

The Deep State Behind Trumpgate

The following is selected and edited from the LaRouche PAC Weekly Webcast of March 31, 2017, and includes comments by Jason Ross and transcripts of two film clips from an [interview](#) with Ray McGovern, the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity.

Jason Ross: The first aspect we're going to be dealing with is what's called "Trumpgate," or the idea that Vladimir Putin not only put Trump in power, but is actually running the Trump administration and setting policy. To discuss that with us, we had an interview earlier today with retired CIA analyst Ray McGovern; who worked in the CIA for decades and is one of the co-founders of VIPS, Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity ...

FIRST VIDEO CLIP:

Ross: Ever since Trump was elected, and especially since his inauguration, there has been a growing chorus of claims about Vladimir Putin putting Trump in office by directing the election, and of even directing Trump's policy. That, in effect, Vladimir Putin is running the United States government. So, is this true?

Ray McGovern: Well, if it is, then I don't know anything about Russia or the Soviet Union. I was counting up the years that I've been immersed in Russian studies; it goes back 59 years when I decided to major in Russian, got my graduate degree in Russian. Taught Russian; was the head of the Soviet foreign policy branch at the CIA; briefed Presidents on Gorbachov. I like to think I learned something about how Russian leaders look at the world.

When I heard this meme going around that Vladimir Putin clearly preferred Donald

Trump, my notion was, well, here's Vladimir Putin sitting with his advisors, and he's saying, "That Trump fellow—he's not only unpredictable, but he's proud of it. He brags about it, and he lashes out strongly at every slight, whether it's real or imagined. This is just the guy I want to have his finger on the nuclear codes across the ocean." It boggles the mind that Vladimir Putin would have had any preference for Donald Trump. That's aside from the fact that everyone—and that would include Vladimir Putin, unless he's clairvoyant—knew that Hillary was going to win.

So, just to pursue this thing very briefly, if the major premise is that Vladimir Putin and the terrible Russians wanted Trump to win, then you have a syllogism. Therefore, they tried to help him; therefore, they did all kinds of things to help him. But if you don't accept that major premise, the whole syllogism falls apart, and I don't accept that major premise. Putin said it himself: "I don't have a preference." And I didn't have any preference; I happened to be in Germany during the election, in Berlin. It was exciting, because the German anchors didn't know what to say, to make of it; and my German friends were saying, "We have a German expression here: The choice

between Trump and Hillary Clinton is *eine Wahl zwischen Pest und Cholera*." That means it's a choice between plague and cholera. I said, "You know, I kind of agree."

That's the way I looked at it. I kind of think that's the way Putin looked at it, and when he said, "I don't have any preference," he probably meant he didn't have any preference. So, that syllogism falls down.

Now, just pursue that one little bit here. Everyone expected Hillary to win; everyone. We're talking summer; we're talking fall as Trump disgraced himself in one



EIRNS

Ray McGovern

manner or another. He could never win, right? And nobody thought that Hillary was such a flawed candidate that nobody trusted her, that she might lose. So, you hear what I'm saying? "Well, it looks like Hillary is going to win. Looks pretty sure she's going to win. So, why not hack into her mechanism there in the Democratic National Committee? If I get caught, well she may be angry with me, but what's to lose?" I don't think so. Putin is a very cautious fellow. If he thought Hillary was going to win, like the rest of us did, the last thing he would want to do is hack into their DNC apparatus and be caught; because he would likely be caught. And have an additional grievance for Hillary to advertise against him. So, it falls down on logic alone.

Now, luckily, you mentioned Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. We are the beneficiary of a membership whose expertise in intelligence matters just won't quit. This includes four former high officials in the National Security Agency—retired; one of whom devised all of these collection systems that NSA is still using. His name is Bill Binney. He and I are very close. He writes for us, and he helps me write things. What he has said from the outset—and this is five months ago—is that this could not be a hack; it had to be a leak. And for your your viewers, a hack goes over the network.

Ross: You're speaking of the DNC?

McGovern: Yeah, I'm talking about the Russians—thanks for interrupting; the Russians are accused, of course, of hacking into the Democratic National Committee emails, and they're also accused of surfacing the Podesta emails. Bill says, "Look, I know this network; I created pretty much the bones of it. And, I'm free to talk about it. Why? Here are the slides that Ed Snowden brought out; here are the trace points, the trace mechanism. And there are hundreds in the network. So, everything that goes across the network, Ray, and I know this is hard for you to believe, and you're looking at me real strange, but *everything*. You know where it starts and you know where it ends up, everything." So, if this was a hack, NSA would know about it. NSA does not know about it.

