

Sayers, Margery

From: Dan Finkelstein <danf879@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2018 9:05 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: TAO1-FY19, CB61-2018, CB62-2018

I write in strong opposition to these bills.

Like many of us, my family and I based our home search by the proximity to Historic Ellicott City, settling on a house up hill from the historic area. And like many of us, we watched with horror during the flash floods as torrential rains flowed off our roof and driveway, onto our street, and then onto Main Street, sweeping away countless businesses and three lives with it. As a resident of the watershed, I cannot shake the feeling that I am in some way responsible.

My kids now ask if OEC is OK every time it rains. When we're there, they anxiously search the sky for storm clouds. I want a plan that makes the town safe again in this new era of climate change, where I can send my kids without checking the weather forecast first. By their own admission and hydrology studies, the Kittleman-Weinstein plan fails this test in every way: It predicts and allows for 4-6 feet of flash flood water traveling at 6.7 feet per second on lower Main Street. It's exceedingly obvious this is just a band-aid, one that will sadly destroy 24% of the buildings on lower Main Street during its implementation.

The 2016 McCormack-Taylor study spells out how the proposed plan is insufficient: It proposes 18 new or upgraded storm water management facilities totaling almost 400 new acre ft of storage while the new plan will give us only 2 totaling 23. Why are the tunnel bores suggested on page 39 not being costed out in more detail? I understand tunneling sounds difficult and expensive but real estimates from real companies that do this sort of work should be obtained, instead of simply relying on ballpark. During the meeting on 9/12, Mark DeLuca claimed more information would be released about why this tunnel idea was discarded out of hand, yet this has not occurred. At the very least this information should be shared before this important vote.

I recognize the urgency and desire to act quickly but insist real science comes first. The engineers at McCormack-Taylor should be used to make recommendations instead of just validating ideas. We are in an enviable position as a wealthy county to do this right the first time. Let's be bold and make the town safe, not just marginally safer.

Sincerely,

Dan Finkelstein
8521 Trail View Dr

Sayers, Margery

From: steve tigue <tyz228@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2018 1:48 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Ellicott City

Dear Howard County Council,

I am extremely dismayed at the proposed plan to demolish so many of the historic buildings in Old Ellicott City. Doing so will do nothing to address the problem, namely the inadequate water handling system. There will still be, with severe enough rain, flash floods. Ellicott City is, for myself and many of my friends, one of our favorite historic places in the area. We visit it often. The shops, restaurants, and quaintness of the buildings draw many visitors. Wouldn't a better idea be to come up with some way to handle future torrential rains, which I would presume you will have to do anyway, and save the part of old Ellicott City that so many people love? Please reconsider this plan, and save the lovely historic buildings of Old Ellicott City.

Sincerely,
Stephen Tighe
Gwynn Oak, Maryland

September 16, 2018

Thank you for taking the time to read my testimonial. The future of historic Ellicott City is in your hands. I want to let you know that I support the 5-year plan and plead you to pass the legislation for TAO 1-FY2019 and CB61-2018 to provide the funding to move forward with the flood mitigation.

I have been a customer of the historic district for over 30 years when my driver's ed teacher had me drive through the surrounding roads. I was immediately struck by the beauty of this little town. I have always loved history and was shocked to find such a wonderful place so close to home. Over the years, I would continue to visit.

Once, my daughter was old enough, I started bringing her a few times a year. Ellicott City was always a "go to" place during the holidays. Years later, she started to hang out at Diamondbacks and other places.

A long-time friend of mine, Amie McClasin decided to open her 2nd store on Main St. I helped her with the store and it was an amazing 11 month. I got to meet several of the business owners as well as neighbors and their dogs. We knew we had found the perfect spot for Amie's business to expand. We were located across from Portalli's. Life was great!

The night of July 30th, 2016, our lives turned upside down. Thank god we were closed at the time. We had no back exit and over 7' of water crash through our store. Most of the water came across from Caplan's. We have video of the store getting flooded. If the storm had come just a 1 ½ hour earlier, we would have been there and the only place to go would have been into the raging water. I shutter at the thought that there was a high likelihood that one of us might not be here today to talk about this if that storm had come sooner.

3 weeks later, we finally got to start cleaning out the store. It was destroyed. We could only save a handful of jewelry. Over \$90, 000 in damages and loss of inventory. She hadn't even had a chance to finish paying off the loans from opening the business. We struggled that day, crying, digging, and more crying while throwing everything away. A group of volunteers came and helped us remove 2' feet of what we called "mud". I will never forget the smells of that day.

I look back at and my heart aches for every business owner I encountered that day. There wasn't a smile or a dry eye. Just the look of agony, sorrow, and an overwhelming feeling of heartbreak, which was deafening. After the flood, I had sprung into action and started pulling a list together of the businesses, their gofundme pages, and fundraisers on Facebook. The note spread like wildfire. I did what ever I could to show the owners that they weren't alone and that the commUNITY would come through for them. Apparently, there were a lot of us and the hashtag #ecstrong came to life. The owners could absolutely feel the love. It is the only reason why many of the businesses, including Amie's fought the fight and found a way to return.

Fast forward, Amie's store had to bounce around a bit. We couldn't go back into the original location. We knew that we would outgrow that space and it still had to many scary memories. Amie's family struggled for quite some time. It is so hard seeing one of your best friends dealing with the pain that they had to go through, financially, emotionally, physiologically, and physically. Broke my heart.

We were fortunate enough to keep our presence in EC until we found a new permanent home after our other new spot fell through (the building to the right of Caplan's). We were now at the top of the street and thought we would be safe if anything ever happened again. We were wrong. We never thought we would ever have to deal with another flood like the one in 2016. Again, we were wrong.

This time we got about 2' of water in the store. Unfortunately, we did have someone in the store and a customer at the time. They had to wade through knee deep water in the parking lot to escape. That employee was still dealing with PTSD from the 2016 flood and is having to go through it all over again. We were only re-opened for 6 weeks this time.

I look back at these events and wonder how buildings can be allowed sit over the Tiber river with just an 8'6" opening and be considered "safe". Yes, the storms are getting worse and yes, I believe run-off from the developments (new and old) affect the amount of water coming through the channels. But, Ellicott City is designed to have water run through it, we can't change that. What we can change though, is where we have choke points in the channels. The Hudson bend is certainly an obvious one. But the Caplan's building is another big one. I've seen through the videos how the water backs up at Caplan's, blasts through the buildings above it, shoots across the street, and slams into the buildings on the Northside. We must be able to have the funds to move forward with removing these hazards. I do love history, but not at the cost of lives. I have many friends that barely escaped if it weren't for their own quick thinking. I am still shocked that we didn't lose more lives in both floods when I hear the stories of what people had to go through to get out of harms way. And, it scares me to the core that I could have been one of those people myself if it weren't for the timing of the 2016 flood.

Again, thank you for taking the time to read my story. I hope that we can move forward as a commUNITY and do what is right. I do believe there is a way to remove the buildings and keep the historic value of the town. I don't think there is a choice in the matter. It's very simple in my eyes. Keep the buildings and lives will eventually be lost or remove them and allow Ellicott City to be safer so that businesses can return and flourish.

One last note, opening a small business in today's world is hard enough, but to try to do it on a main street and one that is on a flood plain takes courage. Constantly starting over again and again, knowing customers will stay away at the 1st sign of rain. It takes a certain character to make it in this environment. The resilience and strength of the business owners in this town is incredible. Best group of people I have ever met. I would hate to see Ellicott City die because we aren't brave enough to do what is right.

Thank you,

Kristy Gapen-Hoke
A La Mode Boutique

Sayers, Margery

From: Alexander Kutylev <kutylev@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2018 11:41 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: save Old Ellicott City!

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken.

Do not make a rush decision! Consider all the options and take time to make a deliberate and wise choice, or it may be too late and the Old Ellicott City treasure will be lost forever.

As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

Sincerely,

Alexander Kutylev

Sayers, Margery

From: Rocco, James <James.Rocco@terex.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2018 7:48 AM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: AOL
Subject: Plans for Ellicott City

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken. As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

Sincerely,

Jim Rocco
8717 Frederick Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21043
425-922-1400

Sent from my iPhone

Sayers, Margery

From: Sam McClung <twintwix1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2018 6:53 AM
To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan
Subject: Re: Flood Mitigation on Merryman Street

Hi Mr. Kittleman and Mr. Weinstein,

I'm emailing again. I and my father, Sam McClung of 8411 Merryman St, attended the 9/12 Ellicott City Meeting about the flood plans. Again, we noticed that in the plan there is no direct flood mitigation for Merryman Street where the "S" curve, in particular, comes around which is the exact spot of #8411. At the meeting we learned of the Tiber Flood Retention Facility but when we got home, we could not find much information on it and what it is or will actually do to reduce the flooding at the "S" curve.

Please direct us to where the information is about flood mitigation that is currently happening (from the 2016 flood) or that is currently planned for Merryman St, in particular the "S" curve that receives 8+ feet of flood water that has damaged #8411 horribly, not once but twice.

We want to be informed for the public hearing tomorrow evening on 9/17.

Please respond with information tomorrow, Monday daytime.

Thank you so much for your assistance as my dad deals with this second devastating flood of his home. He has lost everything again and really needs your help to retain value in his property and get back on his feet again quickly. (Hopefully much quicker than the 2016 flood as he had only been back in his house for 6 months before the May 2018 flood.)

Best regards,

Heather McClung, on behalf of Sam McClung my father of 8411 Merryman St

On Thu, Sep 6, 2018 at 9:22 PM Sam McClung <twintwix1978@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Mr. Kittleman and Mr. Weinstein,

I'm emailing you on behalf of my father, Samuel McClung of 8411 Merryman Street in Ellicott City. He does not have a computer, and I, and my brother, maintain this email account for him, the account that we created for him after July 2016 flood.

I've been going through the Flood Mitigation Plan and looking over the maps that are included in it. I see Merryman Street on the maps on page 11 however, my dad's property on Merryman St is hidden behind the legend on the maps on page 16. These are the maps that show how flood mitigation will improve the situation and my dad's property does not seem to be included. Do I assume that there is no flood mitigation for Merryman Street? Is there someone who I can talk to that can point me to a place that explains flood mitigation for Merryman Street, in particular to 8411 Merryman St, that I may be missing?

Please help so I can get my dad, Sam, the information he needs about how his property is included in the flood mitigation plan.

Thank you so much!

Cheers,
Heather McClung, daughter of Sam McClung

Sayers, Margery

From: Mike & Cindy Moran <moranm1@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2018 3:10 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken. As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

I understand that a moratorium was put on new development. The over development in the area was said to have been a major cause of the problem. Why not make the moratorium permanent or at least until such time as the matter can be truly decided on the evidence. Destroying buildings makes other buildings vulnerable and may put the historic B&O depot in more jeopardy.

Don't allow haste to make things worse. Thank you.

*Sincerely,
Mike Moran*

Sayers, Margery

From: Shelley Wygant <wdgdirect@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 9:39 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Push Pause on the County Flood Plan

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken. As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

Sincerely,

*Shelley Davies Wygant
College Ave- Ellicott City MD*

Sayers, Margery

From: Joan Misencik <jmisencik@verizon.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 6:24 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Old Ellicott City Demolition

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken. As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

Sincerely,
Joan M. Misencik

Sayers, Margery

From: DASHannon <dashannon@verizon.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 2:46 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Ellicott City flood improvement plans

Concerning flood control in Ellicott City: Voters will not understand the decision to tear down historic buildings, spend millions and STILL fail to prevent flooding. The decision appears to be rushed , pending upcoming elections. I urge you to study the problems and explore the unintended consequences of tearing down buildings, both practical and political.

Dorothy Shannon
9936 Whitworth Way
Ellicott City, MD

Sayers, Margery

From: Misty Smith <ablueskysmisty@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 1:03 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: DEMOLITION OF HISTORIC BLDGS IN OEC

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken. As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

Sincerely,

MISTY SMITH

Sayers, Margery

From: Ashley Serio Alfeo <kidstimeout@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 8:33 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: EC Plan

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken. As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

Sincerely,

Ashley Serio Alfeo

Testimony on Ellicott City

Christine Barton
5021 Landing Road
Elkridge, MD

I sent some early feedback on Ellicott City regarding an idea of raising the entrances of Ellicott City to the second floor and building Main Street up to allow water to flow below. This essentially makes Main Street and its sidewalks a bridge with an at-grade railway crossing. This helps mitigate flooding from the flash flooding as well as rising water from the Patapsco. This idea comes from Seattle as a model. It gives an opportunity for increased tourism by giving Underground tours which are very popular in Seattle. This idea may not be feasible as I am not a civil engineer. I certainly have not seen it proposed by anyone. However Preservation Maryland mentions the feasibility of allowing water to flow below the buildings as Harper's Ferry has done, as described in the attached podcast, so perhaps it's not that farfetched.

I stand with Preservation Maryland in doing our best to preserve the streetscape of Ellicott City as it is more than half the charm, though you say it is only 5% of the historic district. Please move forward with upstream improvements for flood mitigation without delay. Please move forward with acquiring the buildings and keeping people out of harm's way until further decisions can be made. Please delay the wrecking ball and consider more lucrative options that maintain our town's charm while preventing all loss of life from flooding there. This could be a win-win for our community.

My number one priority is protecting lives. My number two priority is salvaging the history of a town which shows the evolution of old to new in the strip of buildings you propose destroying.

I love the idea of having a state or county run historic park in those buildings on days where there are no flash flood warnings. It's an opportunity to raise revenue and educate visitors.

<http://www.preservationmaryland.org/preservation-maryland-featured-on-daily-record-podcast/>

Sincerely

Christine Barton
Elkridge Maryland

Sayers, Margery

From: listan 1 <listan1@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 11:34 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Main Street

Hello,

I continue to be completely dismayed about any plan that includes the demolition of a significant portion of historic Main Street, about the process used to get to that plan, and the methods used to push this plan through to approval.

I fear you will not save lives with this plan. I fear that someone will die after the plan is approved, and even after it is implemented. I fear that will result in a slow or fast roll to the end of Main Street. I fear that saving lives is not the real reason for the selection of this plan, and I wonder why emergency measures were not taken after the first flood and are not being taken right now when people are living, working, and visiting Main Street every single day. I fear you have no idea what the repercussions of the demolition are on the long-term viability of Main Street. I fear that in 50 years, the demolition of these buildings will be seen as a crime, just like the overdevelopment in the Tiber Watershed is today, but yet you all will be long gone, just as those responsible for the overdevelopment are.

Today, I fear that ONE SINGLE DEVELOPER has influenced Kittleman and Weinstein and is the driver of this plan. (See attached photo of email.) I fear that "but for" his influence, we would not have this plan. I fear this developer is not looking out for our community or town, but for his own interests. I just lost my breath when I read the email below. The plan, the press conference, and everything after has not made sense to me. But when I read the email below, it sheds some light on why it all has been so mystifying and concerning. Why it smells of a rat. It started smelling as I watched the press conference, where our officials tried to scare the community into supporting their plan and where they tried to set up a false choice: historic buildings or lives. I have never involved myself in discussions like this. I vote, religiously, but don't really get engaged in local politics. I'm no activist. Before this topic, I've never emailed any County Council Member. But I care about Old Ellicott City and the awful situation with the flooding, and was excited to hear the plan, so I tuned in, having no idea that what I would hear would steal hours from my life over the subsequent weeks being engaged in this fight.

I also fear that the dire financial and emotional straights of a few merchants have influenced the decision. While that might be a reason to buy them out or make them whole, that never should be a reason to demolish the buildings. And while I respect their perspectives, merchants come and go and no momentary merchant should have the right to decide the fate of a 200+ year old town which we hope will be around another 200+ years.

I implore you to not be the ones responsible for this horrible decision. Find another way.

Final comment: Please implement safety measures NOW in the town for the sake of the people who come there. Where are the emergency evacuation plans, the education on the higher ground egress options, the warnings systems, the blocking off or closing of the town when there is a real threat, where is anything like that?! You will save more lives doing these things than reducing the water a few feet.

Thank you for your time.

Lisa Orenstein
4341 Stonecrest Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

This is consistent with exception #3; it will result in immediate reduction in flooding in OEC with any further studies or changes to codes are completed.

Specifically the 65 acre "hospital property" at 4300 College Avenue was largely developed prior to modern storm water management (SWM); with the exception of two small SWM ponds built to accommodate two new 3000 square foot print homes in the late 1980s, there is no SWM on the property other than to get the water to the nearest streams. There are many acres of impervious buildings, parking lots and roads. Under CR56 as proposed, re-development of this property to current standards with quality, quantity and 100 year flood management will not occur at this time. This will continue to doom OEC to the extent my property at the top of the hill floods OEC, including my properties at the bottom of the hill. I propose that our redevelopment will exceed the current standards, providing even more protection. This is vital to prevent further damage to OEC and further possible loss of life. We want to start part of this work early next year, as has been planned for several years with plans that have already been submitted and can be modified to exceed current standards for water flow to OEC.

Several multimillion dollar projects will be delayed or halted by CR56 without this amendment. This will mean that the county will not only be failing to allow requested projects that will reduce flooding, but it will have political, legal and fiscal implications as well. The new tax base alone for the reconstruction of the "hospital" properties will be well over \$100 million in just a few years, and should eventually exceed \$200 million or more, depending on the ultimate build out -- all while reducing storm water run-off to OEC from its existing state.

In addition to these plans at the top of the hill to help free OEC from flooding, Don Rauwer, Charles Alexander and I have created the attached plans for lower Main Street, Old Columbia Road and Saint Paul St. It is our hope that this plan can be studied by the County with McCormick and Taylor engineers to see how substantially it will reduce or eliminate flooding of OEC in most storms when implemented in addition to the plans devised for the Hudson Branch and upper Main Street. For any who are not familiar with the plan, we would be happy to meet with you to review it.

With the proposed friendly condemnation and removal of buildings bridging the Tiber from Caplan's on down, this plan will allow the Tiber to be dredged and flow unimpeded to the Patapsco, and it diverts most or all the water from the New Cut streams, estimated to be 40% of the water reaching lower Main St., by sending it down or under Saint Paul to the Patapsco. I am in favor of this plan to protect OEC even though it involves the demolition of 5 or more of my properties. In addition to SWM the plan offers better traffic flow and an opportunity to replace demolished buildings with new structures for the economic viability of OEC. I understand there may be a reluctance to move forward with such a bold plan prior to the November elections, but let's at least get studies moving forward now. How soon can we get McCormick and Taylor to meet with us to evaluate its potential positive contributions to improving the safety of OEC?

Please let me know your thoughts on the amendment for CR56 as above.

Thanks,

Bruce T. Taylor, M.D.

Office: 410-465-3674

Cell: 410-868-9871

Sayers, Margery

From: Bernie Karmilowicz <bernie@bernieland.com>
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 10:32 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: submitted testimony, 2018-09-17 Legislative Public Hearing

Good evening, Howard County Council;

Please included this email message with the submitted testimony for the Legislative Public Hearing scheduled for Monday, September 17, 2018.

Regarding the Ellicott City Legislation (TAO1-FY2019, CB61-2018, and CB62-2018) under consideration by the Council;

I am opposed to the use of County funds for historic Ellicott City improvements on and around lower Main Street. It is technically impractical to implement meaningful flood mitigation improvements supporting preservation of the historic buildings - let alone commercial and residential use of the lower valley - and thus investing in such mitigation efforts is not a constructive use of County funds. Buoying the use of the lower valley for any purpose other than bridging Frederick Road (Rt. 144) with upper Main Street will be - near literally - flushing even more tax dollars down the river.

I instead support the use of County funds to (a) improve water collection and diversion in and around upper historic Ellicott City so that portion of the historic area will be better protected from heavy and/or prolonged rainfall, and (b) facilitate the relocation of historic Ellicott City residents and businesses now on and around lower Main Street to a contiguous area of Howard County which is not at risk of flooding.

