a very open question—but what did he say? He told the Congress in December 2017 that CrowdStrike couldn’t see any evidence that files which have been “staged for exfiltration” ever were exfiltrated. They never left the DNC as far as we could find it, he said.

Think about that! That is, in May 2020, we’re just finding out what everybody in Congress and everybody in Washington knew, definitely, as of December of 2017. Barack Obama, Joe Biden, those guys knew this even before, obviously, the Congressional testimony of CrowdStrike’s president.

What did those emails also show? Most people have forgotten completely about that. They showed that Hillary Clinton was stealing the Democratic nomination for President, from Bernie Sanders. They showed that Hillary Clinton was a craven tool of Wall Street. Most people don’t even remember that.

Now, think about the fact that Donald Trump comes in, he goes through all the things he goes through, and he says to Mike Pompeo, who was then director of the CIA, “I want you to meet with this guy Binney and I want you to find out about the Russian hacks.” What happens is, Pompeo does meet with Bill Binney; Bill Binney tells him everything you just heard, and proba-

bly more, and because of what Bill Binney said—that it is just likely that the CIA did the hacking of the DNC or did whatever intrusion was involved there—this thing has been completely, totally covered up. It is an un-touchable, in Washington parlance.

So, what we're contending is that any investigation which does not attack this, and expose it, is rotten and self-defeating. It will leave the surveillance apparatus and intelligence apparatus in place, which we contend has left many Americans mentally imprisoned and pacified since 9/11, and particularly since the financial collapse of 2008.

That is why Julian Assange, who is a witness to this, may very well die in Belmarsh prison, as a result of the coverup of this very crime. It's why Craig Murray, who is a witness to the actual handoff—at least, according to what he says—has never been interviewed by any government agency in terms of what he has to say about the so-called "Russian hack." That's why the surveillance state, which is really the imposition of a police state in the United States, which Bill Binney and Kirk Wiebe have opposed ever since Sept. 11, 2001, might very well be imposed completely. This was, after all, what Hillary Clinton's presidency was supposed to be going forward from the continuance and expansion of this type of surveillance during the Obama Administration, after its initial, widespread implementation in the Bush Administration. But it's also why, if this particular lie gets exposed, gets dug into, we have a good chance to overturn the entire, horrible apparatus meant to subdue a population in a failed United States, which is really what the British oligarchy has planned here, why that descent into the maelstrom can finally be halted. And that's what I have to say.

Speed: Thank you very much, Barbara. Now, Bill has a team that he works with, and he's worked with him for a while, and one of the members of that team is with us here. And he, that is, Mr. Kirk Wiebe, and Bill, have a story that goes back way: They at one point decided that they had to leave NSA and they had to do that, in order to do their job. And I'd just like to have

Kirk say something, and then we'll open up the lines for the questions; and let me just say to everybody, if you are on the zoom platform, you just raise your hand, I think you have a direction for that, and then we'll get to you; and then we have also written questions and there'll be a couple of us asking those questions.

Kirk Wiebe: Hello, my name is Kirk Wiebe. I'm a longtime colleague and friend of Bill Binney's and we've been through a few wars together, some adversarial actions taken against us by the U.S. government. Thank God, we survived those. But I want you, the audience to understand the background for Russiagate, and some of the things that have happened, especially, the misuse, the illegal use, of United States government surveillance capabilities, against Donald Trump, as alleged, and other people connected to his administration. And that alludes to the fact that Bill is the part of several affidavits in court cases, one associated with Roger Stone, who's just had his sentence commuted by the President; but was not allowed to testify in court. And I believe I can tell you why.



Schiller Institute

Kirk Wiebe

But you need to understand, in the context of recent, say the last 20 years, what has brought about this situation, that makes it possible for

people to misuse or illegally use against us—all of you—very, very powerful surveillance capabilities.

When NSA, and Bill and I, were researching the evolution of communications capabilities, in the '90s, basically this is around 1995, 1996-97 timeframe, it became clear that this thing called the internet was gaining ground, and it was advancing quickly. All kinds of applications, those little icons you find on your computer, your phone or whatever it may be, were flourishing, new means of interacting between people, were being developed almost overnight. And the end result is, we are all very wired people. Many of us have more than one phone in our families, multiple computers; now your refrigerator is even being connected to the internet! Well, there are very positive things about all of this, but there are some negatives. It means, if people can crawl up a wire, which is basically what the internet is, speaking figuratively, they can access your phone,

they can access your computer, they could access your refrigerator.

Now, why would you do this? Well, you want to surveil. You know, back when the United States was fighting for its independence, the King of England wanted to put a soldier in the home of every colonial resident. Why? So that he could monitor and surveil the mood of the colonial structure, those oddballs living in the United States that he wanted to keep under control. And this is one of the factors that led to the United States revolution against England. People want privacy. And that ultimately gets reflected in our Constitution, the U.S. Constitution, in Article 4 of the Bill of Rights. And we believe—Bill and I—raised under the Constitution, and sworn to defend it, that that right should be extended to the general population of the world. In other words, why would you want to spy on innocent people—why? There’s no need to! It’s hard enough to catch bad guys, why complicate things?

So, when Bill and I were working on ways for NSA to exploit, or use the internet to catch terrorists, identify people planning to bomb things, whatever it may be, we made sure we built in protections for innocent people. Now the thing that allows you to do that, is the technical makeup of the internet. Things don’t just fly around in the free space. Just like you have a phone number that is equated to you as a person, or an email address, or anything like that, the internet functions on the same principle: There are IP—internet protocol, or IP—that are associated with every communications device. And

it’s monitored and it can be monitored. We use that information to exclude anyone that did not fit the definition of being a terrorist or a known bad person, or a someone under active suspicion of being part of a terrorist or a criminal organization. So, we had a way of separating out the wheat from the chaff, if you will. Unfortunately, Bill Binney was ordered in one night and told to remove that safeguard.

And ever since, NSA’s been on a rampant surveillance exercise, collecting everything it can about everyone. Is it literally everything? No. But it’s so much, that the odds are that if they want to know about you, they can know about you. This was everything against the principle of privacy under the United States Constitution, but they didn’t care. The ability to do it was too seductive. And this is how people, this is how mankind goes wrong. They always tend to screw things up, and they did here.

If Bill Binney’s protections had been built into NSA surveillance programs 20 years ago, *we would not be even talking about surveillance* and FISA and all of these words you’re hearing being used against the Trump Administration. People wouldn’t have been able to surveil innocent people. But the government made a conscious choice not to build that in. And they don’t want you to know that! They don’t want a national uproar, they don’t want a global uproar—that it’s all fixable with a simple, couple steps. This is not hard to do, you just need the will to do it.

And so, that’s the backdrop against all of this, that I wanted to pass along and make sure you understood.



The Jan. 27, 1989 Jailing of Lyndon LaRouche Defined an Era, Which Now Must End

[Watch](#) The LaRouche Case video

[Watch](#) the LaRouche Memorial video

[Sign](#) the **Petition** to Exonerate LaRouche at lpac.co/exonerate