As a matter of fact, the CIA and the FBI said, "We have high confidence that the Russians did this." But the NSA, which is the only real agency that has the capability to trace this, said "We only have moderate confidence." In the Army, we called that the SWAG



FBI Director James Comey (center) testifying at a House Select Intelligence Committee hearing on alleged Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election.

factor—it's a Scientific Wild-Assed Guess. So NSA doesn't have the information. If they had the information, I'm pretty sure they would release it, because this is not rocket science. Everybody knows how these things work, particularly since Ed Snowden revealed the whole kit and caboodle.

The Surveillance State

Ross: Ray McGovern and Bill Binney co-authored an article three days ago, called "[The Surveillance State Behind Russia-gate](#)." I want to read a very short part of it. They write:

Although many details are still hazy because of secrecy—and further befogged by politics—it appears House Intelligence Committee Chairman Devin Nunes was informed last week about invasive electronic surveillance of senior U.S. government officials and, in turn, passed that information on to President Trump.

This news presents Trump with an unwelcome but unavoidable choice: Confront those who have kept him in the dark about such rogue activities or live fearfully in their shadow. . . .

What President Trump decides will largely determine the freedom of action he enjoys as President on many key security and other issues. But even more so, his choice may decide whether there is a future for this constitutional republic.

Very strong words. In the past month, on March 4, we saw Trump's announcement that he was surveilled

by the outgoing Obama administration; he used the word “wiretap” at times, for which he was attacked for his choice of language. But the statement still stands about surveillance. On March 20, FBI Director Comey testified that he was investigating the Trump administration; guess he didn’t have any time to investigate the Saudis.

Just today, Wikileaks came out with a report in which it released the latest section of what they are calling “Vault 7,” which is a collection of material from the CIA —documentation and source code. What this latest release showed was “Project Marble,” as the CIA called it, which revealed a program that they have to obfuscate their own creation of cyber weaponry, of malware and other types of attacks, and the ability to easily attribute such attacks to other state actors—including the ability to make it look as though an attack came from Russia, also including a seeming cover-up of Russian tracks so that a security researcher might feel that they had stumbled across a clue by finding Russian language comments in this cyber attack weapon, when really it had been planted from the beginning. This of course raises the question of attribution at all, and in particular about the DNC hacks.

The FBI never investigated the DNC computers, and all the complaints about Russian involvement and Russian malware came from CrowdStrike, an independent firm ... All signs point to this and the Podesta emails being leaks rather than hacks anyway.

So, let’s hear our second clip that we have for the program from our interview with Ray McGovern.

SECOND VIDEO CLIP:

McGovern: I think Nunes wants to do the right thing. Whether he’ll succeed or not is anybody’s guess. All I can say is, he’s up against formidable opponents; witness what the ranking member or minority leader of the Senate, Chuck Schumer, has said outright to Rachel Maddow.

He says, “You know, I thought Trump was a really smart guy. But he’s done something very foolish.” What’s that? “Well, he’s taken on the CIA”—now this is Schumer—”and the CIA has six ways from Sunday to get at you. So, whereas I thought Trump was a reason-



“The CIA has ‘six ways to Sunday’ to get at you ...”

cia.gov

ably bright guy, a really good businessman, I’m not so sure anymore, because he’s done something very foolish.” Now, what does Rachel say? Well, if you were Rachel, if I were Rachel, I think I would have said, “Senator Schumer, are you saying that the President of the United States should be afraid of the CIA? Is that what you’re saying?” What she did say was, “Oh, I guess we have to go to break now.” So, all I’m saying is,

there’s the minority head of the Senate, and he’s saying “Look, you take on the CIA, they’ve got six ways to Sunday”—that’s an old Bronx expression; I come from the Bronx. “Six ways to Sunday” means six days of the week ‘til Sunday to get at you.

So, that was part and parcel of all this. They’re afraid.

Ross: Yeah. It puts the rank in ranking.

McGovern: Yeah, you got it!

Ross: I think this story or picture that you’ve painted really gives us something that we need to do, because if this is to be fought out only among institutional layers, it’s a tough fight. It’s something where, if people are aware, as we’re able to make known to the population more generally, that this is a fight—that this isn’t about Democrats versus Republicans,—This is really much more about Deep State versus the potential of elected government to determine our course. The threats of say, blackmail via the FBI or other intelligence agencies, the dossiers that no doubt exist on these elected officials—that stands as a threat if people aren’t aware of that being the *modus operandi*.

I think people are more familiar with the way the FBI targeted Martin Luther King, urged him on more than one occasion to commit suicide to prevent these kinds of documents from getting out. I think it really means that there’s something for all of us to do in terms of making sure that this is known; making sure that the terms of the fight are known, to make it possible to win this one.