Respectfully,

- Bernard Karmilowicz
7425 Hickory Log Circle
Columbia, MD 21045-5065

Sayers, Margery

From: Susan Imbach <susanimbach@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 10:01 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Save Old Ellicott City

Dear Howard County Council:

Historic Ellicott City deserves a better plan to protect its citizens, visitors and businesses. Push pause on the portion of the plan that seeks to demolish buildings years before real flood mitigation is undertaken. As someone who cares deeply about saving lives and preserving the historic integrity and economic viability of Ellicott City, I urge you to fully investigate proposals that stand to take lethal waters off of lower Main Street and truly make the town as safe as it can be.

Sincerely,

Susan Imbach

Paul Mill RD

Ellicott City 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Anne Roy <asorkin@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 9:56 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Support for TAO1-FY19, CB61-2018 and CB62-2018

My name is Anne Roy and I am submit this testimony as a private citizen. I am writing to you to express my support for TAO1-FY19, CB61-2018 and CB62-2018 which would provide funds need to embark on the flood mitigation plan brought forth by Councilman Weinstein and County Executive Kittleman.

After living in Columbia almost my entire life, as of July 7, 2016, I moved to District 1. Proximity to Main Street was (and is) one of my favorite things about my new address. I watched both the 2016 and 2018 rain events from the relative safety of my car and home. During the 2018 event, my basement took in a small stream of water at the electric panel and I was advised by the power company to vacate temporarily. My inconvenience, however, pales in comparison to the business owners and residents (some of whom are amongst my dearest friends) who have been devastated; some of them twice. And it certainly pales in comparison to the devastation of lives lost in these catastrophic events. This plan is not without heartbreak; however, we are already broken.

In the aftermath of each storm, I did not spend countless hours in committee meetings and parsing through engineering reports. I am not an expert in stormwater management, but I am very grateful for my friends and neighbors who put in that time, educating themselves, and working to educate our entire community. I trust those who were most impacted to represent our collective best interest. It is hugely important to me that this is the plan supported by the Ellicott City Partnership and an overwhelming number of Main Street owners, businesses, and residents. Similarly, I trust the representation of my councilman and our county executive. It is my hope that the remainder of the council shares that trust, is ready to move forward, and votes to support this plan.

Thank you for the consideration.

Sayers, Margery

From: R. Michael Anson <ranson1@alumni.jh.edu>
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 10:58 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Questions regarding short-term safety in OEC

Good morning,

All of us on both sides of the "demolition" debate want to ensure that no lives are endangered in future floods, and several issues which would provide easy and immediate benefit have been raised online and in discussions lately that lead me to send one more email prior to the September 17 meeting:

- Technology now exists which could provide instant data regarding water flow west of lower Main, and could be connected to warning sirens which might provide those on lower Main Street with an emergency warning, similar to a fire alarm. This could be done in weeks rather than years.
- Someone in our group suggested to me recently that traffic lights could be triggered along with the sirens, turning flashing red (along with a "immediate flooding danger!" warning) on all roads leading into the flood zone and green on all roads leading out.
- It was mentioned at the Sep 12 meeting that the buildings were at one time, long ago, connected by access bridges of some sort at the upper levels. If true, could that be done again, both as historical renovation and to permit egress in emergencies?
- Wouldn't it be safest (and ultimately cheapest) to instigate parking restrictions to be sure that parked cars are not in flood zones, perhaps with a shuttle from more distant lots or a city-wide valet parking system?

Thank you for your time and consideration!

R. Michael Anson, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

The Community College of Baltimore County | School of Mathematics and Science

Associate Editor

The Journals of Gerontology | Biological Sciences

(Published by the Gerontological Society of America)

Editorial Board Member

GeroScience (formerly "The Journal of the American Aging Association")

Association Fellow, Board Member (elected for 2018-2021), and Trainee Advocate

The American Aging Association

Primary Email: ranson1@alumni.jh.edu

Sayers, Margery

From: Bruce Taylor <btaylor@taylorservice.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 3:36 PM
To: Ron Huffman (ronald.huffman@pnc.com)
Cc: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan
Subject: Ellicott City support emails needed
Attachments: TAO1-FY19.pdf

Great catching up with you just now on Ellicott City.

I appreciate if you could send an email supporting the council flood mitigation plan bill prior to the 9/17 public hearing. The bill is attached. Please include that you live in and visit Ellicott City, and that you want the email to be testimony for Council Bill TAO1-FY19.

Please copy Executive Kittleman.

councilmail@howardcountymd.gov

AKittleman@howardcountymd.gov

Liz Walsh is against the plan and she is running for Ellicott City's Council District ; if you want to copy her, the email is:

WalshforOne@gmail.com

If you can encourage others to do so as well who are concerned about Ellicott City, that would be great.

Thanks,

Bruce T. Taylor, M.D.

Office: 410-465-3674

Cell: 410-868-9871

Sayers, Margery

From: Stephanie Waters Thompson <stephmwaters@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 2:40 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: SUPPORT FOR CURRENT EC FLOOD PLAN

Members of the Howard County Council,

I am writing in support of Executive Kittleman and Councilman Weinstein's current flood mitigation proposal. My family bought a home in historic downtown in 2010, specifically because we could walk to Main Street to take advantage of our "small town within a big city".

I am sorry that the plan has been mired in controversy, misrepresentation, misinformation and social media gossip. Those of us who have been following the progression and details of the plan, understand that this was an incredibly tough decision to make but one that sadly needs to be made. As I hope you have seen, those who actually live and work in the historic district support the plan however painful it may be. We recognize that we have studied this ad nauseam and the time for action is now. We need to do whatever it takes to stop the problem as quickly and cost efficiently as possible, even if it means sacrificing some buildings in order to strengthen the rest of the town.

Please add this as "testimony" to any record is being kept. Unfortunately, I have three small children at home and am not always able to make it to the council meetings, however I do watch them on livestream.

Many thanks,
Stephanie Waters Thompson
3740 College Ave
Ellicott City

--

Stephanie Waters Thompson
240-463-7799 cell

We are Dave and Tina Callaway. We are renters in the 8600 block of Main Street in West End. We have suffered major personal belongings losses in both recent floods. We had to close down our home based business...twice. We decided to move after the 2018 flood because we are certain it will happen again. The flood mitigation plans need to move forward and it needs to be done now.

The storms are getting more frequent and more violent. Yes, there are a lot of differing opinions on the course of action. People don't want to see Old Ellicott City change, but the work on the stream convergence can't happen with the buildings in the way. The channel can't be improved upstream without a disruption in people's lives. Retention efforts won't happen without major change. One certain fact is...It will happen again, repeatedly, until this work is done.

You can't attract businesses or tourists if they don't know if they are safe. Old Ellicott City will continue to die at the hand of Mother Nature until this work is done and safeguards are written to protect its future from overdevelopment. The flood mitigation plan may not be what you want, but do you want a flood ravaged ghost town? Doesn't seem too appealing to me. Probably won't attract many people either.

Lives have been lost. People have put everything they have into a business only to have it destroyed. People have had their belongings and personal memories washed away or ruined. People live in fear every time rain is called for. Many of us, myself included, feel that Old Ellicott City just won't be the same as it used to be after these changes, but without these changes, it just won't exist...period. Pretty easy decision for me. I think one word can describe what is needed right now...REALITY. Unfortunately, emotions are not going to fix these problems. More deliberation only delays action. It also gives Mother Nature more time to do it all over again. Put some plaques with pictures in the proposed open air park that reflect the buildings of old and the damage done by the flood. People will still come, and they can enjoy a little history of this old town. But, you can bet they aren't going to come see a falling down town that used to be. Thank you.

Sayers, Margery

From: Len Berkowitz <greatpanes@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 8:07 AM
To: Bruce Taylor
Cc: debbie.slackkatz@genesishcc.com; Kim Egan Rutter; Joe Rutter; Don Reuwer (dreuwer@ldandd.com); Jared Spahn (jspahn@5304dorsey.com); CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan
Subject: Re: EC Sun Article

Yes we do. Why hasn't the community (property, business, residents, and everyone who has a vested interest) shown up to support the five year plan. Those businesses that are open should know I for one will not invest \$\$\$\$ in another rebuild. Do you think Main St looks like a viable district now? What will change? Isn't it hurting everyone? You want progress, support the move forward and add to the future past! Show up to these meetings and express your support.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 11, 2018, at 3:25 PM, Bruce Taylor <btaylor@taylorservice.com> wrote:

Nice article Debbie,

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/readersrespond/bs-ed-rr-ellicott-city-future-letter-20180907-story.html>

We need more positive press with all the social media and public bashing that has been going on. And Council needs to hear from more folks that the County's current flood mitigation program needs to be supported.

Thanks,

Bruce T. Taylor, M.D.

Office: 410-465-3674

Cell: 410-868-9871

Sayers, Margery

From: Bruce Taylor <btaylor@taylorservice.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 3:26 PM
To: debbie.slackkatz@genesishcc.com
Cc: Kim Egan Rutter; Joe Rutter; Don Reuwer (dreuwer@ldandd.com); Jared Spahn (jspahn@5304dorsey.com); "greatpanes@gmail.com" <greatpanes@gmail.com>; CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan
Subject: RE: EC Sun Article

Nice article Debbie,

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/readersrespond/bs-ed-rr-ellicott-city-future-letter-20180907-story.html>

We need more positive press with all the social media and public bashing that has been going on.

And Council needs to hear from more folks that the County's current flood mitigation program needs to be supported.

Thanks,

Bruce T. Taylor, M.D.

Office: 410-465-3674

Cell: 410-868-9871

Sayers, Margery

From: Robert Casey <rcasey95@frontier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 1:09 PM
To: cs@foolmart.com; csanchezdu@bloomberg.com; cotreasurer@co.tx.us; cotreasurer@co.loving.tx.us; credden@rcso-wv.com; cotreasurer@co.liberty.tx.us; countyassessor@harrisoncounty.in.gov; csclub@concord.edu; contact@calhouncronicle.com; info@crfb.org; noreply@loc.gov; contact@passaiccountynj.org; cpr@state.nm.us; credden@raleighcountysheriff.com; webmaster@cs.hmc.edu; mjneiman@ccao.org; cshearman@plateautel.net; corporations@state.nm.us; councilmembers@kauai.gov; cowiltz@co.cowiltz.wa.us; cowlitz@co.cowlitz.wa.us; cooperw@charlescountymd.gov; councilmembers@frederickcountymd.gov; criley@garrettcounty.org; countycommissioners@garrettcounty.org; council@harfordcountycouncil.com; CouncilMail; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; countyboard@arlingtonva.us; countyadmin@goochlandva.us; criggs@camdencounty.gov; criggs@camdencountync.gov; county.manager@randolphcountync.gov; cpressley@chestercounty.org; countyadministrator@greenvillecounty.org; cportee@orangeburgcounty.org; crystala@co.pickens.sc.us; info@conejoschamber.org; countyadmin@antrimcounty.org; webmaster@cookcountyil.gov; countytreasurer@jodaviess.org; countyadmin@co.mchenry.il.us; cschestnut@alachuacounty.us; county.treasurer@treasurer.hamilton-co.org; countymayor@rutherfordcountyttn.gov; countymayorsoffice@comcast.net; county_executive@albanycountyny.gov; countyexecutive@co.broome.ny.us; consumer.affairs@suffolkcountyny.gov; contact@counties.org
Subject: County level solutions to world problems. There is Only One Conspiracy that Drives All Others and it's been going on for Thousands of years!
Attachments: Let a Ray of Freedom Shine Through You.docx

It is depressing to read about people openly talking about what a good thing it is that our elected President is being controlled by retired generals. The DNC and GOP with help from the media and even help from psychologists have destroyed the sitting Presidents reputation. Whenever someone is enough of a lowlife to control another person using programming they are not going to be trying to help anyone, it's just the wrong thing to do, "The Ends Justifies the Means" is not "The American Way." People should realize by now that the "Electoral College" really did its job and saved us from the true Russia colluding, Uranium 1 selling machine that Hillary Clinton has become after years in Washington. We've finally elected an outsider that promised to drain "The Swamp" of, both Democrats and Republicans committed to running up the national debt. And thanks to the powerful influence of both parties even Trump supporters seem to be okay with him being controlled by others. I say we need to put an end to the controllers as quickly as we can. "The Swamp" sucks the good sense and independence out everyone sentenced to serve in its dirty waters by being elected to the House, Senate or Executive branch, or appointed to the Judicial branch. I am a big fan of Joe Manchin's because of the excelent job he did while governor of WV leaving the state with a large surplus of money when he became Senator. The President, in what was certainly a departure from the control of his handlers, reaches across the aisle to ask Joe Manchin for advice on whom to nominate for the Supreme Court and sadly the Democrat who was independent enough to speak out against deficit spending while Obama was President shows that he too has lost an awful lot of independence by replying, "Mr. President, that's not my job." Sad!

Thank You,
Robert James Casey
134 Creek Road
Moatsville, WV, 26405

PS I have only been able to reachout to about a thousand of the counties across the country so, if any of you can forward this to the rest of the counties in your state it would be greatly appreciated. Again, Thank You.

Sayers, Margery

From: Robert Casey <rcasey95@frontier.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 1:09 PM
To: cs@foolmart.com; csanchezdu@bloomberg.com; cotreasurer@co.tx.us; cotreasurer@co.loving.tx.us; credden@rcso-wv.com; cotreasurer@co.liberty.tx.us; countyassessor@harrisoncounty.in.gov; csclub@concord.edu; contact@calhouncronicle.com; info@crfb.org; noreply@loc.gov; contact@passaiccountynj.org; cpr@state.nm.us; credden@raleighcountysheriff.com; webmaster@cs.hmc.edu; mjneiman@ccao.org; cshearman@plateautel.net; corporations@state.nm.us; councilmembers@kauai.gov; cowiltz@co.cowiltz.wa.us; cowlitz@co.cowlitz.wa.us; cooperw@charlescountymd.gov; councilmembers@frederickcountymd.gov; criley@garrettcountry.org; countycommissioners@garrettcountry.org; council@harfordcountycouncil.com; CouncilMail; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; countyboard@arlingtonva.us; countyadmin@goochlandva.us; criggs@camdencounty.gov; criggs@camdencountync.gov; county.manager@randolphcountync.gov; cpressley@chestercounty.org; countyadministrator@greenvillecounty.org; cportee@orangeburgcounty.org; crystala@co.pickens.sc.us; info@conejoschamber.org; countyadmin@antrimcounty.org; webmaster@cookcountyil.gov; countytreasurer@jodaviess.org; countyadmin@co.mchenry.il.us; cschestnut@alachuacounty.us; county.treasurer@treasurer.hamilton-co.org; countymayor@rutherfordcountyttn.gov; countymayorsoffice@comcast.net; county_executive@albanycountyny.gov; countyexecutive@co.broome.ny.us; consumer.affairs@suffolkcountyny.gov; contact@counties.org
Subject: County level solutions to world problems. There is Only One Conspiracy that Drives All Others and it's been going on for Thousands of years!
Attachments: Let a Ray of Freedom Shine Through You.docx

It is depressing to read about people openly talking about what a good thing it is that our elected President is being controlled by retired generals. The DNC and GOP with help from the media and even help from psychologists have destroyed the sitting Presidents reputation. Whenever someone is enough of a lowlife to control another person using programming they are not going to be trying to help anyone, it's just the wrong thing to do, "The Ends Justifies the Means" is not "The American Way." People should realize by now that the "Electoral College" really did its job and saved us from the true Russia colluding, Uranium 1 selling machine that Hillary Clinton has become after years in Washington. We've finally elected an outsider that promised to drain "The Swamp" of, both Democrats and Republicans committed to running up the national debt. And thanks to the powerful influence of both parties even Trump supporters seem to be okay with him being controlled by others. I say we need to put an end to the controllers as quickly as we can. "The Swamp" sucks the good sense and independence out everyone sentenced to serve in its dirty waters by being elected to the House, Senate or Executive branch, or appointed to the Judicial branch. I am a big fan of Joe Manchin's because of the excelent job he did while governor of WV leaving the state with a large surplus of money when he became Senator. The President, in what was certainly a departure from the control of his handlers, reaches across the aisle to ask Joe Manchin for advice on whom to nominate for the Supreme Court and sadly the Democrat who was independent enough to speak out against deficit spending while Obama was President shows that he too has lost an awful lot of independence by replying, "Mr. President, that's not my job." Sad!

Thank You,
Robert James Casey
134 Creek Road
Moatsville, WV, 26405

PS I have only been able to reachout to about a thousand of the counties across the country so, if any of you can forward this to the rest of the counties in your state it would be greatly appreciated. Again, Thank You.

FREEDOM; Nothing Grows Without IT!

Let a Ray of Freedom Shine Through You!

ACA Repeal and Replace & Complete Tax Reform by:

Decentralizing the Administrative State updated 9/9/2018

“As the form of government closest to the people, counties offer a unique perspective that makes them critical players in decisions affecting their citizens and as state and local governments evolve, counties will continue to play a prominent role.” South Dakota Association of County Commissioners. Perhaps, what is printed on the back of President Ron Watson of the Harrison County Commission’s business card will be a suitable oath of office for all county commissioners. “I am committed to a government that is open, responsive and accountable to the citizens of Harrison County.”

James Madison said: “Debts and taxes are the known instrument for bringing the many under the domination of the few” and “I go on the principle that a public debt is a public curse.” Thomas Jefferson spoke to the dangers of a government drunk on out-of-control spending that leads to increasing debt: “To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.” Cal Thomas in “Drowning in Debt” 2/13/2018: **“the budget bill; ... is expected to increase the debt to \$30 trillion over the next decade,”**.

The goal of “Decentralizing the Administrative State” is for the federal and state governments to be relieved of the bloated expense of administering programs and services that can be administered more efficiently by the county. According to the article by: Damian Paletta and John Wagner “Trump sees a way forward: Shutting IT Down” ... “The last government shutdown, in 2013 when Republicans controlled Congress, lasted more than two weeks. During that partial shutdown, the Obama administration said that at one point 850,000 federal employees were placed on furlough or leave without pay. ... “Many lawmakers from both parties agree that the way the government funds its operations is broken and does not allow agencies to plan or prioritize. But **the stopgap system has remained in place because lawmakers have a hard time agreeing on spending levels for different programs.** Steve Bell, a republican former staff director of the Senate Budget Committee, said Trump’s call to shut down the government over the problem was merited and could lead to a breakthrough.

‘I don’t know anything other than a really dramatic statement that could fix this,’ he said.”

This article points out how important it is that the White House and Congress shed the responsibility of funding these programs so that funding for what remains, is approved six months before the start of the fiscal year and covers an entire year. It would be advantageous to have the president present a four-year spending plan, during the first year of each term. In fact, if we accomplish this full package, the federal government will be streamlined enough that large

portions of the presidents' four-year plan will be more easily approved by congress, requiring only minor tweaks annually. This strategy that I propose, was taught to me 40 years ago by a professor at West Virginia University based on the writings of the geniuses of governing that were our Founding Fathers. Many of the Founding Fathers were of the mind that counties should be the smallest form of government and the most involved in the governing of the people. This was recognized as the most efficient way to govern, and therefore, the most effective way to avoid excessive debt. The sparse population of many counties was the reasoning for the allowance of municipalities. The need to provide for a strong military was the reason for a strong central government. There are still some sparsely populated counties but the combined strength of the counties in each state, together with our technological abilities makes this a non-issue. By making counties the smallest governing entity and allowing them to impose a 15% income tax on all residents of the county, I put forth, that the counties will be able to provide all services required by the people. Furthermore, our military is the strongest in the world and the federal government will become much stronger when the White House and Congress are able to focus a great deal more of their attention on The World Trade Organization, The United Nations, The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, The Organization of American States and The World Court, et al.

To be guided by the writings of the Founding Fathers, who were most concerned with avoiding unsustainable debt and the people maintaining their individuality and free will, calls for the federal government to be responsible for governing the states without infringing on the states' constitutions, and the business entities that the federal government taxes, among other governing responsibilities that are many. The federal government must also govern itself, and the people must make their voices heard, in how the federal government governs itself. This is accomplished by the people insisting that their elected officials present bills and vote on bills according to the needs of their constituents, or they will not be re-elected. This is happening on an unprecedented scale now, in the effort to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. The document before you offer county officials a rallying point, to call for greater autonomy of county government. Unite the county into a single tax base and claim sovereignty over personal income tax of county residents to supply the resources necessary for county government to relieve the federal government of the incredibly complicated, and ridiculously expensive responsibility of providing services to 321.4 million (2015 census) people from Washington.

