

Bill Binney: Look at the Evidence To Investigate the Mueller Hoax Crimes

These are selected excerpts from the discussion between William Binney and LaRouche PAC's Jason Ross, broadcast on LaRouche PAC TV on April 11, 2019. Mr. Binney is the former Technical Director for the National Security Agency (NSA), who resigned from the Agency in 2001 after serving more than thirty years. The discussion occurred immediately following the arrest of Julian Assange in London, at the Ecuadorian Embassy, based on a previously sealed indictment from March 2018 filed in the U.S. District Court of Eastern Virginia, charging him with conspiring with Bradley Manning—now Chelsea Manning—to provide secret documents for release through WikiLeaks. The full video, which has received more than 94,000 views as of 7:30 pm Monday, April 15, is available [here](#).



William Binney

LPAC-TV

Jason Ross: Bill Binney is quite aware of WikiLeaks' history and he is an expert on matters of intelligence and on matters surrounding the Rus-siagate controversy that has been engulfing the United States over the past two years. I don't think that these events are entirely unrelated.

Mr. Binney, please tell us what your view is, of the arrest of Julian Assange today in London.

William Binney: This is a very bad precedent. It's all fabrication. They're not going to give him due process when he gets here. The message is, to everybody else in the world, "Either you con-

form to what we tell you to do, or we'll do this to you."

Attorney General Barr

Ross: Let me put this in context. We've seen the release of the report by Special Counsel Robert Mueller, concluding that the Trump campaign had not colluded with Russia in the election; although it did include, as a tacit assumption, Russian hacking of the Democratic National Committee, as an attempt by the Russian government to throw the election to Donald Trump, an assertion that was not challenged by Attorney General Barr in his summary of Mueller's findings.

Now, despite this, Barr has stated that he is concerned and planning to investigate what was going on with Russiagate.

Attorney General Barr told the Senate Appropriations subcommittee, April 10, 2019: "I think spying on a political campaign is a big deal. The generation I grew up in, the Vietnam War period . . . people were all concerned about spying on anti-war people. . . . There were a lot of rules put in place to make sure that there's an adequate basis before our law enforcement agencies get involved in political surveillance. I'm not suggesting that those rules were violated, but I think it's important



C-SPAN

Attorney General William Barr

to look at that. And I'm not just talking about the FBI, necessarily, but intelligence agencies more broadly."

Sen. Jeanne Shaheen replied to Barr: "So, you're not suggesting, though, that spying occurred?"

Barr answered, "I think spying did occur. Yes. I think spying did occur."

We need to get at what was involved in creating this investigation in the first place, and the improprieties there. The central theme, though, is going to have to be taking apart the "Russian hack" myth.

Now you've been very outspoken. You are one of very few people, including Julian Assange, who is able to speak with a certain level of expertise and knowledge about whether Russia had attacked the election. What implication do you think it has on getting to the bottom of Russiagate, if Julian Assange is arrested? What effect do you think this arrest has on the ability to get to the bottom of this matter?

Get to the Truth

Binney: I don't think his arrest will have any effect on the ability to do an investigation in this matter. All they have to do is investigate the NSA data bases and look at the published data that WikiLeaks posted on the DNC and Podesta. The evidence is already there; the forensic evidence that it was not a hack is very clear, and demonstrable in a court of law. So, let's have at it. Let's go into a court of law, and let's demonstrate this for everybody to see. The point is, that there's no evidence whatsoever, that anything that WikiLeaks published is in any way connected with a hack or the Russians.

Ross: At a certain point, maybe some months after the inauguration of President Trump, President Trump had asked then CIA Director Mike Pompeo to meet with you regarding your views on this matter. Pompeo, a few months before he met with you, in a speech to the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), said that WikiLeaks was a "non-state, hostile intelligence service" and in that speech Pompeo said that "WikiLeaks is abetted and aided by the Russians."

The Basic Forensic Evidence

Binney: There's no evidence that the Russians are enabling any of that. The question is, what is the basic evidence? And nobody has it. In Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein's indictment of some Russians, he listed GRU [Russian military foreign-intelligence service] agents.

Well, I looked at that, some people assume that that

Apr. 13, 2017, 2:49 p.m.