McGovern: Exactly, and those were wiretaps, back in the late ‘50s, early ‘60s, those were real wiretaps. You’re quite right; that was heinous. Now I asked Coleen

Rowley, who is, as I say, [an example of] the expertise we have available to us at Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity that won't quit. Colleen was the counsel of the Minneapolis division of the FBI; she was the one who wrote memos to the Director saying this is how we screwed up on 9/11. She's got guts that won't quit as well. I said, "Colleen, Robert Kennedy—my God! Robert Kennedy, Attorney General, allowing, authorizing the FBI to try to persuade Dr. King to commit suicide? How do you figure that, Colleen?" And she said, "Ray, wiretapping, J. Edgar Hoover. Bobby Kennedy would know that J. Edgar Hoover has lots of information on all those pretty girls that he and Jack used to invite to the White House pool and all of that stuff."

She's *imagining* this; but the reality is, Robert Kennedy would know that J. Edgar Hoover would have lots of material to blackmail not only him, but his big brother.

That's big; and that's why when all this came out in the mid '70s, they created these laws and created these Oversight Committees, which for a while, did their job. Now, they're hopelessly unable, unwilling; they don't want to know this stuff, and they don't know it for that matter. The intelligence officials say, "They don't want to know this, so why should we tell them?"

As for citizens, I would emphasize that this whole business when Edward Snowden came out with his revelations in June of 2013, what happened? People said, "Well isn't this interesting? Everything—they intercept everything! Emails, telephone calls, wow! Luckily, I have nothing to hide." So, we asked someone from the Stasi—Stasi is the old East German secret service; and if people have seen *Die Leben der Anderen*—"Other People's Lives"—an Academy Award film about East Germany and the Stasi. The Stasi was their KGB. You get a picture of what they did. Wolfgang Schmidt—his real name by the way—a Stasi colonel, is interviewed. One of the Americans sits down and asks, "Wolfgang, what do you think about people in America when we say, 'We have nothing to hide'?"

Schmidt says, "This is incredibly naïve. Everyone has something to hide. You don't get to decide what they get on you. The only way to prevent it from being against you, is to prevent it from being collected in the first place." Beautiful, you know? If they collect it, they can use it. They don't read it all; they don't listen to it all. But they put it into these little files—they're not files, but they're . . .

So, yeah, *all of us*. What Edward Snowden said about "turnkey tyranny." If you have these kinds of pri-

vate information about *everyone* including the President and Michael Flynn and all his associates, back in October, November, December; well, you have the ability, if not to win the election, then at least to destroy,— or make these folks seem beholden to the *Russians*, of all places, and disarm the attempts that Trump wants to make, vis-à-vis Russia.

Now, I would have to tell you, that I am against everything Trump stands for, internally. I think he's not only unqualified to be President, but all his instincts are terrible. . . . [But] he's right about Russia. If he were to say to Vladimir Putin, "Look, I don't think we need to put more troops in the Baltic states or Poland, so why don't I pull out those troops, and you pull out the troops on the other side? It's a deal?" I'm morally certain Putin would say, "It's a deal!" Now, what would that mean? That would mean what Pope Francis, to his credit, called "the blood-drenched arms traders" would lose out, big time. Peace: bad for business. Tension: very good for business. So, there's a lot at stake among very, very powerful people, and if Trump can make this stick—this is not a puny, incidental issue, it's a transcendental one.

I was more afraid that Hillary would bring us to a nuclear confrontation than Trump. I didn't like Trump on the environment, because I have nine grandchildren. So, for me it was a choice between plague and cholera. But here we have a possibility for a new—what the Germans call *Ostpolitik*—a new policy, looking to the East. Take my word for it; I've looked at what the Russians have done. I've looked at the heyday of the relationship of the United States and Russia, which goes back to October of 2013 when Putin pulled Obama's chestnuts out of the fire by persuading the Syrians to destroy, or have destroyed, all their chemical weapons *on U.S. ships*. Okay? Nobody knows about that but the United States.

But the neocons, the people who want to create a *bad* atmosphere in relations between the United States and Russia—they know about it. It only took them six months to mount a coup on Russia's doorstep in Kiev, Ukraine. And that's where all this trouble started: Russians accused of invading Ukraine—not true; of invading Crimea—not true. All that stuff was artificially pumped up; it's just as easily deflated. And Trump, if he's willing to do that, well, that would be a biggie.

Ross: Great! Thanks very much, Ray. Thanks.

McGovern: You're most welcome. Thanks for asking. It's very rare that I get a chance to review what I observe.