This is the way to achieve the presidents goal of reducing corporate taxes to 15% while paying down billions on the national debt by the end of the year, and trillions every year after that. The idea is for the county to be the only form of government making laws that directly affect the people, directly policing the people, or taxing the peoples' income. That the state enacts laws that only govern the businesses they tax and the counties, (not the people). That the state be the only form of government taxing businesses income headquartered in the state and that are licensed to do business in no more than four other states and taxing counties with a surplus more

than \$1,150,000.00/year at a rate of 15%. That the federal government enact laws only governing the states, (not the counties nor the people), the businesses the federal government taxes, the military and the intelligence community, etc. That our federal government be the only form of government in the US taxing businesses income headquartered in the United States and doing business in more than five states and international corporations head quartered in the US and taxing states with a surplus more than \$1,150,000.00/year at a rate of 15% and taxing the other international corporations that only sell products to US businesses or directly to citizens in the United States with a 15% across the board tariff. No favoritism, no punishment, simply a 15% tariff on all products entering the US.

Making the changes of turning over the responsibility for administering and funding of federal programs to the counties is smart business. President Donald Trump is a business man elected to make the government more business-like. Effectively delegating authority is the key ingredient for a large corporation to continue to be successful. **Delegation is about giving employees the responsibility, authority and resources to make decisions and carry them out.** Effective delegation will allow the president and Congress more time to work on, what have become extremely important and difficult problems. **The world is in crisis.** Our Founding Fathers provided the blueprints for counties to be the smallest governing entity and to be the only governing entity allowed to collect income tax from the people. Being the smallest governing entity makes them of adequate size that the population can generate enough resources to provide all services required by the people. **These proposals are intended to strengthen the federal government,** not weaken it. The federal government is becoming weaker because of excessive debt, caused by excessive responsibilities to administer services to the people. The only employee's necessary to administer these services already work in the counties, but hundreds of thousands of unnecessary employees are required to administer them from Washington.

Recognizing that these changes can achieve the presidents goal of reducing corporate taxes to 15% while paying down billions on the national debt by the end of this year, and trillions every year after, should be more than enough incentive to begin overcoming the naysayers and get this started in all counties. Due to the shock to the economy from the tax relief at every level, most of all to the people in cities, the benefits will pour down, not trickle. Certainly, city mayors will be the most likely ones to balk at this move but even they will have to admit that the people of the city would be relieved of an immense combined tax burden from the city, county, state and federal governments to pay only 15% income tax to the county. The mayor would, in fact, have a much larger budget to work with as the commissioner of the primary district in, what was the city or as mayor of the county; (I propose that all states adopt the form of county government used in Hawaii where there are no governing bodies smaller than the county and they elect a county mayor and further that the boundary of each city or town that presently has a mayor be the boundary of a district, or of several districts, named for the city.) It is important that the small towns continue to grow and retain their identity. These changes will result in the County Commission being a full-time job in places it is not already because of a greater work load, and

require much higher pay and responsibility, but the county will have a much, much larger budget to work with in all cases. Analysis of this needs to be done by county and state government. A single congressman can request analysis by the Congressional Research Service for the federal government, the CRS has access to the same data as the Congressional Budget Office but doesn't carry the weight of the CBO score.

Turning over this responsibility to counties and having county governments adopt the form of governing used in Hawaii may be able to be initiated by "Executive Order" to the state governors, citing the intent of the Founding Fathers and ***the dire need of solving the \$20,600,000,000,000.00 (Twenty Trillion Six Hundred Billion Dollar) NATIONAL DEBT.*** (Visit Congressman Raul Labrador's Official Site to experience the dizzying speed of the "Debt Clock" moving faster than a million dollars a minute 5:30 AM Saturday, 2/17/2018 and rising). This is a win-win-win-win situation. The people living in cities that pay all kinds of taxes to the city, county, state and federal governments will pay one tax of 15% to the county, what a boost to the economy. Ninety percent of counties will have millions in surplus when they send out their first tax returns. All states should do very well with less responsibility and taxing businesses head quartered in the state and doing business in no more than 4 other states and counties with an annual surplus of more than \$1,150,000.00 at 15%. The federal government should be the biggest winner of all shedding more than 850,000 federal employees in counties across the country and in Washington. The people in the counties will be working for the counties but the ones that lose their jobs in Washington should be well taken care of, those with 25 years or more should receive full retirement and the rest should receive, either a partial retirement or a generous severance pay. All should be encouraged to go into business for themselves. All federal and state employees still employed that know their job is a total waste of tax payer money must be offered an additional bonus above the generous severance pay to blow the whistle on themselves.

The 15% Personal Income Tax collected by the County:

Those who earn less than \$15,000.00/year will get a full refund in October, one year and a half after filing in April. This year and a half lag will make it much easier to get this massive project off the ground and make it easier for the county commission to budget the money in the future. The tax table will increase 1%/thousand between 15 and \$30,000.00. One earning \$22,000.00 will pay \$3,300.00 in tax and receive a \$2,250.00 refund. The \$15,000.00 deduction will phase out between \$100,000.00/year and \$115,000.00/year at 1%/\$1,000.00. Married couples with, one or more children, with a single income will be taxed as if it were two incomes. Single parents of children living in the home or attending college up to the age of 26 will be taxed the same as a married couple with a single income, as if it were two incomes. No further

deduction for dependent children should be necessary, but that will be left to the discretion of the counties. Minimum wage for 14 and 15-year old's, working on a work-permit will be \$7.50/hour, for 16 and 17-year old's, minimum wage will be \$10.00/hour, minimum wage for adults between 18 and 21 will be \$12.50/hour, for adults over 21 minimum wage will be \$15.00/hour. All counties will have a minimum raise scale of .50c/6mon. Tips will not be taxed. Minimum corporate salary will be \$60,000.00/year, based on a 60-hour work week this is less than a \$5.00/hour raise over \$15.00/hour. Minimum raise for salary earners will be \$2,000.00/yr. The answer to all budget issues on every level is getting people back to work in the private sector at a taxable income. The beauty of a \$15.00/hour minimum wage is, it is a gross income of roughly \$31,200.00/year for 40 hours/week, 52 weeks/year. Minimum salary for county employees would start at \$30,000.00/year tax free and would increase \$1000.00/year, such as teachers in the county. This would mean teachers with 10 years teaching in Barbour County would be making \$40,000.00/year and 20 years, \$50,000.00/year tax free. Teachers with a doctorate would start at \$40,000.00/year tax free and 35 years-experience would bring their pay to \$75,000.00/year.

Belington, Junior and Philippi would join with the rest of the people of Barbour County to become a single municipality with one mayor, the mayor of Barbour County. There will be at least three additional county commissioners in Barbour County. The county commissioners of the District of Belington, the District of Junior and the District of Philippi. The Mayor of Barbour County will not be a commissioner as the presidents of WV counties currently are. Barbour County should play a leading role in this effort by determining how much income, the 15% income tax described above would generate and calling upon the teachers, who are already motivated by years of low pay, to take this message to the people. County Officials will find that this single tax will cover everything lain out for the county to take care of, with a substantial surplus. Why? Because, if it is done with a full and open accounting by the Barbour County Commission there will be virtually no outrageous losses due to inefficiency and corruption, excuse me for saying there is corruption in federal government, that's not "politically correct", I should have said, "misappropriation of funds" or "improper payments". **It's not a lie, it's just "politically correct"**. The potential for efficient and effective use of the substantial available revenue by the County Commission working with the private and religious aid agencies in Barbour County to provide the needs of the people is enormous and is something the federal government is totally incapable of. The spending issues, ranging from [Medicare](#) and Medicaid mismanagement to transportation programs to weapon systems acquisitions, **cost taxpayers \$125 billion in improper payments** in 2014 alone, as highlighted in a new report from the [Government Accountability Office](#). By [Kellan Howell](#) - *The Washington Times* - Thursday, March 5, 2015

Counties will have only two sources of revenue to fund the programs and services with one exception, non-residents that own property they rent-out or don't use, or a vacation home they use only a couple of weeks, to a month per year in the county, will be the only property

owners required to pay property tax. Because they benefit from the services provided, while paying their income tax elsewhere. People who live in West Virginia for 7 months and Florida for 5 months will be required to break down their income tax accordingly. Everyone that earns a pay check, regardless of where they work, will pay 10% for Social Security and 15% income tax to the county in which they reside for the services provided to them and to share the costs of providing for others in the county. Counties will be required to find ways to budget their money to insure they have a minimum surplus of \$1000.00 annually, to maintain a growing rainy-day fund. When a shortage of funds is an issue it may be solved by calling on local churches and aid organizations to pick up the slack, or in some cases, for them to take care of some needs permanently, so the programs the county cannot afford can be discontinued. Social Security will be used for one and only one reason, retirement, all other programs currently funded by Social Security will either be funded by the 15% income tax or discontinued.

Funding the start-up by the state and federal government:

The governor will look at the money budgeted for the Board of Education for the coming fiscal year and break it down county by county determining how much they spent in each and send them a check for how much was spent in their county last fiscal year adjusted in accordance with the amount budgeted for the next fiscal year and the county commission will deposit it in a Board of Education account. State Road will do the same, retaining control over what is needed to maintain the interstate highway system. Regional Jails will be owned and operated by the county in which they are located. All other state services that the governor determines can be run more efficiently by the county will be handled the same way. The President will have the Congressional Budget Office determine how much was spent in each county last year by the Department of Health and Human Services, and issue a check based on the budget for the coming fiscal year to each county to be deposited in a county DHHS account. The county commission will spread these accounts around to the different banks in the county until a County Credit Union can be opened in an existing building or built. **CCU Rules: Only residents of the county will be able to be members of the County Credit Union, but anyone will be able to open a savings account there. The County Credit Union will be allowed to start its own mutual fund with up to half of the CCU assets above the minimum. County residents with a savings account i.e. members savings accounts interest rate will be based on a percentage of the annual gain of the CCU-MF of the previous year ending one month before. Example: Interest rate month of June based on CCU-MF earnings May of previous year to April. Non-member deposit interest rate 80% of the member rate. Members and non-members FDIC protected up to \$250,000.00 per 2018 rate. Details to be worked by each county commission. If "We the People" ever stand together and stop the bus from repeatedly running over us. Think: Anthony Borges. Think about what this young man did in the face of near certain death, alone. We must find the courage to stand together.**

The state and federal government will provide payroll information for the previous year. Since 2019 will be the last year of funding these programs, rather than reducing funding, the president and Congress should boost it. The federal government will be able to save a lot more money on programs like HUD, which is something entirely different from DHHS, than just reducing the payroll in Washington. Where HUD is concerned, I believe you can cut that \$47 billion in half and split \$23.5 billion up among the counties per capita and ask them, "Can you do more with less?" And they will. For instance: paying the rent for someone is a never-ending expense, while buying a house and letting them live there free will be a huge savings when the county pays off the loan. If the county can find them a job they could sell them their home, or give it to them, owning provides positive options to the county, if not abused, this may be an area where the state will need to pass a law insuring that the county did not collect rent.

Funding county-run Social Security accounts:

The federal government will advertise in every newspaper across the country, the total amount in the Social Security account, the total population of the country, the total population of each state, and the population of each county and the total number of retired people drawing a retirement check in each county. So, everyone will see that the numbers add-up and the money in Social Security is being distributed to the 3,144 counties in a fair and equitable way. Ten percent of what is allotted to the state will be deposited in a state Social Security account and 10% of what counties collect will be paid to the state account to assist counties that do not take in enough to cover their retirees. Each county will deposit their check in a Social Security account, 10% of residents' income will be paid into this account. The amount each person pays into this account will be tracked to determine how much they qualify to receive when they retire. The minimum monthly amount paid to retirees will be increased to \$1000.00/mon. after age, 65, whether you paid into it or not, and the maximum amount anyone can receive will be \$3000.00/mon. No tax will be paid on Social Security income, even though the maximum is \$36,000.00/yr. When taxing retirees, their income from Social Security will not be counted. This means retirees can make \$15,000.00 from a part-time job or in dividends and get a full refund or pay no tax on that income. Gains on money in the stock market, other than dividends, will be taxed only when the stock is sold. Retirees that sell "all" of their stock, will be taxed only for the amount more than \$1,000,000.00.

For counties that are going in the hole the state will build recycling plants that recycle paper and melt down glass, plastics and metals for reuse. Canning jar plants that use recycled glass for the jars, that are a standard quart size and recycled metal for the lids big enough to get your hand in. And a food cannery that cans food in the quart jars made next door. If only one county requires this assistance, the three plants will be designed to handle the needs of the entire state, based on 100% recycling. All counties should be working toward having their own recycling

plants that separates, reuses or melts down the materials for reuse, with the goal of mining old dumps when 100% recycling is achieved.

The 15% Business Tax collected by the state and the tax on counties:

Counties will be relieving the state government of a great deal of expense and responsibility and the people of the counties deserves some concrete assurances for taking that on. Initially, the state will make it law that the state will tax only the businesses headquartered in the state and licensed to do business in no more than four other states (and make it clear the state will not tax the people) and that tax will not be a sales tax that the people pay. The maximum tax the state can collect from the businesses will be the same exact 15% tax described above with a \$15,000.00 deduction, increasing 1%/\$1000.00 between 15 and \$30,000.00/year, with a one year and a half lag between filing and receiving a refund. With one exception, the \$15,000.00 deduction will phase out between \$85,000.00 and \$100,000.00 at 1%/\$1000.00. The state will require less revenue, and the 15% ceiling on the tax rate will keep prices down for consumers. The only deductions businesses can claim will be for **the cost of administration salaries, labor wages, materials, rentals, utilities and fuel for transporting goods and personnel and operating equipment, contract work, new construction, the purchase of land and existing structures and the purchase of new or used equipment expenses for the year with no loopholes.** This is a simple, no loopholes, tax code that, not only makes it possible to calculate a maximum 100% markup on the products a business sells, but also makes it easy for anyone to go into business. All states will adopt the same tax code. All employees on salary will be paid no less than \$60,000.00/year. From management to the board of directors to the owner, everyone that is on salary, their salary can be claimed as an administration deduction up to a maximum allowable deduction of \$300,000.00 each for those making more than \$300,000.00/year. Even though ones' employer can only claim a maximum deduction of \$300,000.00/year for their salary, these individual's total income will be taxed by the county in which they reside. Counties that have an annual surplus more than \$1,000,000.00 will be taxed by the state, on a tax table starting at 0% for a \$1,000,000.00 surplus, and increasing 1% per \$10,000.00, up to a maximum of 15% on a surplus of \$1,150,000.00/year. The tax money collected by the state from the counties will be set aside to be used to help the counties that are going in the hole. The concrete assurance that the state will provide to the people that the contents of this paragraph will be respected will come in the form of an amendment to the state constitution. **All calls for a Convention to alter the United States Constitution must be thwarted to avoid the possibility of losing far more than what the Convention was proposed to achieve, even to the point of losing the entire United States Constitution.** **READ:** "The Koch Brothers Want To Rewrite The Constitution. They May Succeed." **International Business Times** Josh Keefe. **AND:** "11 Things The Koch Brothers Don't Want You To Know, From Robert Greenwald's Newly Updated Documentary" **The poster boys for the top 1 percent are even worse than you thought.** By **Steven Rosenfeld / AlterNet** May 19, 2014, 12:19 PM GMT

*Who is programming you? What are they programming you to do?
How do we answer these questions? How do we stop them?
Enhanced Body-Cams for everyone that record 24/7.*

The 15% Corporate Tax collected by the IRS and the tax collected from the States:

The federal government will tax only the businesses, companies, or corporations licensed to do business in more than five states and international corporations licensed to do business in the United States. International corporations and all other business entities will be required to purchase a license in each state before selling products in the state whether from a store, by catalog or on the internet. To be fair to everyone the federal tax will be a maximum of 15% with a \$15,000.00 deduction, the tax table will increase 1%/thousand between 15 and \$30,000.00. there will be a one year and a half lag between the time they file their taxes and when they receive their refund. The \$15,000.00 deduction will be phased out between \$70,000.00 and \$85,000.00 at 1%/\$1000.00. The only deductions businesses can claim will be for **the cost of administration salaries, labor wages, materials, rentals, utilities and fuel for transporting goods and personnel and operating equipment, contract work, new construction, the purchase of land and existing structures and the purchase of new or used equipment expenses for the year with no loopholes.** All states and the federal government will have the same simple tax code, but they will not tax the same businesses, this is a key factor being able to calculate the maximum markup on all businesses. All employees on salary will be paid no less than \$60,000.00/year. From management to the board of directors to the owner, everyone that is paid a salary, their salary can be claimed as a deduction up to a maximum allowable deduction of \$300,000.00 each for those whose salary is more than \$300,000.00/year. Even though ones' employer can only claim a maximum deduction of \$300,000.00/year for their income these individuals will pay tax on all of their income to the county in which they reside. The federal government will tax states that have an annual surplus of more than \$1,150,000.00/year at 15%, starting at 0% for \$1,000,000.00/year surplus and increasing by 1% per \$10,000.00 (Ten Thousand Dollars) of surplus per year. The tax collected from the states will be used to pay the national debt off first, then it will be used for infrastructure.

Argument for no loopholes:

"There's a lot to like about cutting corporate taxes" article by Noah Smith, May 5th, 2017, The Exponent Telegram, Clarksburg, WV: "...perhaps the clearest reason to cut corporate taxes is the waste they generate through avoidance. A key, often overlooked fact about the U.S. corporate tax is that many businesses manage to pay little or **nothing**. One of the most common ways to do this is to shift profits overseas, through transfer pricing, inversions or other perfectly legal methods, to a tax haven country like the Cayman Islands. There, a company can avoid taxes indefinitely, reinvesting the profits in its business and letting them compound. If the company wants to cash out, it has to repatriate its cash and pay taxes to the U.S., but the returns from delaying the date of payment can be substantial. And often, a corporation can avoid taxes altogether by waiting for the U.S. to enact a repatriation holiday.

“In addition to tax havens, there are many other legal loopholes businesses can exploit to avoid taxes. As a result of avoidance, the U.S. doesn’t collect much more than other countries do, despite having a much higher official tax rate. A number of recent studies find that, on average, U.S. companies pay about 27 percent to 30 percent of their profits in taxes, compared with 24% to 26% average for other nations. Meanwhile, because of tax avoidance, the true rate isn’t closely tied to the headline rate. The official U.S. rate has remained 35% since 1993, with only minor changes. But the percent of corporate profits collected through the tax system has fallen quite a bit. All that avoidance costs real resources – hours of labor by tax accountants and financial professionals, buildings for them to work in, and computers to keep everything in order. By cutting the corporate tax rate, the U.S. would reduce the incentive for companies to waste all that money avoiding taxes. Reducing the reward from tax avoidance might also lower an important barrier to entry in U.S. industries. Tax avoidance probably has big fixed costs – you have to hire teams of lawyers and set up foreign subsidiaries. Those fixed costs make it difficult for small startups to compete on a level playing field with big, established companies, worsening the problem of monopoly power in the economy. Cutting the rate would make the system fairer. (Maybe, but closing the loopholes and making transfer pricing, inversions, etc. illegal would, definitely do the trick). “So, although we shouldn’t expect corporate tax cuts to be a cure-all, there are a number of reasons to slash the official rate. Most advanced countries have already done this. A rate of 15% might be a bit extreme, but a cut to 30 or 25% would almost certainly be a good move.” Thank you very much Mr. Smith! But here again, 15% is doable, but only by significantly lowering expenditures by the federal government. Now we know federal government is perfectly capable and willing to brake laws requiring that lowering of taxes not increase the national debt, as the permanent 22% corporate tax will increase the national debt by trillions of dollars. As will the temporary tax reductions for the lower and middle-income families that will placate the public and make everyone ignore this truth.