BY BRIAN BENNETT

CIA chief calls WikiLeaks 'non-state hostile intelligence service'



(AFP/Getty Images)

CIA Director Mike Pompeo denounced WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange as a "narcissist" who works in concert with Russia, relying on "the dirty work of others

was NSA data. I said it can't be NSA data because NSA data is classified. If there's any NSA data published anywhere, it's redacted, publicly; you can't expose,—otherwise, Rosenstein is guilty of Title 18 criminal codes for violating the Espionage Act, as well as violating protection of classified material.

So, that's not from NSA. I assumed that that was CrowdStrike or from some other third party doing an investigation of what was left of the DNC servers. The FBI cannot show continuous control of the DNC servers because they never had them! So, in a court of law, that would be dismissed as unreliable evidence, kind of like hearsay. The FBI has to seize evidence, maintain control of it, so they can use it in a court of law as the basic evidence. But they never did that, and they never had that! So, they're only getting whatever somebody tells them from a third party, some commercial company.

The whole thing is basically a fabrication. Nobody wants to look at it, and they want to profess whatever they want. But I think the Russians are doing discovery now in court, in that case—that's going to be great, because now they're going to 'fess up to what they've been doing.

Look at DCLeaks and Guccifer 2.0—with Guccifer 2.0 we can easily prove a fabrication, in a court of law. Let's do that, so that everybody knows, "yeah, that's the fabrication." Rosenstein, in using that as the part of his indictments—claims that Guccifer 2.0 is a Russian,

working for the Russians. The timestamps we got on the data, inside the data, show somebody on the East Coast, somebody in Central Time, and somebody in the West Coast of the United States—nothing in Russia! Where the hell are they getting this from? The only answer is that they're just manufacturing this; it's out-right lies.

Ross: We've been [calling](#) on Trump to declassify the documents regarding the origin of this investigation. Where did the Steele dossier come from? What was the British role, with George Papadopoulos, Carter Page, and others?

They Who Wish to See No Evidence

We have heard that President Trump is attacking the press, that his calling CNN “fake news” is a *terrible* assault on press freedoms and the First Amendment. How do you think Trump calling CNN “fake news” stacks up with the arrest of Julian Assange, as far as an attack on the free press?

Binney: Well, certainly the arrest of Julian Assange is attack on the free press, that's a direct attack. Calling the “fake news” fake—that's simply telling the truth. We need to tell the truth, and we're not getting the truth yet about Assange. We need to get to the bottom of how this Russiagate started.

It should begin with declassifying all the information presented to the FISA Court by the FBI, and the NSA, and the CIA, and the Director of National Intelligence, to get the warrant to spy on somebody in the Trump campaign. The President can declassify anything he wants. If he wants it declassified, he can go ahead and do that.

Nobody in the U.S. government, the House, the Senate, intelligence committees, the judiciary committees, any of the investigations, has ever wanted to talk about the forensic evidence that we found! Both in the Guccifer 2.0 data and also in the documented, posted WikiLeaks DNC data. Nobody wants to talk about that, because it doesn't fit into this narrative that they manufactured about Russiagate.

Ross: What was the origin of the FISA warrants? Where is the evidence for the Russia hack? You've written a number of articles, with the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS), with other colleagues, and done various interviews about the lack of proof on this. And in fact, doing your own forensic work, you've



CC/Romy Marquez

Craig Murray, former British Ambassador to Uzbekistan.

shown that the Guccifer 2.0 story doesn't hold—and, by looking directly at the files released by WikiLeaks, that there is more evidence of a copy than of an internet-based hack. Julian Assange said repeatedly that this was not a state actor, who gave him these files.

They Who Know Who Did It

Binney: Craig Murray, a former British ambassador said that he met somebody at the American University campus who was involved in a transfer of data to WikiLeaks. So, that is not a hack; that's evidence of somebody—like we found using the File Allocation Table (FAT) file format—downloading to some kind of portable device, a thumb drive, or a CD ROM of some sort, and physically transferring data, before WikiLeaks posted it.

Ross: Assange would have firsthand knowledge; Craig Murray claims firsthand knowledge; and you, who have provided forensic evidence and analysis. Were you approached by the Mueller investigation, to get your insights?

Binney: Nope! Nope! That's the whole point. Nobody wants to know what we found.

Also, I would add, I'm not alone in this. There are a number of people in VIPS, about five or six of us, and some others helping us externally. There are about ten of us here, technical people doing this. So, the forensics part of it is pretty clear—and nobody's challenged it, at all. No one has challenged it anywhere. We published it; we show the data that was out there. You can do your own evaluation. We're open to peer review; the problem is, we can't find any peers!