The federal government will charge a 15% tariff on all products coming into the country to help level the playing field, it will not be used to punish some and favor others. International Corporations with their headquarters outside the US will be required to file pay roll information for the previous year, and they must verify that they pay a minimum wage the equivalent of five US dollars per hour to receive the license and they must file the documents to verify this every year to renew their license. Just imagine what this will do for the Chinese market, and the other markets where labor is paid less than two dollars per hour. Or worse, a bowl of rice a day, reproduce at 13, and die at 14, another word, slave labor still exists, just Google the average life-span of different countries of the world. International Corporations’, with headquarters outside the US, that do no production of their products in the US, only tax paid to the US will be the 15% tariff paid to our federal government for products entering the US. International Corporations, headquartered outside the United States with manufacturing or retail stores in the US, will only claim deductions for employees working in the US and materials bought in the US for use in the

US, likewise for the rest of the allowable deductions. All individuals, businesses, companies, corporations or international corporations will pay the 15% tax annually to only one of the three levels of government, federal, state or county except for owners of businesses that pay themselves a salary more than \$300,000.00/year. All entities that pay their income tax to the federal government will be required to verify that their employees, board of directors and owner have paid their income tax to the county. No entity will operate tax free for any reason, not as an incentive to do business, nor as a so-called non-profit institution, nor as a so-called charity, these have been abused to the point they are the most profitable businesses and the richest tax havens in existence. The only exception will be religious groups that voluntarily provide financial records to the county and provide aid to the less fortunate in the county at a minimum of 10% of their net income when their financial records indicate they can afford to do so. The only individuals that do not pay income tax are the people that are paid with taxpayer money by the county. State and federal officials and the military will pay income tax to the county or counties where they live. Contractors paid with taxpayer money, most of whom are making money from many other sources will pay tax on their total income.

Reining in healthcare costs; READ: [Health Politics of healthcare](#) The Punch Sun, Jul 23

For the first 170 years of the history of our nation, the high integrity of our merchants, displayed by satisfaction with modest profits held inflation down. A 10% mark-up was widely held to be the maximum markup, without government involvement. During our first 170 years, the conservative integrity of merchants led the Republican Party to become staunchly against price controls. Some claim that, the lack of a gold standard causes inflation. "The gold standard is a monetary system that directly links a currency's value to that of gold. A country on the gold standard cannot increase the amount of money in circulation without also increasing its gold reserves. Because the global gold supply grows only slowly, being on the gold standard would **theoretically** hold government overspending and inflation in check. ... "The country effectively abandoned the gold standard in 1933, and completely severed the link between the dollar and gold in 1971." MentalFloss. I am a man of common sense, and my common sense tells me that this **theory** is incorrect, inflation is more closely tied to the modest integrity of merchants and the modest integrity of those that govern, than being on the gold standard. Regardless of who is right, it is not likely we will return to the gold standard and modest integrity is difficult to find, so we must accept self-destruction by inflation or demand a reasonable price control.

What I propose is a price control made possible by limiting the deductions from state and federal taxes. This will produce quick results in lowering prices, but it will take time to accumulate the data necessary for accuracy. It will take more time for the IRS to examine the data to decide if the pricing meets the requirements of the law. It should also be noted that reducing the tax base of the federal government, eliminating loop-holes and simplifying taxes will result in the IRS

having more time to devote to this. For this to be fair it should not target healthcare but be applied to all industries and businesses. (Something should also be done to address why there is a middleman warehouse business between pharmacies and the products they sell). Case in point: The article in today's The Exponent Telegram, Clarksburg, WV, 4/4/2017, "Mylan subsidiary gets hit with RICO Act". "The lawsuit targets the EpiPen list price last year of \$608.62, an increase of 574% by Mylan since it got the rights to market and distribute the drug in 2007". ... "Why has the price of a product, which Mylan did not develop and costs so little to produce, gotten so out of control? EpiPen's list price has skyrocketed because, as Mylan has admitted, it pays 'intermediaries' in the pharmaceutical distribution system, known as pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs), ...". Amazing timing, "thank you".

"WHY DRUGS COST SO MUCH"

Article by THE EDITORS OF AARP Bulletin, May 2017

"Nothing stops drug companies from charging the highest price the market will bear.

The result: **PRICES THAT MAKE LITTLE SENSE, BUT LOTS OF PROFIT"**

Our president is working on ways to lower the cost of bringing drugs to market and that will allow drug companies to lower prices if they are fair about it. I propose that state and federal government cap retail and wholesale markup at 100% of the cost of bringing each product to market, spreading the cost of the only deductions businesses can claim on their taxes, which are **the cost of administration salaries, labor wages, materials, rentals, utilities and fuel for transporting goods and personnel and operating equipment, contract work, new construction, the purchase of land and existing structures and the purchase of new or used equipment expenses for the year with no loopholes** across the company's products. Because these expenses are the only deductions from gross income for the proposed 15% across the board tax on every business entity, it makes determining that prices are within the guidelines possible, which is not the case with our present tax code. Not allowing for the cost of clinical trials (where applicable) or research and development (R&D), I propose that new drugs, new technology and new products be allowed a markup of 300% the first year, 200% the second year and 150% the third year they are being sold in the market, trusting that sometimes this will be more than is needed and sometimes less but over time it will even out. And knowing full well that company's engaging in R&D, especially pharmaceutical companies can afford it, or they wouldn't be paying their CEO's a median salary of \$14,500,000.00 (Fourteen Point Five Million Dollars). More than any other industry. And spending \$24,000,000,000.00 (Twenty-Four Billion Dollars) marketing directly to doctors and \$6,400,000,000.00 (Six Point Four Billion Dollars) advertising to consumers in the U.S. annually, (per AARP article cited above). Since this is a percent increase of the cost of bringing

products to market it will not be necessary to increase it because if the cost of bringing the product to market increases, the price you can sell it for increases exponentially.

States will enforce the mark-up maximum of 100% detailed above:

The states will be required to enforce the same 100% markup cap with the “new product” guide line and enact a state law to this effect, as described above on the businesses they tax by requiring them to verify their compliance with the law to receive a state business license each year whether the state charges for the license or not. There is, potentially, a lot more money in business licensing, let’s say we keep it at \$30.00 for life for businesses netting less than \$100,000.00/year here in WV, then increase it to a \$1000.00/year for businesses netting between 100,000.00 and \$200,000.00/year in the state, increasing it by \$1,000.00/year every additional \$100,000.00/year after that. The state could allow businesses to obtain their first license in the state at \$30.00 as incentive, rather than having to estimate in-state profits.

The free market is a wonderful thing when merchants have modest integrity, in all areas of business except one, it can bring the highest quality products at the lowest prices. The one area that this is simply not true is health insurance. Health insurance rates go down as the size of the healthy pool goes up, this means that the more insurers cutting up the healthy pool the higher the rates the insurer is forced to charge. This is being illustrated in every debate taking place in the fight to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. The largest pool in any country is a single-payer or universal system. One national health insurance provider creates the largest possible pool of healthy patients available to offset the costs of the chronically ill, therefore providing the lowest rates to the people, or the government as single-payer is defined, but that is not what I am proposing because that requires increased government regulation and that is not my goal.

Bill Gates, Charlie Munger and Warren Buffet all agree Medicare and Medicaid, as a universal system, are the future of health-care in the United States with private insurers providing insurance to people who believe they will be better protected with private insurance. I believe this is a fair assessment of the interview I watched, 5/9/2017, on the internet.

READ: Business Some of the most powerful people in the US are talking about a massive change to healthcare Business Insider 7-24-17

President Donald Trump said that **Australia has “better health-care than we do”** during a meeting with the Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull. Senator Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.)

“Thank You, Mr. President”

“Let’s move to a Medicare for all system, that does what every other major country on earth does, guarantee health-care at a fraction of the cost per capita that we spend.”

I like what Bernie Sanders said about guaranteeing health-care at a fraction of the costs, but I don't like the way "single-payer insurance" is defined; increasing federal regulation of health-care, increasing taxes so the federal government pays all the medical bills. That's no way to control healthcare costs or to be more fiscally responsible, that's just a sure way to increase the national debt and increase taxes and end the free market in healthcare.

Affordable healthcare combined with fiscal responsibility trumps all else. The choice is not, one or the other, it is possible to have both. When we can have both, when faced with a **\$20,600,000,000.00 National Debt, (Twenty Trillion Six Hundred Billion Dollar National Debt)**, (Visit Congressman Raul Labrador's Official Site to experience the dizzying speed of the "Debt Clock"), we cannot let anything stand in the way of choosing both. We cannot run this debt up any higher. At some point, soon, we will be faced with, nearly insurmountable, run-away interest.

ACA Repeal and Replace

Medicare, Medicaid and CHIP as a "Semi-Universal System":

Medicare, Medicaid and CHIP as a "Semi-Universal System" allowing private insurers to try to compete provides a great opportunity today. I am not proposing that Medicare, Medicaid and CHIP have exclusive rights to the healthcare market. What I am proposing will stifle private insurers only as long as it takes congress to rein in health-care costs. This strategy provides a generous price control that does not impede the free market in any other way. We can write a whole slew of laws targeting healthcare or we can accept this full package of tax code reform that facilitates an across the board, ceiling on markup. What I am proposing is that we allow Medicare, Medicaid and CHIP to compete by selling insurance by this simple formula to anyone living in the United States, regardless of immigration status. CHIP to pregnant women and parents with children under the age of 26 starting at \$50.00 (Fifty Dollars)/month and increasing \$1.00/month each year. A married couple that are facing fertility issues will have to start CHIP coverage to have insurance pay 90% of those expenses, the rate will remain \$50.00/month until the child is a year old. Medicaid to people from the age of 26 to 50 starting at \$100.00 (One Hundred Dollars)/month and increasing \$3.00/month each year. At 49, full coverage Medicaid insurance would cost \$169.00/month. A married couple, both 30 years old with a 5-year old would pay \$279.00/month for full coverage health-care insurance. And Medicare to people over 50 starting at \$200.00 (Two Hundred Dollars)/month and increasing \$5.00/month each year. Medical conditions will not be a factor, the rates will simply be the same for all people of a specific age based on the above formula. Sell them full coverage health insurance with a 10% co-pay with a maximum co-pay of \$15,000.00, for those netting less than \$100,000.00/year, on hospital bills, doctor visits, prescriptions, dental and eye care, cover every medical bill except mental health

phase out "Obamacare's" expanded Medicaid, which allows states to provide federally backed insurance to low-income adults previously not eligible. Many people in that demographic are in their 20s and 30s and dealing with opioid addiction. Dollars from Washington have allowed states to boost their response to the crisis, paying for medication, counseling, therapy and other services." (The AP: by Ricardo Alonso-Zaldivar.) Addicts in prison tell everyone that getting locked-up saved their lives. Politicians ignore the truth, a 360-day misdemeanor sentence that cannot be shortened by "good-time" with a 5 to 10 day weaning period with Methadone is how their lives are saved and the addiction defeated. The only counseling or therapy necessary is job training, exercise and time. Less than a year, so it's only a misdemeanor because a year sentence is a felony. But enough time for them to realize, for themselves without counseling, how much better off they are, since being freed from their addiction. Opioids leave the blood system, five days usually, ten days max. No-one should be on Methadone for life. Chronic pain should never be treated with an opioid or any other addictive pain killer. Twenty to thirty-year-olds, beating their addiction, getting a job making more than \$30,000.00/yr. and paying for Medicaid Health Insurance covers the cost of the expanded Medicaid described in this county run system. Especially when it is handled on the county level where county officials can work directly with the medical personnel involved when paying medical bills.

PREPARING THE GROUNDWORK FOR DECENTRALIZING THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE

President Trump will need a carefully prepared speech to the governors of the fifty states promoting the advantages of maximized [autonomy of the counties](#) in exchange for accepting the increased responsibilities of funding and administering all entitlement programs for the people of the county, through "[Decentralizing the Administrative State](#)". A key point here is that more than enough employees than are needed to administer these programs are, already, working in the county doing that job. The president will announce that an executive order to this effect will be signed and call upon the governors to, forthwith, convene a meeting with the county commissioners of their state to lay out the details of counties becoming the smallest form of government under the state, per the Founding Fathers to pay the national debt without mercilessly gutting the benefits that so many have come to rely upon. No doubt, all counties may want to make changes to some programs or discontinue others, but counties being closest to the people are best suited for making these difficult decisions and carrying them out in a way that is not merciless. The commissioners will, initially elect a county mayor themselves, preferably the present mayor of the largest city in the county, to preside over the transition. (During the special election, to be held in 2020, the people will elect the county mayor, as well as, the commissioners.) This message will be carried by the commissioners to the mayors, city councilmen and town councils to describe how the transition will take place. For two years, all town and/or city employees will be kept on, during that time, decisions will be made determining how many are needed to carry-on the business of the county. There will no longer be city mayors, city councilmen or town councils but there will be all present commissioners and some additional county commissioners and a county mayor to be elected. In Harrison County West Virginia, the

borders of the small town of Lost Creek will be the borders of the district of Lost Creek with its own commissioner to represent Lost Creeks' interests, not just a neighborhood, as proposed by your County Commission President, who would be guilty of "High Treason" against the county if there were such a thing, proposing that Clarksburg usurp the power of two counties. For what? Greater dependence on federal dollars that is being used to twist the arms of mayors across the country. All residents of the county will have the same services available to them depending on their needs and these services will come off the top of the county budget. The County Commission will decide how to best portion the rest of the budget. Per district per capita may prove to be the fairest way. But it will not be possible to skew in favor of the most populated district or group of districts. If it is to be skewed at all, it will be away from the most populated to the least populated districts with districts that had previously been small towns being favored to promote their continued growth. How the county mayor and commissioners decide to budget the money will be shared with the public annually.

Doing the deal: The first step is a "Repatriation Holiday at 15%" to bring trillions back into our banks to get the economy moving in a strong positive direction. The second step is an "Executive Order" calling on the governors to inform the counties to begin collecting a 15% income tax from all residents of the county October 1st, 2017, in preparation for the counties to take over all funding and administration of state and federal programs using the same people presently performing these jobs and detailing paragraph that follows. The third step is to deed over all property owned by the state or federal government in the county to the county. All property associated with the State Road including all trucks and equipment, except for what is needed to maintain the interstate highway system, will be deeded to the county. The Board of Education (it will be clearly stated that counties will have total control of public education, through 12th grade), Health and Human Resources, Social Security, HUD, etc. along with all responsibility for payroll and every aspect of administering and funding these programs and services will be turned over to the county. This will take place quickly in Hawaii where there are no municipalities smaller than the county and in many other counties around the country where there are no town or city governments' only the county.

The mayors and city councilmen of municipalities smaller than the county will become members of the county commission appointed by the county commission to carry out the business of the city for two years while assisting in making it a smooth transition from being separate entities to become a single entity. The commissioners will, initially elect a county mayor themselves, the mayor of the county seat or the mayor of the largest city in the county, to preside over the transition. All employees of the municipalities will be kept on for at least two years. For example: City police forces will be deputized at their current rank, chiefs of police will be the commanding officer of a branch office of the sheriffs' department that will continue to operate out of their city police headquarters. County elections will be postponed if necessary and a special election will be scheduled in two years. At this time all county commissioners and the county mayor will be elected by the people.

A look at the U. S. Military and how a return to tradition can better prepare us for the future:

National Guard vs. Reserves by Jeffrey Joyne: The United States Armed Forces are comprised of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines and Coast Guard. The U.S. Coast Guard is under the control of the Department of Homeland Security, while the other four branches report to the Department of Defense. As of 2011, the combined total of active-duty personnel was about 2.3 million, with an additional 846,000 people in the National Guard and reserves. Although there are many similarities between the National Guard and reserves, there are significant differences.” ... “The primary difference between the guard and reserve components lies in the command. Reserve units are part of the federal armed forces, and as such they are under presidential command. Guard units are organized on the state level, and the governor can call them to service in response to civil riots or natural disasters. The president has the power to federalize guard troops, if needed, but a governor has no control over reserve units.

“Americas Reserve and National Guard Components” by Col. Richard J. Dunn III “Militia service is as old as the United States. Before independence, local communities formed their own security forces, composed of citizens who would rally in times of emergency, to protect their towns from external threats. After independence, the individual states remained in the habit of raising forces—militias—as needed, providing units to complement those of the federal forces as was the case during the U.S. Civil War.” ... “The relationships between the National Guard, the full-time Active federal forces, and the Active Components’ Reserve elements have changed over time as the needs of the country have changed. For much of its history, the U.S. maintained a small Active component that was expanded by draft or mobilized reserves during times of war. Following the Vietnam War, the shift to an all-volunteer force and the heightening of tensions with the Soviet Union led to sustainment of a large standing military that changed the relationship between Active and Reserve/Guard elements, with Active elements kept in a ready status that would enable them to respond immediately to any Soviet aggression while the Reserve and Guard elements served as a strategic reserve.”

“...The Vietnam War and its aftermath had a profound impact on U.S. senior military leadership in many ways and on the relationship between the Active and Reserve components. General Creighton Abrams, who as Vice Chief of Staff of the Army had overseen the preparation of Army forces for deployment to Vietnam and who had served as commander of all forces in that engagement, became Army Chief of Staff in 1972 and began to restore the combat effectiveness of an Army that had seen its morale crumble during the Vietnam War. To enhance readiness and expand the size of the force available for large-scale operations, he and then-Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird created the Total Army concept that integrated the Active and Reserve components much more closely. Some have argued that one reason for this approach was to make it impossible for the Army to go to war again without the Guard and Reserve. Some also claimed that the resulting “Abrams Doctrine” would limit the ability of future Presidents and Congresses to commit the U.S. to war without first garnering the public support required to mobilize and commit the Reserve components. However, the historical record does not substantiate this claim.⁵¹ The Abrams Doctrine led the Army to integrate the components to the degree that a third of the force structure of most Army divisions stationed in the continental U.S. was made up of National Guard units. To provide the President with the necessary access to the Guard and Reserve absent a declaration of war or declared national emergency, Congress

created the Presidential Reserve Callup Authority in 1976. "...With time to train and properly prepare before deployment, Army National Guard brigades began to assume their place in a rotation schedule for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. "At one point in 2005, half of the combat brigades in Iraq were Army National Guard—a percentage of commitment as part of the overall Army effort not seen since the first years of World War II." With combat rotations scheduled well in advance, Reserve component units were given the same time and training resources to prepare for deployment that Active component units received. Active component units train throughout the year, honing their ability to execute both tactical actions and higher-level operations that, due to their complexity, place great demands on senior-level staffs. Guard and Reserve performance in Iraq and Afghanistan was as good as it was not only because of the dedication of the members involved, but also because they were given the time and resources required to train to the same tactical standards as Active component forces before they deployed.

Balancing Roles. Traditionally, the Guard and Reserve components have served as a national *strategic* reserve force, a national asset that can be mobilized in times of significant crisis to provide expanded military capacity to the Joint Force. In the recent engagements in Iraq and Afghanistan, however, they have often served as an *operational* reserve, filling the manpower needs of an overly taxed Active component. "As an operational reserve," writes Dr. Daniel Gouré of the Lexington Institute, "Guard forces participated routinely and regularly in ongoing military missions. Entire Guard brigade combat teams (BCTs) were deployed to both conflicts, [and] Guard officers commanded entire multi-national Corps in Iraq."⁶⁰

To their credit, the Guard and Reserve components filled this role well, but it has made them more closely resemble the Active component. The time required to prepare and train to deploy, and the overseas deployments themselves, have exceeded what had previously been expected of individuals not serving full-time in the Active military component.

A CRITICAL COMPONENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Our armed forces must be prepared to support an effective national military strategy across the full range of potential threats that the nation faces in the current and uncertain future threat environment. This calls for Guard and Reserve component forces to be postured for action in ways that best suit their organizational nature, their access to resources, and the demands of evolving operational and strategic requirements. **In general, the Reserve component, composed of Guard and Reserve forces, best supports the country by serving as the nation's insurance policy in the event that the Active component finds itself in major combat operations** rather than by substituting for the Active component in smaller contingencies due to an undersized Active force." ... "The men and women who compose the Reserve components are a testament to the desire, willingness, and ability of our countrymen to serve the security interests of our nation while also contributing to the wealth, resiliency, vitality, and stability of our nation on a daily basis in their various capacities as private citizens when not soldiering. Our Reserve and National Guard forces are national assets that must be resourced and supported in a manner that is commensurate with their critical functions in preservation of the nation's security.

Second Amendment: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

It's time to have well-regulated, state militias that are under the command of the state governor and recognize that the right and the desire of the people to keep and bear arms in the

nuclear age is to defend their home against intruders and for hunting. Semi-automatic and fully-automatic weapons and silencers for all firearms must be totally banned from sale to the public and an effort must be made to confiscate existing ones. Deadly weapons must be banned from use by law enforcement except for use by SWAT teams.

Eighth Amendment: “Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.”

“Listen, you can defend torture, or you can defend the Constitution. Not both. The 8th Amendment explicitly forbids torture with all forms of cruel and unusual punishment. To defend torture is to attack the Constitution.” Mar. 15, 2018 Edward Snowden, American Hero

Defending against terrorism using technology and an entirely overt strategy inside the country:

In recognition of the changes sense the break-up of the Soviet Union, and the clear and present danger of a terrorist attack on American soil. I propose that we return to the traditional use of the National Guard and The Reserves and bring all of them home. The National Guard will take up its traditional role as state militia under the command of the governor. Furthermore, that President Donald Trump order The Reserves to act as part of the State Militia, so they can train together an extra weekend each month, for additional pay, as a battalion. This battalion will have four companies, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines; Here in West Virginia most of the old State Farm in Huttonsville has gone fallow for many years. I propose a large portion of the old State Farm be designated as a training ground for the troops. For their first gathering they will bivouac for a month. The first order of business, at the end of the first week will be to elect four company commanders; 3 Captains and the Navy Commander. After 3 week's they will elect a Lieutenant Colonel to be commanding officer of the battalion. They will meet an additional weekend each month in Huttonsville and an additional 2 weeks during the winter, maybe with Super Bowl weekend in the middle would be a good time, it seems a drive-in theater would be useful for training purposes to Google Earth real-time, militarily enhanced, to be students of the action in Afghanistan and Iraq under General Mattis.

As for the Active Duty Personnel, it is time to ramp up the forces to full training capacity. New recruits must be guaranteed they will not be sent to war unless it is on United States soil, during their first four years of active duty. This will bring far greater numbers of volunteers to the service. Only Active Duty Personnel that re-up after their initial four years of service will be sent to war on foreign soil. I totally agree with Trump about pulling out of Syria. Syria is worse than Vietnam. We need to focus on Iraq and Afghanistan and put as many Active Duty Personnel with more than four years-service on the ground in these two countries as we possibly can. We must secure the borders of

these two countries. We need to construct a twelve-foot tall chain link fence on the border with signs and speakers that can explain the situation: Motion sensors will detect your presence and surveillance cameras will track your movements. Bring your weapons and move across the road and position your weapons against the inside wall. Then move back to the other of the road. If you follow these directions, we will bring food and water and provide with shelter. Fifty yards to a two-lane road with a substantial, yet see through fence with motion sensors built-in, fifty yards off the inside of the road to be able to adequately patrol the borders of Iraq and Afghanistan. We must ramp up; production of fixed position and land roving robot tanks and flying drone defense systems to act as full-time perimeter forces that can be deployed that never sleep and do not kill, but together can incapacitate hundreds or thousands, crossing a border at once while sounding the alarm for the closest troops to come on the run, so we can secure the borders of Iraq and Afghanistan. Careful consideration should be given to deploying Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) systems in central locations in both nations after the borders have been secured and a democratic republic is in place, with a military. This will require an international airport along-side so that we will be able to insure the security of these installations, as well. Set up "Border inspection Depots" at high traffic points, allowing everyone in, if they have been strip-searched to confiscate all weapons. Beginning the vetting process nearby before allowing them to freely roam the interior and providing food and shelter in Iraq or Afghanistan for these refugees.

The CIA has created an untenable situation that is getting our troops maimed and killed and causing them to commit suicide in unacceptable numbers. If Mike Pompeo is a reformer and not just a career CIA like every other director before him, then reinstate him and order him to reform the CIA this way. All CIA must be brought back to the US and exiled to Alaska where they can bring their families and live free except for travel, they won't be allowed to leave the state. They will continue to receive their current pay until they have completed a full chronological report of their career in the CIA and provide everything they know the CIA "Black Money Accounts." Then they will be entitled to their retirement. Seriously, the CIA is the "Drug King-Pin" to the World.

It is time to stand up for what we believe in and print the United States Constitution in the Afghan and Iraq languages and deliver copies to their people, begin the process by electing county commissioners. And allow the elected county commissioners to use it as a guide if they wish but these elected officials must gather scholars to write their document providing the process for the only acceptable form of government in the "New Millennium", one that is elected by the people. The County "As the form of government closest to the people, counties offer a unique perspective that makes them critical players in decisions affecting their citizens and as state and local governments evolve, counties

will continue to play a prominent role.” County commissioners must take charge of drafting their constitution and planning their national elections. How many of the CIA’s dictators have we ended up having to kill ourselves? That is clearly a failed strategy. The CIA’s reason for putting dictators in power is that dictators are supposed to be more stable business partners. **“However, the historical record does not substantiate this claim”**, I quote these words from above and acknowledge they were not used in this context, though, this is clearly true.

Traditionally the National Guard has been the state militia under the governors’ command. The State Police, DNR and DEP will become a part of the state militia and train with the National Guard and The Reserves one weekend per month and for two weeks in the winter to prepare for a possible terror attack. The State Police will have detector booths wherever a road crosses the state line that can detect sensors attached to the cars that travel the road on a regular basis, and when someone is just passing through they just stop at the booth and scan their driver license. A camera in the middle of the road will read the tag to determine if the car is stolen. If someone drives through a booth without stopping or the tag does not match the license, the State Police will be automatically alerted that someone has entered the state illegally. The State Police will investigate criminal activity by business owners, county officials and drug traffic in the state across county lines and across the state line. And patrol the interstate highways. The DNR and DEP rolls as members of the militia will be expanded, logging much more time walking the state lines, becoming familiar with the terrain and working with land owners to have their support. They will also train with National Guard and Reserves and clear it with land owners when the Battalion will bivouac along remote portions of the state line.

Dealing with the drug and alcohol problem within the ranks:

The military is not the general public, and alcohol and drugs have been promoted within the ranks as weapons to destroy our military from within. All alcohol and drugs must be banned from all military bases with searches at the gate. If these men want to drink, they can do it off base. Alcoholism has been used as a prerequisite for promotion, I don’t need any proof that this is true, all Active Duty personnel knows it’s true. Case in point: Navy Seals! Alcohol and drugs must be quarantined from all United States Military Bases around the world. Navy Seals and all other military with drug or alcohol addiction, must be detained on base for a minimum of one year and only treated with decreasing amounts of Methadone for five to ten days for opioid addiction. Alcoholics should be given Ativan at the onset of Detrimental Trimmers. This must be a team effort. Team-work is what the military is all about, and when it comes to Special Forces, team-work must be sacrosanct. Those that do not have a drug or alcohol problem should be right there for those that are going through withdrawals. Just because they are being detained on base

doesn't mean they can't go out and train with their unit in a strictly' drug-free and alcohol-free environment. They need to be out there sweating it out. This is something the politicians have gotten totally wrong. I did 12.5 years in prison, and the only ones happy to be there were drug addicts and severe alcoholics, most all of them said the same thing, "I would be dead by now if I had not been locked-up!"

County level security precautions and defense of cyber space:

County lines will be patrolled by High School and College cross-country athletes and other citizens, not in any official capacity, but simply being aware of who the people are that frequent these areas. So that when someone is trying to flee from county to county or state to state after committing a crime it will be much more difficult to get away with it. County officials will make this safe in urban areas and where highways are crossed by providing wide ramped overpasses for joggers and walkers. County officials will work with land owners to make this happen across ranches and farmland. This will make it nearly impossible for someone to get away with kidnapping and transporting the victim across state lines undetected, much less, clear across the country, or someone to drive around committing multiple murders or bank robberies without being caught. When overt security is taken to the highest level that our technological capabilities now make possible, covert security inside the boundaries of counties, states and the nation is no longer necessary. To make cyber space more secure for US citizens, guarantee privacy, and provide a process for the courts to gain access to any specific communication deemed necessary. The county will record all communications coming into and out of the county and between citizens of the county in a secure facility that guarantees that; **"No one has listened to these communications, but they have been securely made accessible to the local circuit court only"**. These communications will not be accessed by a simple warrant, they will only be accessed when, during a trial, there are claims that a communication contains information that could affect the outcome of the case. When the case is not local, public hearings will be held in the local circuit court to determine whether the communications will be made available. When it is a federal agency, there will be strict guidelines directing the request first through a Federal Court, then to the State Supreme Court, before approaching the County Circuit Court to ensure that local authorities are not intimidated by a federal agency, as well as, to demonstrate the high priority and importance of protecting privacy and the fourth amendment.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

This will be designed specifically to prevent a Federal Agency or anyone else from invading the privacy of US citizens. It will not prevent a Federal Agency from listening to or recording international calls on the side coming into the country, that portion of the communication will be vulnerable, but the US portion will be so thoroughly encrypted that masking will not be necessary and unmasking will not be possible without help from the county. This is the way to prepare our country for the inevitable arrival of AI (Artificial Intelligence) as it relates to the IoT (Internet of Things). What is needed is for each county to be a system that can be effectively isolated with the touch of a button or automatically, to prevent a breach of the control of the IoT systems information to protect ourselves from the unknown future ramifications of AI. It would be wise for each county to employ techies who attempt to, with all due respect to Native Americans, "count coup" on other counties by breaching their system in a strictly benign way, to improve defenses. "It's one of the cultural artifacts that somehow was handed down in my family. It wasn't until I was an adult that I realized two things: First that everyone didn't know what that meant and second, that it might be significant. Made Mom happy. But counting coup has a much deeper history beginning long ago and perhaps on both sides of the Atlantic." (Touché). ... "Counting coup refers to the winning of prestige in battle, rather than having to prove a win by injuring one's opponent." Posted 10,5,2012 by Roberta Estes, Native Heritage Project

This is the way to secure FaceBook, so that people are confident that their information is being held within their county and when they communicate with friends in other counties their information is not available to that county. When you communicate with friends in another state your information will be shielded by another layer of security. The end result to be that, Robert Mercer's algorithms or those developed by Cambridge Analytica would be required to go through a licensing process state by state and county by county. I suspect that every county will be determined to make it illegal for personal information to be used to target the people of their county for any reason and mind-altering algorithms certainly must be banned. "Monster Tech Corporations" are not doing a service to customers by collecting information on the sights you visit so they can customize their offerings to your personal needs, Cambridge Analytica taught what that this is about shaping your thoughts, which is? Programming you.

Legal Information Institute: Article III

SECTION 1.

The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

SECTION 2.

The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;--to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;--to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;--to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;--to controversies between two or more states;--between a state and citizens of another state;--between citizens of different states;--between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the state where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any state, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

SECTION 3.

Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted.

The state will make secrecy of any kind by state or county government strictly illegal. All activity by all state and county officials will be carried out in such a way that it cannot be found to have been purposefully hidden from the public. No secret organization, no matter how benign they claim their reasons are for being secretive will be tolerated. All state intelligence agencies or security agencies and any other state run or privately operated secret agency will be required to order all personnel to report to the county court house where they live, bringing with them all computer files pertaining to their work, prepared to work in the court house or a location provided for the purpose as long as they expect it will take to prepare a full report of their activities over the past five years or since being hired that explains more thoroughly the information they have compiled. Banning secrecy will also be brought before the people to vote on as a state constitutional amendment.

I want to clarify that, although the county will accept all federal and state laws pertaining to individual people. It will no longer be the state or federal governments job to enforce or enact laws that pertain to individuals. This will be left to the county, in the future the county will be the only form of government with the authority to pass laws effecting individual people. Repeal of state and federal laws will be the same except the county commission will be a go between for the people and either the State House of Delegates or the Federal House of Representatives. The county commission will be called upon to make use of the many lawyers they now have at their disposal, that no longer work for the state, to examine state and federal law with the goal of identifying laws that need to be repealed. When the county commission decides that a state or federal law should be repealed, they will email a copy of the law to all voting age residents of the county to get consensus on whether the people agree that the law should be repealed, if at least 55% are in favor of repeal, the commissioner will bring this to the representatives attention and it will be the representatives job to bring it to the attention of the other county commissioners for them to get further consensus on how the people feel about repealing the law. When enough people are in favor of repeal then it will go before the appropriate House for a vote. A county that feels a state or federal law that was repealed worked for them, can pass it as a county law. **All calls for a Convention to alter the United States Constitution must be thwarted to avoid the possibility of losing far more than what the Convention was proposed to achieve, even to the point of losing the entire United States Constitution.** **READ:** "The Koch Brothers Want To Rewrite The Constitution. They May Succeed." International Business Times Josh Keefe. **AND:** "11 Things The Koch Brothers Don't Want You To Know, From Robert Greenwald's Newly Updated Documentary" *The poster boys for the top 1 percent are even worse than you thought.* By Steven Rosenfeld / AlterNet May 19, 2014, 12:19 PM GMT

The changes to the federal government will give the house, senate and executive branch of the federal government more time to devote to foreign policy: NATO, The United Nations, and The International Court, etc. and trade: NAFTA and The World Trade Organization, etc. Just as the state will govern only the counties, leaving it to the counties to govern the people. The federal government will govern only the states, leaving it to the states to govern the counties. All counties will be sanctuary counties for illegal immigrants presently living in the county, but they will be required to begin the necessary process to become a legal citizen of the United States. Federal law enforcement will also have extremely limited authority over individuals, their focus will be criminal activity in state government and criminal activity in the businesses the federal government taxes. The primary focus of federal law enforcement will be organized crime. Just as state law enforcements involvement in individuals' crimes will be greatly limited except where it involves trafficking across county lines and the state line, federal law enforcements involvement in individuals' crimes will be greatly limited except where it involves trafficking across state lines

when two states request assistance in addressing a problem and will be required when more than two states have become involved.

Satisfying the need to Educate the Politicians of the Future:

There is a great need for college professors with real world experience from the highest level of our government, to prepare political science, and prelaw students for careers in politics. I suspect that any college would jump at the opportunity to have an experienced congressman teach a class about their life in politics. What an advantage it would be for future politicians to learn the ways to avoid being compromised, rather than trying to navigate these rocky shores in gale-force winds. What about doing away with the rocky shores and the gale force winds and teaching how to avoid falling back into these dangerous, stormy conditions. Looking at this as your next important step in life I urge that all congressmen with more than twelve years in office that recognize the need to pass down a fiscally sound federal government to well-prepared future politicians, get behind this full package, to make it happen. And support a retro-active term limits bill limiting the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives to a maximum of twelve years, as a part of this package. The US House of Representatives will serve a maximum of six, two-year terms in office, during their sixth or final term they will not be able to run for public office at any level. The US Senate will serve a maximum of two, six-year terms in office, during their second or final term in office they will not be able to run for public office at any level. These term limits are retro-active and all seats in the US Senate and all seats in the US House of Representatives that will be vacated as a result of this retro-active term limits law, will be filled by someone else following the next scheduled election. In recognition of the need for mature, experienced candidates in these high offices, there will be a minimum age limit of fifty for future candidates included in this bill that will not affect present underage members until they come up for re-election. With the increased responsibility at the county level, young political science majors and young lawyers with political ambitions should be encouraged to begin their political careers in county government working their way up through the state to the federal level. All county, state and federal employees, whether elected, appointed or hired must be required to wear body-cams with audio, 24/7 to ensure that the decisions they make and the words they speak are their own and not a programmed response. The winds of change are blowing, and Congress knows how great the need for change is better than anyone else. Congress has the power to order the moles from their holes! Do you in the Congress of the United States of America have the fortitude, the strength of mind that enables one to endure adversity with courage, to weather the storm that will come upon us when we stand up to the entire secret intelligence community. We know they have compromising information on you, but we also know that you were coerced to do things that you wish you had never done. Therefore, we forgive you and ask you now, to grant all elected officials from county, state and federal government immunity from past crimes and make it federal law that all elected officials wear

body-cams 24/7 while holding public office. Order all American citizens home from abroad to provide cover for the men and women of the intelligence community that will make the effort to comply with the order for all intelligence agents to return state-side and file reports on their career and recommendations on how to proceed in a transparent world committed to the use of overt security and the end of covert security. Resolve yourselves to indict and imprison those that will make a fight of it. **This battle must be fought now**, while we still have our constitution and the rule of law and young and old who are waking up to the truth of how we have been victimized. **The youth of today will be the incorruptible adults of the future** because they know how they have been victimized and will be highly motivated to prevent a return to secrecy and the corruption that comes with it. But it is up to those of us over 35 or 40 to stand tall and lead this fight. **Determined that this fight is for the United States Constitution** and that no changes are needed to this document because our Founding Fathers were aware of the pitfalls of secrecy in government and they provided no avenue for the protection of secrecy in government, the right to privacy in ones' home, yes and communications, please. We are not asking that elected officials share the 24/7 recordings of body-cams with the public all the time, only that they be available to you to protect yourself and that you only live-stream when acting in your official capacity as a public servant. The remainder of the recordings would only be made available to the public if the need arises during a trial, the same as the proposed telecommunications warrant, a far higher standard than FISA. This will likely prove more useful in protecting yourself from being compromised than being used to protect the public from you. Sad, sad Americans not fully programmed enough to survive the **Chinese Nazi-communist** purge but too programmed to try to stop it. Trump has done some things that if we built on them we could turn this whole thing around. He told European countries they are going to have to do more to defend their countries. We need to concentrate on stabilizing Israel, Iraq, Afghanistan and Venezuela and tell the rest of the world there will be no more foreign aid until we pay off our own debt. We should promise to aid only democracies in the future and promise countries like Greece that when we have paid our debt we will assist you in paying your debt if you are using enhanced body-cams to deprogram democratic leaders. We are a democracy and we must make a commitment to democracy and engage in promoting democratic republics based on the rule of law. Call on all dictatorships, whether they are monarchies or communist to adopt these enhanced body-cams to put an end to this history of fanatical control through programming. Xi and Kim, no matter how thorough their programming since birth still have that innate saving grace that calls out for controlling themselves, as opposed to being controlled by others. China, Russia, North Korea, Saudi Arabia and all other non-democratic countries will find their own way to democracy if we take these simple steps to sure-up our own democracy and sure-up failing democracies and stabilize and promote democracies where we have been drawn into conflict. Trump has been exposed to the two groups that display tyrannical behavior of the slave-ship captain retired to his plantation of slaves for twenty years, that is television directors and master chefs and the republican party

recognized that by putting people like Mike Pence, John Kelly and Mike Pompeo in his face, they could control him, but his programming is not as focused on Alt-right politics as Pence is. We must wake-up and recognize the golden opportunity we have with Donald Trump being president of the United States of America. This man is truly a non-racist moderate that is willing to rule by consensus, but the republican party has not allowed this man to do anything he set out to do.

What ignited the character assassination that began 1987? It seems kind of strange now, but the petition I wrote in 1984 was about building two border fences along the Mexican border about 200 yards from each other with a two-lane road running down the middle. The outer fence would be 12ft high, easy to get over but with motion sensors, so the Border Patrol could move in before they could get over the taller, more difficult to cross second fence. *I wasn't interested in deporting anyone.* I wanted the two fences to swing north around Big Bend National Park and build a vetting center there and let the people have a neutral zone while finding a place for them and making most of them citizens in about a six-month period. When anyone was refused they didn't have to go back, I thought the Big Bend could hold a small town of those denied entry that stayed but most would be in transition. I've since found that Big Bend is a pretty rare and special environment. Seeing as how that was 30 years ago, I've had a lot of time to mull this over. And I saw in the news, that the towns east of Big Bend don't want to change the way it is because their economy depends on the workers that cross the border every day. We do need powerfully strong borders to defend our country against terrorism with an entirely overt strategy.

Starting out west, I propose that we build a three-lane border bridge (the symbolic wall), that runs along the top of a hundred or more check points, however many are needed to keep traffic moving, so every vehicle can be thoroughly inspected from end to end removing everything inside a tractor-trailer, family car or FedEx truck, so no-one has to wait very long in the hot sun. If the four people that work in a check point are not needed they hop in a Humvee and head east into the mountains on patrol. If they are needed they're just called back in. When you drive off the top of the wall the road moves a hundred yards from the border with the low sensor fence on the border and the 30ft tall see through fence 100yds north of the three-lane road. I propose that these two fences and the three-lane continue, uninterrupted from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean. With the 12ft fence being about 100yds from the floodplain of the Rio Grande when the fences get to where the Rio Grande runs along the border. South of Laredo, about half way to Roma, I propose that the border fences and three-lane turn east toward the Gulf with fences only seventy-five yards apart with road in the center, running just north of Roma and the rest of the border cities.

Trump is right to put the National Guard on the border, but I believe California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas need to have border crossings onto federal land that are designated welcoming centers where the vetting process can begin with full transparency. Lukeville, Arizona

is surrounded by Forest Service property and would be a good place to start handing out yurts and setting up KOA type, campgrounds with security fences set back at least 3 miles from the area being used for camping. The vetting process should begin as soon as an immigrant meets Border Patrol. The immigrant caravan should be directed to come here. We should be welcoming everyone that wants to come to our country. We need immigration to supply the needs of science, engineering and technology.

When the full effect of the increased overt security takes place Homeland Security and Immigration and Customs Enforcement will be able to be totally focused on the borders and all the other intelligence agencies will be able to be focused outside of the borders, but full disclosure will be mandatory for the continued existence of the agency. If we get our own house in order, we will have a better chance of finding solutions to the more difficult problems in bringing about peace in a very dangerous world. In Venezuela, right here in South America, the people are being starved to death, talk about a slow agonizing death. We need to make better use of the International Criminal Court to solve these problems. We can get warrants for the arrest of President Nicolas Maduro for “trying to eviscerate Venezuela’s democratic institutions and establish one-man rule” and creating an emergency humanitarian crisis. And for his vice president and the rest of the alleged criminals currently wanted by our justice department for their various crimes. This should be brought before the International Criminal Court by the authority of the “Organization of American States” with the help of Secretary General Luis Almagro. [United States and the International Criminal Court](#) From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia “The [Congressional Research Service's](#) Report for Congress states the ICC is not “an instrumentality of the U.S.”.^[53] Therefore, it does not threaten to supplant the Constitutional authority of the U.S. Supreme Court.”

- 1) Place several aircraft carriers off the coast of Venezuela right here in the Gulf of Mexico.
- 2) Begin loading container ships with food from Galveston to Miami.
- 3) Send a dozen military jets to every major airport in Venezuela from the mainland.
- 4) Bring troop carriers ashore in every port food is being brought to.
- 5) Arrange with mayors in every town for places to distribute the food.
- 6) Put a dozen troops at each distribution point.
- 7) Have a troop carrier at the front and rear of every convoy.
- 8) Use Airforce 1 to transport Secretary General Luis Almagro to the capitol to serve the warrant and make the arrest of President Nicolas Maduro, his vice president and the other criminals currently wanted for crimes by our justice department.
- 9) Transport Nicolas Maduro, and all the rest to The Hague in the Netherlands. This is the way to handle Assad in Syria, it wouldn’t be as easy to intimidate our way in, but we cannot work with his regime. His regime is the problem. He has bombed his own people. He has caused millions of his own people to flee across the border causing a humanitarian crisis.

Why Nicolas Maduro Of Venezuela May Wish He Lost The Presidential Election

MAY 25, 2018 [The Little Black Book of Billionaire Secrets](#) Kenneth Rapoza

It's coming to a close, fans of the Bolivar Republic. This sad story in Caracas is unsustainable and this weekend's election showed either people like 10,000% inflation or the Socialists United (PSUV) need to squash opposition to remain in power. It's probably the latter. The Venezuela oil economy that made PSUV powerful and made Venezuela one of the richest countries south of Texas is on its last legs. It's not because of Washington, as PSUV's novel writers like to say. It is because of the government leadership.

With sanctions in place due to Maduro basically banning all serious contenders from running for the presidency, a slight to the community of democratic nations in the hemisphere, it is more certain than ever that Venezuelan oil major PdVSA will get sucked deeper into this political black hole. A Maduro win is potentially a crushing defeat for PdVSA. Ironically, a Maduro win may also ultimately be bad for Maduro himself. He needs a miracle to make it through his next term. Even a full-on dictatorship won't save the Venezuelan president. "If we assume that the incompetent economic team cannot insulate PdVSA cashflow with U.S. still the most important paying customer, then this should further aggravate cashflow stress...and it is not about having sufficient funds to pay bond investors," says Siobhan Morden, managing director for Nomura Securities in New York. "It is rather that there are sufficient funds left to pay off corrupt officials and the military, to sustain support for Maduro," she says.

There is already dissent in the military among the rank and file. The U.S. has banned numerous transactions with Venezuela. It is also making it harder to move money through the financial system. Maduro's foray into cryptocurrency, launching its petro coin, is not going to save it. So, the thinking goes that cashflow stress at PdVSA, the PSUV ATM machine, undermines Maduro. Nomura predicts trade sector sanctions against Venezuela, with an incremental approach that preserves reputational costs and future leverage for an economy that is already entering the terminal phase of collapse in oil production capacity. "It will become increasingly difficult for a global integrated oil company to function within the constraints of international isolation," Morden says. "Especially for a government that cannot effectively insulate commercial and financial flows from the legal threats of U.S. sanctions and bondholder litigation."

Maduro sees himself as carrying on Hugo Chavez's legacy. He is fighting the good fight against Yankee imperialists and their like-minded capitalists in the Venezuelan business class. These are PSUV's natural enemies. It was Chavez who first expanded the powers of the presidency by changing the constitution to allow him to run for another term. He also removed one chamber of Congress, similar to what Maduro did years later when he cut the National Assembly off at the knees and created his Chamber of Yes-men, known as the Constituent Assembly. In 2004, Chavez effectively took control of the Supreme Court by expanding its size and appointing 12 justices. The court is 100% PSUV. In 2009, Chavez led a successful referendum ending presidential term limits. Maduro can run for ever. But he will not. Oil accounts for about 95% of Venezuela's export earnings and 25% of its gross domestic product. PdVSA controls all the country's oil exploration, production, and exportation. PdVSA is going broke. They are not investing in oil production. One would think that if low oil prices was Venezuela's problem, as Maduro tells his base, then a 100% increase in price from \$30 a barrel just three years ago, to \$70 today would signal a return to the good ole days. As reality would have it, Venezuela has only gotten worse even as oil prices haven risen. And so, as PdVSA runs out of money in its ATM to pay off people in the military and within the political apparatus to play along, one wonders what happens when the money dries up?

It is drying up. The weekend elections further increase the trend of Venezuela's isolation from Latin America, let alone the U.S. Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Colombia, Honduras, Costa Rica and Guatemala all took diplomatic measures on recalling their ambassadors. They think the election was a sham. Washington retaliated post-election with more

financial sector sanctions making it impossible for Venezuela to raise funds in its most reliable market: the U.S. Tighter sanctions will further compromise PdVSA and that ultimately forces some sort of regime change in Caracas.

PENCE CALLS ON LATIN AMERICA TO JOIN US IN ISOLATING VENEZUELA, SUSPEND

ELECTION BY FRANCO ORDOÑEZ FORDONEZ@MCCLATCHYDC.COM MAY 07, 2018

... 'Trump's [aides have drawn up](#) outlines of available economic and individual sanctions meant to strangle Venezuela's economy and force a change. **But the administration, so far, has stopped short of applying sanctions on Venezuela's precious oil, which could starve the oil-dependent Caracas government of desperately needed cash.** U.S. Ambassador Michael Kozak, of the State Department's bureau of democracy, human rights and labor told McClatchy that the administration's goal is to punish the wrongdoers in the regime, not the Venezuelan people. "The effort is to try to put the pressure on the people who are responsible for the disaster that they have made in Venezuela, not to exacerbate the disaster for the innocent people in the country," Kozak said. He emphasized Monday that a secure hemisphere is important for everyone in the region. Those who supported freedom, he said, need to take bolder action. "We must do this because it's right," Pence said. "The people of Venezuela deserve democracy."

Donald Trump is not running anything, Mike Pence usurped power from the president before he took office. When the president has said or done anything on his own it has been a positive, but John Kelly and Mike Pence have the power to control what comes out of his mouth, whether he has changed his mind or not. If Pence wanted democracy for the people of Venezuela they would have been applying sanctions to their oil over a year ago and Maduro would be out by now. Pence has been groomed to be the Alt-Right leader of the American Nazi Party and he and Mike Pompeo and the rest of the Alt-Right imagine themselves ending democracy in the United States of America before another presidential election in this country. Keep being afraid to organize an effort to force an official investigation of the of the crimes committed on 9/11/2001 to save those who are dear to you that the perpetrators of 9/11 have threatened and watch them die because you didn't. Organize it and keep it on the county level just as this document prescribes and you have a chance. The republican party is not made up entirely of the Alt-Right. I believe the majority in Congress want to do away with secrecy in our government, but their hands are tied by compromising information held by the CIA and the FBI. They couldn't expect to grant themselves immunity, so they can act, it wouldn't work. This move must come from the people, as an offer, in exchange for the end of secrecy and decentralizing the federal government.

Who is responsible for oil prices going up to \$100.00/bl? Will we buy oil from Maduro at \$90.00 or \$95.00/bl? What will that mean to the future of the dictator, Maduro?

VENEZUELA'S ECONOMIC CRISIS DEEPENS AS U.S. STICKS WITH SANCTIONS THAT HIT ORDINARY PEOPLE HARDEST

THINKPROGRESS.ORG 12/8/2017

"... So, the question remains: **Other than issuing sanctions** that so far have only hurt ordinary people and failed to bring about change, **what can the Trump administration do**

to turn things around in Venezuela?” ... “The sanctions that the U.S. has imposed are basically banning any American organization from negotiating with the government. So, if the government is willing to negotiate — which is a big *if* — this is the only point of leverage. The U.S. could really pressure the Venezuelan government, saying ‘Look, we are willing to work on the sanctions with you if you’re willing to go through the national assembly, but on the condition that you re-do the electoral council, to commit to elections,’ to all these things,” said Bahar. This, he admits, is highly unlikely. As it stands, Bahar said there are three likely outcomes, with them hinging on the [opposition and the government to manage to negotiate](#) an agreement on next year’s presidential election. A “good outcome” said Bahar, is that negotiations are reached and that next year’s elections will be fair. If talks fall apart and the elections still take place with Maduro winning in a “highly unfair” poll, that would be a “bad outcome.” “With that, I see things getting worse and worse ... I see a scenario in which Venezuela lives with a dictatorship for decades,” said Bahar. The third possibility, he said, might be a military coup, (FORGET ABOUT IT)

As Venezuela disintegrates, Maduro consolidates power

Washington Post 12/9/2017 By Rachele Krygier and [Anthony Faiola](#)

VENEZUELA: OPPOSITION TO BE BARRED FROM NEXT ELECTION

12/10/2017 VENEZUELA'S LEADING OPPOSITION PARTIES CANNOT TAKE PART IN NEXT YEAR'S PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BECAUSE THEY DID NOT TAKE PART IN SUNDAY'S LOCAL VOTING, PRESIDENT NICOLAS MADURO SAYS, IN A MOVE SET TO FURTHER CONSOLIDATE HIS GRIP ON POWER.

Getting back to the main objective of this project:

I was taught this strategy, that is based on the writings of the Founding Fathers, 40 years ago by a professor at WVU. He had concluded that politicians would never enact this strategy on their own. He believed it would only happen when the national debt reached a critical point and even then, only by enormous peaceful pressure from the people. It can happen, but it won't without a tidal wave of public support. I am painstakingly sending this to every county in the USA, County Commissioners, Treasurers, and Assessors requesting that they do analysis of how this would play out in their county and asking that they share the results with the citizens of their county. I believe sharing this information with your people will get them firmly behind it. This is how we can get this done. By doing the analysis on the county level, governors will want to know the results of the analysis on the state level. When that happens there will be growing pressure for analysis on the federal level. Don't assume this won't work. Don't remain uninformed, find out the answers by doing the analysis. I'm not asking you to send me residents voter registration information. You should have enough information available to you to get a pretty good idea of what a 15% income tax would bring in, share this information with the residents of your county. If you get an idea of what a 15% income tax would be to your county and you don't believe it will be enough, then take a look at the ways this system proposes to assist your county. West Virginia

may have the highest ratio of counties that will struggle to counties that will be paying 15% to the state to assist those counties. But I am sure that West Virginia would do very well. By building large recycling plants, struggling WV counties could serve the needs of several east coast states. The cheap raw materials that this would make available can be used to tremendous advantage. By making CNC equipment and 3D printers available to everyone that wants to experiment with making things, we can stimulate a new era of invention. I can't do the analysis for the state or any of the counties. Most states would be busting their buttons with state pride at the wealth this would bring. If the federal government didn't let any of the richest corporations off scot-free or the rich and powerful "non-profit organizations" or the rich and powerful "tax-free charities" i.e. tax havens for the rich and powerful, get away without paying a measly 15%, the federal government could increase the military budget and pay off this obscene debt. This is truly a tax overhaul with incredible advantages built in. The simplicity facilitates a reasonable yet highly profitable price control, any company that claims they must raise the price of a product more than double what it cost them to put the product on the shelf, to make a tidy profit, is simply being greedy. Any politician that claims to be a conservative that doesn't agree that anything more than a 100% markup is taking advantage of the consumer is adhering to a Victorian definition of being a conservative which is so defined for the sole purpose of justifying the excesses of a monarchy. Claw your way out of that box and allow common-sense to define what it means to be a conservative or admit that you're a robot. We are not a monarchy and we can no longer rely on the modest integrity of merchants and "Big Pharma" to be reasonable about the pricing of products.

FREEDOM; Nothing Grows Without IT!

The Twenty Trillion Six Hundred Billion Dollar National Debt, (\$20,600,000,000,000.00) is the reason I wrote this paper. I am not interested in recognition for these ideas, for these ideas are not my own. County government with no smaller governing entities was the original plan of the geniuses of governing that were [our Founding Fathers](#). Our constitution has been with us for over 240 years, we are strong and anyone who thinks it can be done better should look around. This is the most dynamic democratic republic of all time. We are the strongest country in the world, our strength is a direct result of the strength of our constitution. It is our constitution that provides the ability to make changes in the way we do things to solve the problems we face. Our Founding Fathers were intense scholars of thousands of years of governing and the absolute pinnacle of democratic governing, [the United States Constitution](#) is the result. They knew that to run a large country, even one only as large as the original thirteen colonies from a central location, is so inefficient that enormous debt is virtually unavoidable. They accepted that, for a period, it would be best to have a strong central government to become strong enough militarily to survive the challenges that most certainly lay ahead. We now are faced with a debt our Founding Fathers could never have imagined possible, let alone that we could still be soldiering

on under such a burden, but we cannot continue down this road. We must accept the blueprint our Founding Fathers left for us, as the way to go when the burden of a centralized government became too much to sustain. We have gained the strength needed to be the leaders of the free world. We must stand together now in solemn peaceful unity at courthouses across the country taking precautions to prevent any violence and present the solution left to us as our birthright by our Founding Fathers.

FREEDOM; NOTHING GROWS WITHOUT IT!

AWAITING FARM BOY CO-OP & FEED CO. CAPS OK FOR USE

ROBERT JAMES CASEY

134 CREEK RD.

MOATSVILLE, WV 26405

PH.304-457-1995

This Was as far as I intended to go with this, for Anthony Borges' bravery in the face of near certain death now I say to all adults, "Let's Role!"

WHO IS ANTHONY BORGES? HEROIC TEEN SHOT FIVE TIMES SHIELDING FRIENDS FROM FLORIDA GUNMAN BY [HARRIET SINCLAIR](#) ON 2/19/18

From here on, this document is a work in progress that I will be attempting to clarify and polish my presentation. I just got my first computer, this Dell laptop, November 16, 2016 and it has opened the floodgates of news, knowledge and expression. I was deeply interested in the JFK assassination until I read the book "Double Cross" by Chuck Giancana in '96. I felt this was it, this is what happened. Until recently, I felt there was only one troublesome question about the "grassy knoll" explanation, that was the way poor John's head reacted to the bullet that blew his brains out. Recently I saw evidence of the shooter in the sewer and that was the last perplexing problem for me. Fast-forward to 9/11/2001, I had just experienced a total disenchantment with sports, football and NASCAR, the whole "just like it was choreographed" took on a whole new meaning, the way the Rams won the Super Bowl. And the way my driver, Sterling Marlin, went down on his best shot at winning it all, just left me with no interest. The way George W. stole the election had made a skeptic of me. Looking back, my first impressions of 9/11 were that terrorists practiced flying planes in Florida, under the watchful eye of Governor Jeb, and poor Todd Beamer and the men who successfully rescued that hi-jacked plane only to have George W. order it shot down so there would be no surviving hi-jackers. The total collapse of the towers, that was just so shocking that, I was just in shock. The Pentagon, I assumed there were special forces running up and down the halls making sure that all the targets were dead. I was certain that a truck blowing up outside of a building like poor Timothy McVeigh was programmed to do, would only be able to break the glass out of the windows. I assumed he was programmed by elements of the military and Timothy McNichols was likely assigned to be his handler.

Timothy McVeigh chose the poem Invictus, which means "Unconquerable" in Latin, to be his final statement. He handed a handwritten copy of William Ernest Henley's poem to the prison warden, Harley Lappin, just before his death. (Invincible)

Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the Pit from pole to pole,

I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.

In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced nor cried aloud.
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody, but unbowed.

Beyond this place of wrath and tears
Looms but the Horror of the shade,
And yet the menace of the years
Finds, and shall find, me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate:
I am the captain of my soul.

This is the strength of a young man facing Capital Punishment, but let us not forget, there is a fate worse than death. PFC Bradley Manning is attempting to escape the horrifying fate bestowed upon him by the criminals at Fort Leavenworth. This brings new meaning to a Beatles song when I think of Edward Snowden, "You don't know how lucky you are boy, to be back, to be back in the USSR boy." You're lucky you still are a boy. Count your blessings. **The ACLU took the case of the judge that jumped on top of a defendant giving testimony and savagely bit the defendant on the nose and won the case with the defense that it was an accident.** Defending the judge in this case is in direct conflict with the mission statement of the ACLU. The ACLU is condoning the horrifying result of PFC Bradley Manning's incarceration in the infamous prison at Fort Leavenworth Kansas with this call for transgender treatment. If you're thinking about the story his sister tells about him growing up with questions of sexuality, you might give some thought to how self-serving this scenario is to the powerful animals in the FBI, CIA and the descendants of the Nazi doctors brought here after WWII to continue performing their sex change operations on new born babies to the delight of J. Edgar Hoover. The true mission of the FBI was etched in stone by J. Edgar Hoover, who was director of the agency for an unprecedented fifty years. Hoover held that office for so long because he used the FBI to gather compromising information on the members of Congress and privately slap them in the face with the incriminating information any time one of them made a peep about replacing him. What is the ACLU's transgender treatment? **Programming the victims to accept their fate!**

Bradley Manning's suicide attempt leads to new charges as ACLU calls for transgender treatment

7/29/2016 by Butter Bracco US News

Whistleblower/traitor Chelsea Manning, who is known to Americans as Bradley Manning, is serving out his 35-year sentence for disclosing US secrets at Fort Leavenworth prison, but now faces new

charges related to a July 5 suicide attempt. On Thursday, Manning received an Army charge sheet informing her that she is under investigation for “resisting the force cell move team,” “prohibited property,” and “conduct which threatens [life],” the document released by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) reads. If convicted, Manning faces indefinite solitary confinement.

Manning was rushed to the hospital on July 5, following a suicide attempt. The following week, Manning confirmed through an attorney statement that she had attempted to end her own life. “I am okay. I’m glad to be alive. Thank you all for your love. I will get through this,” Manning tweeted July 11.

Identifying as a transgender, Manning wants to be moved away from the all-male population, claiming that this confinement has a negative effect on Manning’s mental health, battling depression, according to the ACLU. “The government has long been aware of Chelsea’s distress associated with the denial of medical care related to her gender transition and yet delayed and denied the treatment recognized as necessary,” said ACLU Staff Attorney Chase Strangio. “Now, while Chelsea is suffering the darkest depression she has experienced since her arrest, the government is taking actions to punish her for that pain.”

Besides the new charges, the ACLU says the Army is continuing to deny the inmate access to “basic health care,” and provided only “inadequate” medical treatment after her suicide attempt. Manning was sentenced to 35 years in 2013 after being found guilty of 20 charges by court-martial, including six under the Espionage Act of 1917 for “whistleblowing on war crimes” committed by the US military in Iraq and Afghanistan – all of which involved revealing US secrets and endangering other soldiers.

What about Reality Winner? This is all I got. Where has she been for nearly a year?

ACCUSED LEAKER REALITY WINNER IS SCARED AFTER ARREST, MOM SAYS

By [Madison Park](#), CNN, June 7, 2017

(CNN) Armed FBI agents surrounded Reality Winner as she walked into her Georgia home after a trip to the grocery store. “She said ... she was very scared,” her mother, Billie Winner-Davis, told CNN’s Anderson Cooper on Tuesday night. “They took her by surprise. She was not expecting any of this.”

The 25-year-old [federal contractor was arrested Saturday and stands charged with leaking classified information](#) to a media outlet. She faces up to 10 years in prison. Before her arrest, the Texas-raised linguist and Air Force veteran was also known as a yoga instructor and animal lover. Her family knew almost nothing about her work life, they said. “I didn’t know what company she worked for,” Winner-Davis said. “I don’t know what she did when she went to work.”

Her daughter called her Saturday to say she was in trouble. Winner-Davis and her husband said they have spoken to Winner by telephone since her arrest and saw her briefly at a hearing Monday. Winner, a contractor with Pluribus International Corp., had been assigned to a US government agency facility in Augusta, Georgia, since February 13. She had top secret security clearance. She is accused of leaking classified information, used as the basis for an [article published](#) Monday by The Intercept, detailing a classified National Security Agency memo. The NSA report, dated May 5, provides details of a 2016 Russian cyberattack on a US voting software supplier, though there is no evidence the hack affected any votes. Prosecutors said when confronted with the allegations, Winner admitted to leaking the classified document intentionally.

“She was afraid she was going to disappear, that they were going to make her disappear. And she felt like she needed to give them what they were asking for at the time,” Winner-Davis said.

‘She served her country’

Winner served in the Air Force from December 2010 to 2016. Her rank was senior airman, and her last duty title was [cryptologic language analyst](#), according to the Air Force. Her mother said she speaks Pashto, Farsi and Dari.

Winner received the Air Force Commendation Medal in 2016, which is for members who have [“distinguished themselves by meritorious achievement and service.”](#) She “provided over 1,900 hours of enemy intelligence exploitation and assisted in geolocating 120 enemy combatants,” the award said.

"She served her country, she is a veteran," her stepfather, Gary Davis, told Cooper. "She's a patriot, and to see her maligned and slandered in the media is very disheartening."

'I'm terrified for her right now'

Reality Winner's parents say she's a patriot. She removed the intelligence reporting from her office and mailed it from Augusta, according to the affidavit in support of her arrest. Her court-appointed attorney, Titus Nichols, cast doubt on the government's side of the story. As for her purported confession, he said, "The bigger issue is: Was my client interrogated without her attorney?" Winner is set to go before US Magistrate Judge Brian Epps for a detention hearing Thursday in Augusta, Nichols said. The judge will determine whether to release her on bond. Winner did not enter a plea in her initial appearance Monday. Winner-Davis told Cooper on Tuesday that if her daughter did what she's accused of, "I know that she's ready to pay the price. "My biggest fear in all of this is that she's not going to get a fair trial," the mother said. "She's going to be made an example of." She added: "I'm terrified for her right now because of the news, the climate, the social media."

Mom: She never praised past leakers

On Twitter, Winner posted about leaks and regularly took to [social media to blast President Donald Trump](#), though her Twitter activity dropped off significantly after she began working for Pluribus in February. Winner posted under a pseudonym, Sara Winners, but didn't seem concerned with concealing her identity, using a photo of herself as a profile picture and posting a selfie in February. [Her attorney told CNN he was unable to confirm that the Twitter account was Winner's](#). On Instagram, where she used the name @Reezlie, same as her Twitter handle, she mostly posted selfies from the gym or photos of food.

Winner-Davis said her daughter wasn't especially political and had never praised past leakers such as Edward Snowden to her. But on Twitter Winner followed Snowden, WikiLeaks, several accounts with links to the hacking collective, Anonymous, and several "alt" government agency accounts that became popular after Trump's inauguration. Many of the accounts claim to be run by agency employees unhappy with Trump. "She's never ever given me any kind of indication that she was in favor of that at all," her mother said. "I don't know how to explain it." The end.

I'm certain the 9/11 Truth Movement has a solid case already. I'm telling you to do something, if you won't follow me, find someone you will. The CIA is all over the mainstream media, as far as I know, that is strictly against the law. I'm sure some of our elected officials have committed such hideous crimes against children that we would be better off never knowing about them, much less, forgiving them. I am a Christian, but I do not believe any man is a God. And I believe Jesus Christ, in His own words went on record, disclaiming any notion that He was God. He said, "I am a child of God, just as all men are the children of God.". Maybe no one believes that the public could accomplish anything by standing up as one and saying to all elected officials "We forgive you and we offer you immunity for all of your past crimes in exchange for a future in which our leaders are not compromised, a full accounting of the demands in this document and for an official investigation into the crimes committed on 9/11/2001." [If not this strategy, then what others have you been offered?](#)

The records of the FBI's crimes are contained in the FBI files. Stand as one "Calling out the truth!" Look at what the heroes standing up to the criminals that commit their crimes in secrecy are suffering, and the courage it takes to stand alone. I am begging you, "We the People" to find the courage to organize peaceful resistance to the criminals in an effort to release the heroes and bring them home. If you will not follow me, for God's sake find someone to follow so we can catch this wave of activism and ride it to a better place. I believe there is no better place than fulfilling the writings of the [Founding Fathers](#). The main tenet of the majority of these men was the necessity of a decentralized government. BUT they recognized the more pressing need of building a strong military to survive the challenges. We face incredible challenges to the rule of law and we must rise to the challenge. I believe there is only one path to something better than we have now and that path is defending our Constitution and removing the scab of secrecy from the multitude of wounds, so they can begin to heal. I stand willing to look death in the face, I pray only that the scriptures be fulfilled and that if I must suffer and die for the words I write, that there is no amount of suffering that I cannot endure with dignity. Perhaps I am simply doomed to be ignored. I hope not. "I hope you dance."
[Or surf.](#)

Mourning fields of amber grain
Weathered faces lined in pain
Are soothed beneath the artist's loving hands.

Now I understand what you tried to say to me
And how you suffered for your sanity
And how you tried to set them free.
They would not listen
They did not know how
Perhaps they'll listen now.
"Vincent" by Paul Grogan

As your children's future fades to black
And the status quo stabs us in the back
All that we see
Depends upon our point of view
What will it be
Now that it's all up to you
The middle aged and older too!
To fight the good fight
The final battle
To shine a bright light
On the last sabers rattle.

Wikipedia

The **September 11 attacks** (also referred to as **9/11**)^[a] were a series of four coordinated terrorist attacks by the Islamic terrorist group al-Qaeda on the United States on the morning of Tuesday, September 11, 2001. The attacks killed 2,996 people, injured over 6,000 others, and caused at least \$10 billion in infrastructure and property damage.^{[2][3]}

Four passenger airliners operated by two major U.S. passenger air carriers (United Airlines and American Airlines) – all of which departed from airports in the northeastern United States bound for California – were hijacked by 19 al-Qaeda terrorists. Two of the planes, American Airlines Flight 11 and United Airlines Flight 175, were crashed into the North and South towers, respectively, of the World Trade Center complex in New York City. Within an hour and 42 minutes, both 110-story towers collapsed, with debris and the resulting fires causing partial or complete collapse of all other buildings in the World Trade Center complex, including the 47-story 7 World Trade Center tower, as well as significant damage to ten other large surrounding structures. A third plane, American Airlines Flight 77, was crashed into the Pentagon (the headquarters of the United States Department of Defense) in Arlington County, Virginia, leading to a partial collapse of the building's western side. The fourth plane, United Airlines Flight 93, was initially steered toward Washington, D.C., but crashed into a field in Stonycreek Township near Shanksville, Pennsylvania, after its passengers tried to overcome the hijackers. 9/11 was the single deadliest incident for firefighters and law enforcement officers^[4] in the history of the United States, with 343 and 72 killed respectively.

Suspicion quickly fell on al-Qaeda. The United States responded by launching the War on Terror and invading Afghanistan to depose the Taliban, which had harbored al-Qaeda. Many countries strengthened their anti-terrorism legislation and expanded the powers of law enforcement and intelligence agencies to prevent terrorist attacks. Although al-Qaeda's leader, Osama bin Laden, initially denied any involvement, in 2004 he claimed responsibility for the attacks.^[5] Al-Qaeda and bin Laden cited U.S. support of Israel, the presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, and sanctions against Iraq as motives. After evading capture for almost a decade, Osama bin Laden was located and killed in Pakistan by SEAL Team Six of the U.S. Navy in May 2011.

The destruction of the World Trade Center and nearby infrastructure caused serious damage to the economy of Lower Manhattan and had a significant effect on global markets, resulting in the closing of Wall Street until September 17 and the civilian airspace in the U.S. and Canada until September 13. Many closings, evacuations, and cancellations followed, out of respect or fear of further

attacks. Cleanup of the [World Trade Center site](#) was completed in May 2002, and the Pentagon was repaired within a year. On November 18, 2006, [construction of One World Trade Center](#) began at the World Trade Center site. The building was officially opened on November 3, 2014.^{[5][6]} Numerous [memorials](#) have been constructed, including the [National September 11 Memorial & Museum](#) in New York City, the [Pentagon Memorial](#) in Arlington County, Virginia, and the [Flight 93 National Memorial](#) in a field in Stonycreek Township near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Using planes as missiles

Immediately following the attacks, President [George W. Bush](#) stated that: "Nobody in our government at least, and I don't think the prior government, could envisage flying air planes into buildings" and [National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice](#) claimed: "no-one could have predicted that they would try to use an airplane as a missile". An Air Force general called the attack: "something we had never seen before, something we had never even thought of."^[1] A few days after the attacks, FBI Director [Robert Mueller](#) announced: "There were no warning signs that I'm aware of that would indicate this type of operation in the country."^[2] However, Mueller noted that an FBI agent in Minneapolis said [Moussaoui](#) might be "that type of person that could fly something into the World Trade Center."^[3] Mueller said this warning should have been followed more vigorously.

Some mainstream media reports have conflicted with these statements, claiming that the FBI, CIA and Executive Branch^[4] knew of the threat of planes being used as missiles as early as 1995, following the foiling of the [Bojinka Plot](#). In September 2002, one year after the 9/11 attacks, [The Chicago Sun-Times](#) reported that:

"The FBI had advance indications of plans to hijack U.S. airliners and use them as weapons, but neither acted on them nor distributed the intelligence to local police agencies. From the moment of the September 11 attacks, all high-ranking federal officials insisted that the terrorists' method of operation surprised them. Many continue to stick to that story. Actually, elements of the suicide hijacking plan were known to the FBI as early as 1995 and, if coupled with current information, might have uncovered the plot."

The book [The Terror Timeline](#) includes numerous articles that are often cited to suggest that the method of flying planes into buildings was known by U.S. officials:^[5] In 1994, there were three examples of failed attempts to deliberately crash planes into buildings, including one where a lone pilot crashed a small plane into the lawn of the [White House](#).^[6]

THE CONSPIRACIES THAT WON'T GO AWAY: BROTHER OF 9/11 VICTIM CLAIM THE US ORCHESTRATED THE ATROCITY AS NEW STUDY SHOWS IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE THAT THE THIRD TOWER COLLAPSED FROM FIRE

Geoff Campbell, 31, was one of 67 Britons killed in the New York 9/11 attacks. His brother refuses to accept the official line and insists there was a cover-up. Matt Campbell will protest outside BBC Broadcasting House on the anniversary. By [Staff](#) September 12, 2017

Next Monday afternoon, Matt Campbell will stand outside BBC Broadcasting House in London's Portland Place, protesting about the killing of his brother, Geoff, and 66 other Britons, in the 9/11 terror attack at the [New York](#) World Trade

Centre. After the horror on September 11, 2001, there was no trace of Geoff. The 31-year-old risk analyst had been attending a conference on the 106th floor in the North Tower, a short stroll from the Manhattan apartment where he lived with his American fiancée, Caroline. **At first, his family clung to the hope he was alive, until one year later fragments of a shoulder blade bearing Geoff's DNA were found among Trade Centre rubble at a landfill site.**

Matt began asking questions. He has not stopped since. He, and others who will be at the BBC protest, refuse to accept the official story about 9/11: that four U.S. airliners were hijacked by Islamist terror chief Osama Bin Laden's pilots. Two were flown into New York's famous Twin Towers, which collapsed.

A third rammed into the U.S. Defence Headquarters at the Pentagon in Washington DC. The last went down in rural Pennsylvania, 150 miles north of the capital, after a tussle between the hijackers and passengers, later portrayed in the Hollywood film *United 93*. Seven hours later, a third tower at the World Trade Centre, [WTC7](#), fell to the ground over seven seconds, even though no plane had hit it. The red building, 100 yards from the 110-storey Twin Towers, was less than half their height at just 47 floors, and few people even know of its existence. It had already been evacuated after the planes had hit the main towers.

In total, 2,977 people died, provoking President Bush to mount the 'War On Terror' that led to the invasion of Iraq, with the UK in tow. Yet as Monday's anniversary approaches, **Matt, a former City worker who is married with three children and lives in Sussex, insists that 9/11 did not happen in the way we have been told and that there has been a huge official cover-up to disguise the truth.** 'There are so many questions that the Americans and the British Establishment refuse to answer,' he says. 'I believe that my brother and thousands of others were murdered on 9/11 and there has been a cover-up. We, as a family, are still overcoming this tragedy, but we will never stop seeking the truth.'

He is not alone in his quest. A survey in U.S. magazine *Live Science* last year revealed that most Americans ([53 per cent](#)) believe the U.S. Government has concealed — and continues to conceal — vital information about the 9/11 attacks. **Crucially, a team of engineers at the University of Alaska concluded this week, after two years of forensic research, that fire could not have caused the collapse of WTC7.** Indeed, though the official story is that WTC7 was weakened by fires caused by debris from the attack, **it's the only steel skyscraper in the world ever to collapse purely as a result of a blaze.**

And a [new book](#) by an academic who has become an authority on 9/11, Professor David Ray Griffin, says that to believe that this building fell to the ground without explosives being involved is asking the public to believe in 'miracles'. Griffin, a retired philosopher at Claremont School of Theology in California, adds in his bestseller [Bush And Cheney: How They Ruined America And The World](#), about the ex-president and his vice-president Dick Cheney: 'There is a growing consensus that 9/11 allowed the U.S. to adopt extreme, unwarranted policies. They include the War On Terror and the attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq as first steps in taking control of the Middle East.'

He, and other 9/11 sceptics such as Matt, have asked if the attack was, in fact, a copy of [Operation Northwoods](#), an aborted plan during John F. Kennedy's presidency to stage terror attacks in America and blame them on Communist Cuba as a pretext for a U.S. invasion to overthrow dictator Fidel Castro. In other words, on that September morning in 2001, did the White House fail to stop — or even fabricate — an outrage against its own civilians so as to provide a pretext for war on Al Qaeda and Osama Bin Laden?

Although there have been countless conspiracy theories about 9/11, the idea that the U.S. Government connived in it still appears utterly implausible and has, of course, been denied by U.S. intelligence services and the White House. Initially — like most people in America and Britain, including Matt Campbell — Professor Griffin dismissed any notion that the attacks were an inside job aimed at triggering the war on terror. It was a year later that

he changed his mind, when he was writing about American imperialism and 9/11 for his latest academic work. As part of his research he had come across a 'timeline' of the day's events based on newspaper and television accounts. It raised several anomalies that caused him to doubt the official version of events. And, however outlandish it seems, his argument bears consideration.

One of the most puzzling anomalies was that none of the hijacked planes was intercepted by fighter jets, even though there would have been plenty of time to do so and it is mandatory procedure in the U.S. if there is any suspicion of an air hijack. In the nine months before 9/11, the procedure had been implemented 67 times in America. Then there were the irregular stock market dealings before the tragedy.

An extremely high volume of 'put options' — bets on the price of shares falling — were purchased for the stock of Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, the international financier that occupied 22 storeys of the World Trade Centre. Even more remarkable was the volume of 'put options' traded on American and United Airlines, which operated the four-aircraft hijacked by the terrorists. On these two airlines, and only these, the level of share trade went up by 1,200 per cent in the three days before the catastrophe. As the shares dropped in response to 9/11 the value of these options multiplied a hundredfold. Someone, somewhere, made \$10 million in profit.

But, of all the conundrums, the most perplexing is how the three World Trade Centre towers fell to the ground. The official version is that the Twin Towers collapsed because their steel columns were melted by the heat from the fuel fires of the two crashed planes. This explanation has been repeated in White House briefings, official inquiries into 9/11, leaks by the U.S. intelligence services and almost every TV documentary on the attack in the U.S. and the UK. However, skeptics say the science does not stand up. They argue that steel does not begin to melt until it reaches around 2,800f, and open fires of jet fuel — such as those in the Twin Towers inferno — cannot burn hotter than 1,700f. Official reports state the steel in the third tower reached a maximum of 1,100f.

Professor Griffin and other skeptics believe the Twin Towers were deliberately blown up. They claim their controversial theory is corroborated by first-hand testimony from firefighters at the scene. In [oral histories](#) of 9/11 by New York Fire Department staff which have been made public, almost a quarter suggest they heard explosions going off before the World Trade Centre towers collapsed. Of the South Tower, firefighter Richard Banaciski said: 'There was just an explosion. It seemed like on television when they blow up these buildings. It seemed like it was going all the way round like a belt . . . all those explosions.' Colleague Kenneth Rogers heard them, too. He said: 'There was an explosion in the South Tower. Floor after floor after floor. One floor under another after another . . . I figured it was a bomb because it looked like a synchronized kind of thing. And Fire Captain Dennis Tardio recalled: 'I hear an explosion and I look up. It is as if the building is being imploded from the top floor down, boom, boom, boom. I stand in amazement. I can't believe what I am seeing. The building is coming down.'

But a more extraordinary challenge to scientific reason would happen on the day of the attacks in respect of the third tower, WTC7, which contained the offices of the secret service, and then mayor Rudy Giuliani's emergency command centre, fitted with bullet- and bomb-resistant windows as well as secure air and water supplies. In 2008, a U.S. Government-ordered report by the prestigious National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) concluded a six-year probe into the WTC7 attack. Bystanders interviewed by U.S. television that day said there were 'bang, bang, bang' sounds before it fell down. Yet NIST insisted there was 'no evidence' of a controlled explosion. The fall was provoked by fires on multiple levels. The heating of floor beams and girders had caused a critical support column to fall, initiating the fire-induced progressive collapse that brought the building down.

This week, eminent Alaska University engineers dismissed this explanation. Dr J. Leroy Hulse, Chair of the university's Civil and Environmental Engineering Department, said: 'Fire did not and could not have caused the failure of this building.' Griffin adds: 'We are led to

believe that for the first time in the known universe, a steel-framed, high-rise building was brought down by fire without the aid of explosives or incendiaries. 'More clearly miraculous was the precise way in which WTC7 collapsed [straight down, with an almost perfectly horizontal roofline] into its own footprint. This is the kind of free-fall implosion that can only be caused by a world-class demolition company.'

But there is another perplexing matter regarding this third building. It concerns the bizarre TV reports in the U.S., and the rest of the world, that it had collapsed when it was clearly still upright — announcements made 23 minutes before it had actually fallen down. One piece of BBC World footage shows a studio anchor talking to news correspondent Jane Standley, who is standing in front of the clearly visible WTC7 tower. The anchor says: 'The 47-storey building, situated very close to the World Trade Centre, has also just collapsed. It seems that this was not the result of a new attack. It was because the building had been weakened during the morning attacks.' Then, oddly, the link to Standley breaks up and is lost. Of course, this may just be a mistake made on one of the most hectic news days ever. Certainly, the BBC seems to think so. In a [statement made in 2007](#), a spokesman said: 'In the chaos and confusion, I am sure we said things which turned out to be untrue or inaccurate, but at the time were based on the best information we had. We no longer have the original tapes of our 9/11 coverage, for reasons of cock-up, not conspiracy.'

This response — and the question of why the BBC announced the fall of WTC7 before it actually happened — has enraged those fighting for the 'truth', such as Matt Campbell. They say, a series of 9/11 documentaries put out by the BBC have not been impartial or scientifically accurate. It is why he, and other Britons who disagree with the official version of 9/11, have chosen to make their protest outside BBC headquarters on Monday.

This unlikely rebel, a trained theoretical physicist, former IT expert in the City, and now a reflexologist, has refused to pay his BBC licence fee for the past four years. He claims: 'The BBC has presented information to the public that breaks its own editorial guidelines. In at least one documentary, it removed the sounds of huge explosions going off in WTC7 moments before its collapse.' 'I think my brother Geoff and many others were murdered in an event that conflicts with what we have been officially told. 'I believe there has been BBC complicity in a deliberate cover-up about how thousands died on that day nearly 16 years ago,' he said yesterday as he braced himself for the sad anniversary.

JEB BUSH'S 9/11 PROBLEM: HUFFMAN AVIATION

To Donald Trump: 9/11 – The Anatomy of a Great Deception

by David Hooper YouTube video that lays out so many facts that it is a solid indictment of George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Jeb Bush, Burt Walker and Marvin Walker attacking the United States of America, i.e. High Treason. It also identifies the CIA working in the main stream media, which is still strictly illegal.

There is only one way to have any chance of freeing our country from the CIA i.e. the Bush family and the FBI, HLS, NSA and the rest of the secret agencies. "We the People" must stand together in peaceful resolution and offer all of Congress and Donald Trump complete immunity and total forgiveness from all previous crimes in exchange for indictments for the arrest of and to be held without bail for "High Treason" for their roles in the attack and coverup of 9/11/2001: George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Robert Mueller, Jeb Bush, Burt Walker and Marvin Bush.

If the public wants the truth about the 2016 presidential election, we must also demand the indictments of James Comey, Mike Pence, the Koch brothers, Robert Mercer, Steve Bannon and Eric Prince for their roles in the conspiracy to get Pence in the White House and elevate him to the presidency by impeaching Trump for collusion.

Trump fired Comey 5/9/2017. What happened that caused the FBI to use Pizzagate to threaten Congress? Something scared the FBI so bad, perhaps Comey new he would be fired.

FBI: Pizzagate Arrests ‘Imminent’ In Washington Pedophile Ring Bust

YourNewsWire.com by Baxter Dmitry, 2/4/2017

An FBI whistleblower has confirmed that 30 politicians and 40 other individuals are to be arrested in Washington D.C. and New York City in connection with the “Pizzagate” pedophile ring, and more suspects are under investigation as the investigation continues “branching out in unexpected directions.”

The insider at the Federal Bureau of Investigation claims that the FBI has just finished (3 pm 2/2/17) submitting paperwork to the Department of Justice in preparation for the “Pizzagate” arrests which will begin as soon as Jeff Sessions is confirmed as Attorney General.

Mr. Sessions has been briefed on the far-reaching investigation and all of the evidence three weeks ago. **Investigators say they have held files on high-ranking politicians for years.** However, they didn’t find a concrete lead until November 2016, when they monitored three suspects after they were allegedly caught using coded language in an internet forum created by the FBI to trap pedophiles. The End. – 2/4/2017 - Particularly advantageous timing to set up Comeys testimony before Congress. **Republicans and democrats,** have a lot to lose if the truth came out of the FBI Files. And the FBI has a lot to lose if the truth comes out about the source of the DNC emails. That is why there was nearly 100% approval for Rod Rosenstein and Robert Mueller. When James Comey delivered his **“veiled threat”** to congress during the senate hearing on 6/8/2017, both sides of the aisle were in jeopardy. This is also the reason the dogs didn’t bark when the cover up of 9/11 began in broad daylight. Same old story, different day.

COLLINS: Did you limit that statement to counterintelligence investigations, or were you talking about any kind of FBI investigation?

COMEY: I didn’t — I didn’t use the term “counterintelligence.” I was speaking to him and briefing him about some salacious and **unverified** material. It was in the context of that that he had a strong and defensive reaction about that not being true. And my reading of it was it was important for me to assure him we were not personally investigating him. And so, the context then was actually narrower, focused on what I had just talked to him about. It was very important because **it was, first, true.** And second, **I was worried very much about being in kind of a — kind of a J. Edgar Hoover-type situation. I didn’t want him thinking that I was briefing him on this to sort of hang it over him in some way.** I was briefing him on it because we were (ph) — had been told by the media it was about to launch. We didn’t want to be keeping that from him. **COMEY:** And if there was some — he needed to know this was being said. But I was very keen not to leave him with an impression that the bureau was trying to do something to him. And so that’s the context in which I said, “Sir, we’re not personally investigating you.”

The FBI already had the “Pizzagate Arrests” hanging over their heads.

If the Seth Rich murder is a conspiracy theory or fake news there sure is a lot of it.

“Truth has power. And if we all gravitate toward similar ideas, maybe we do so because those ideas are true ... written deep within us. And when we hear the truth, even if we don't understand it, we feel that truth resonate within us ... vibrating with our unconscious wisdom. Perhaps the truth is not learned by us, but rather, the truth is re-called ... re-remembered ... re-recognized ... as that which is already inside us.” DAN BROWN, *The Lost Symbol*.

“Peace on this planet will not be forged by military strength. It will be forged by those who come together *despite* their government's differences.” DAN BROWN, *Deception Point*.

Teachings of a nun at St. Andrews Catholic School 50-years ago:

Who is programming you? What are they programming you to do? This paper primarily pertains to what I was taught 40 years ago based on the writings of the Founding Fathers. What I want to cover here pertains to an epiphany I experienced while listening to the Catholic Priest speak during my mothers' funeral that pertains to something I was taught 50 years ago by a Catholic Nun while attending St. Andrews elementary in Roanoke VA. She taught us that Nazi-ism and Communism is the ultimate attempt to divide and conquer because the goal is to make the public believe these are the only two choices they have, while the result is the same regardless of which one you choose because they are two sides of the same coin. She said that the proof that they are two sides of the same coin is that Hitler and Stalin had the same program. She taught us that, **universal slavery** was the outcome of either choice, the programming of every human being on the earth with the leaders being the most thoroughly programmed of all. She said that they have always claimed that they already have total control, but she assured us that while we still have the United States Constitution we can still break free. She taught us that the **"TOTAL CONTROL PROGRAMS"** most perplexing aspect is that there is no-one now living that is to blame for this because according to her synopsis of world history of the past 5,000 years, it all began in China. She said that China's education system had been more about programming than educating. This was a natural result of the difficulty of learning the written Chinese languages such as mandarin Chinese. But they realized the power of programming and they sought to control the world by gaining control of a country by programming the countries King and ruling class. In fact, it would not be until the gestation period that gave birth to the US Constitution that a clear distinction was made between programming and educating. **Our Founding Fathers realized that** there is a difference and that **a person that is programmed is not free.**

China was the first country to program Arabs to gather information in the Mideast and to program Europeans to gather information in Europe. When China began trying to rule the world by getting control of the Kings and the ruling classes by programming them Japan was the first and perhaps the UK was the second. If you said, “The sun never sets on the Japanese Empire” or “The sun never sets on the British Empire”, you were in effect saying the sun never sets on the Chinese Empire. As time went by they expanded the

number of people being programmed from the ruling class of the UK to the Gentry. The conflict that this programming causes in the mind of every individual creates the need for more programming that only results in evil, demented, wicked Kings, "Control Freaks". This resulted in public resistance that began to overthrow the wicked rulers. The Chinese saw the writing on the wall and decided to send out their Japanese intelligence gatherers to all parts of the earth in circa 1700 on a 200-year mission to gather knowledge of where the next great revolution would come from, so they could get ahead of it. This resulted in the ultimate divide and conquer plan described above using the writings of Karl Marx that gave way to World War I and II. This is why communism looks nothing like the writings of Karl Marx and never will. Communism is a psychological program that says all property is publicly held for the good of the people but that is a big lie. Every example we have of Communism, what is called public property is actually owned by the communist party and the people are exploited property of the communist party.

This is where we are today with circles within circles of the programmed and the programmers. The most frightening new aspect of this is that computers are being used to program people and therefore, become a part of the circles within circles. She taught us that the one saving grace that might eventually win out is the fact that every individual is thrown into an internal conflict with striving to remain in control of themselves. **Computers do not have any internal conflict therefore they do not have any saving grace, none.** This saving grace conflict that humans experience is dealt with by programming - **denial of being programmed** and programming that - **I am the programmer not the programmed.** And so, it goes, the circles within circles for centuries in which no-one living is to blame for the programming because the leaders are being programmed by programmers that have been programmed by others that have long been dead. Circles within circles.

Which brings us back to the epiphany that I experienced while listening to Father Sebastian Dezasya, who is from India, speak about the incorruptible people that would walk upon the earth when the holy scriptures are fulfilled. I was deeply impressed with this man's sincerity and began to wonder about an incorruptible people and the "third eye" of Hinduism and the perplexing problem Iain before me 50 years ago and perhaps, Dan Brown's "Lost Symbol" played into it. The third eye is believed to be used to see beyond the apparent to protect good people from evil, as the eye of spiritual wisdom opens, all the evil will vanish. For some odd reason, listening to this Catholic Priest from India made me realize that with our current technology there might finally be a way for people to extract themselves from the circles within circles by getting tech companies to develop an audio and video micro-transmitter that would adhere to the forehead, while remaining invisible to the naked eye or hidden by hair as in the "Lost Symbol", that transmits to your smartphone so you can become aware of your own circle and figure out the answers to these important, perplexing questions; **"Who is programming you?"** and **"What are they programming you to do, think and say?"**, so you can put a stop to it. Audio and video recorders that can go even further to view and listen to your computer to detect any subliminal images or sounds attempting to program you. This is what the tech programs produced by Halliburton to teach about the use of industrial electronic controls, certainly does. These instructional programs subliminally try to make men gay by displaying images of carnal sex not visible to the naked eye. Subliminal messaging is what

Cambridge Analytica was doing, they were brought on by Pence, to get Trump elected and to carry Mike Pence with him. "We the People" must get ahead of this problem.

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
No we didn't light it
But we tried to fight it
Well, I don't know why I came here tonight
I got the feeling that something ain't right
It's so hard to keep this smile from my face
Losing control, yeah, I'm all over the place
Well, you started off with nothing
And you're proud that you're a self-made man
Trying to make some sense of it all
But I can see it makes no sense at all
Is it cool to go to sleep on the floor?
Well, I don't think that I can take anymore
And I can feel it coming in the air tonight, oh lord
Well I've been waiting for this moment for all my life, oh lord
I can feel it coming in the air tonight, oh lord
Well I've been waiting for this moment for all my life, oh lord, oh lord
But I know the reason why you keep this silence up
The hurt doesn't show, but the pain still grows
It's no stranger to you and me
Hold on, hold on.

"We live in terrible times. I believe that everyman must risk something so that in the end he does not have to risk everything. The terrorist situation is literally that – terrifying. We must put an end to it. ... If you believe in what you are doing. Do not let anyone frighten you away." Quote of character Dr. Louis Desforges who was clearly intended to be the hero of the novel "Windmills of the Gods" by Sidney Sheldon. "We the People" must stand together in peaceful resolution and demand that all elected federal, state and county officials be granted immunity for past activities except Mike Pence, to assure the public all elected officials are free of the influence of compromising information held by any part of the intelligence (intimidation) community. All elected public officials will agree to wearing seven body-cams with enhanced audio and video, three of which are on the frame of glasses or along the hairline, 24/7 with miniature audio receivers worn on the earlobes to catch those who would whisper in their ear while they are sleeping. This is to assure the public that our elected officials are the people that are making the decisions and are not being unduly influenced or programmed by anyone else, including their spouse, especially their spouse. You can run your head all day long claiming that no-one's spouse influences their thinking by whispering in their ear while they sleep but until you begin using these devices to protect yourselves you won't know. You will say that you will be surprised if this ever happens. I say you will be surprised at how often it happens.

All members of the National Guard and the reserves will be ordered state-side immediately. All National Guard and reserves in border states will be sent to the national border. All National Guard and reserves in the remaining states will be ordered to work within their unit to coordinate defense of their home, their county and their state with voluntary support from city, county and state law enforcement and emergency medical service and fire department personnel and the media to defend against retaliation by the intimidation community. All citizens

and especially elected officials will be advised on the precautions necessary to protect themselves when opening mail due to our past experience with the intimidation community using anthrax to kill US citizens. "Hoax attacks using white powder play on fears that date to 2001, when letters containing deadly anthrax were mailed to news organizations and the offices of two U.S. senators. Those letters killed five people." Feds: Man sent white powder letters to Trump Jr., Stabenow By: Michael Oszust 3/1/2018. We ask the Technology Companies to mass produce affordable body-cams for everyone, as well as, hand held air quality sensors that can detect deadly gas and dangerous fibers. The FBI is feeling the heat and is using children to kill children and it is time to stand together and demand reasonable gun control laws and adults must say, "Enough is Enough!"

In recognition of the fact that the vast majority of the intelligence community are willing to do the right thing, we ask that you assist in this effort to transition from covert security to overt security by returning to your home county to prepare a complete report on your career in intelligence and that you wear seven body-cams for the above stated reasons, so the public is assured of your independents. Surely there are only a few at the top that would want to see anything like 9/11 happen again and certainly all who have been coerced, lured or programmed into horrible treatment of other human beings are desperate enough for a way out to accept the offer of immunity and forgiveness and bear the burden of exposure to move ahead in this way that guarantees there will not be a repeat. Like Jim Carrey said, "Somebody stop me!" The Bush family is saying the same thing with the flagrance of this act. And the elected officials can be reassured by what Jack Nicholson said "You want the truth. You can't handle the truth!" yes we want the truth, but we want guarantees against secrecy moving forward. In fact, the world may be a better place not broadcasting the details about the ugly truth of the past.

President Donald Trump is not getting the cabinet he wants by the dismissals taking place, Mike Pence is. The problem is not Trump, Vice President Mike Pence is the problem. Pence is the one responsible for recommending the most troublesome cabinet members and it's the few picks Trump made that are being forced out. Pence is the one that should be impeached but the best we can probably hope for is to force him to resign by overwhelming public opinion. And we must force his Alt-Right cabinet picks, Pruitt, Carson, Sessions and the rest must go with him. When it is suggested that Pences' evangelical status, brings respectability to the Trump White House, it is to ignore the historic record. According to a book written by those assigned the task of investigating the American Nazi Party before and during WWII, most American Nazi Party leaders went underground as evangelists to continue programming followers without government oversight and tax-free. Three names I recall are Norman Vincent Peale, Billy Graham and Ed Koch. Using this information, I have tried to Google this book without any luck, but I guarantee there are hundreds of copies still out there. If you have one, make a couple hundred copies and spread them around before revealing the fact that you have one. It has been reported that Pence was

groomed to remain free of controversy to gain a high political office by his evangelistic mentor. If Trump is allowed to think on his own, I believe he will be more likely to choose more moderate cabinet members based on a consensus of top members of the department. The following article supports the additional indictments that I named and my outlandish unsupported claims. I've got a lot on my mind and it would take many more months to get this properly organized, frankly we just don't have the time. You need to read this through several times over several weeks if that's what it takes. If you make the effort to decipher what I am trying to say you'll likely be all-in.

THE BIZARRE FAR-RIGHT BILLIONAIRE BEHIND BANNON AND TRUMP'S

PRESIDENCY **THOMAS HEDGES:** July 2016 The Real News

When all seemed to be falling apart for Trump this summer, one shadowy billionaire offered up his own massive political infrastructure, which included Steve Bannon and Kellyanne Conway, and saved Trump's campaign from demise

HEDGES: In a surprise move, the Trump campaign shakes up its leadership at the 11th hour, bringing on far right editor-in-chief of Breitbart News, Steve Bannon, along with former Republican pollster, Kellyanne Conway. Days later, David Bossie, head of the corporate advocacy group, Citizens United is brought on as Deputy Manager of the campaign. Finally, the campaign also hires the data-mining firm Cambridge Analytica, tasked with probing the American voter's mind.... But a closer look reveals something different. It reveals a hidden connection between these players, a thread between the seemingly random cast of actors.

Enter billionaire hedge fund manager Robert Mercer, and his daughter Rebecca. They've been eyeing Trump ever since their first choice, Ted Cruz, dropped out of the primaries back in May.... The fuel behind Mercer's influence are the absurd sums of money he approves at the investment company he runs, Renaissance Technologies, based on Long Island. Its famed Medallion Fund is one of the most successful hedge funds in investing history. Averaging 72% returns before fees, over more than 20 years. A statistic that baffles analysts, and outranks the profitability of other competing funds, like the ones George Soros and Warren Buffet run.

In 2015, Mercer had single-handedly catapulted Cruz to the front of the Republican field. Throwing more than \$13 million into a super PAC he created for the now failed candidate. But with the Trump campaign faltering, and struggling for support, there's a second chance for the Mercers to make a big bet.

The Trump campaign is well aware of this, in fact, sources within Mercer's super PAC would later tell Bloomberg News that shortly after Cruz drops out of the race, Ivanka Trump and her wealthy developer husband Jared Kushner, approach the Mercers, asking if they'd be willing to shift their support behind Trump. The answer is an eventual, but resounding yes.

In the months leading up to Trump's presidential win, the Mercers would prove a formidable force. Beginning after the disastrous Republican Convention in July, they would furnish the Trump campaign with millions of dollars, and new leadership, but they would also furnish it with something more -- a vast network of non-profits, strategists, media companies, research institutions and super PACs that they themselves funded and largely controlled.... With the Mercer family in the picture, the post-convention shake-up starts to make sense. Take Steve Bannon. He and Robert Mercer have been close for years, and Mercer is a top investor at Breitbart News, where Bannon was Chief Editor.

Kellyanne Conway also comes out of this network. Before becoming co-manager of Trump's campaign, she headed up operations for Robert Mercer's super PAC when it was still supporting Ted Cruz. And as for Deputy Campaign Manager, David Bossie, he was president of Citizens United, an organization Mercer has heavily funded since at least 2010.

Cambridge Analytica, the mysterious data-mining firm that received grudging praise after predicting the race's outcome more accurately than any other polling company, is also heavily funded by Robert Mercer, and was employed by the Cruz campaign before Mercer switched over to Trump. In fact, the Mercers' political infrastructure is so entrenched, that Rebecca Mercer herself sits on the 16-person executive committee of Trump's transition team.

Mercer's foray into the White House may seem to have been born partly out of luck, especially with Trump, instead of Cruz, as a stalking horse. But his rise to power was systematic, and it was years in the making. The web of connections Mercer's built over the last decade is vast and complex. It includes efforts to dismantle tax law, and weaken the IRS.

It's about funding quack scientists and conspiracy theorists, who blame the government for, among other things, playing a role in the San Bernardino Massacre. Or of colluding with the United Nations, and using climate change as an excuse to implement environmental laws meant to depopulate America's Midwest. It's about pouring money into the neo-conservative John Bolton super PAC, which props up candidates who ascribe to Bolton's hawkish foreign policy.

But one of Mercer's earliest activist ventures was financing a slew of fringe documentary projects that have helped raise the profiles of people like Sarah Palin, Michelle Bachman and most notably, the director of those films, Steve Bannon.

Bannon, who was previously a naval officer and Goldman Sachs investment banker, made his first documentary in 2004 about Ronald Reagan. It retold his biography, using washed out black and white archival footage of the Hollywood actor. Painting him as a brave protector of Western democracy from the threat of Communism.

RONALD REAGAN: You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We'll preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth, or we'll sentence them to take the last step into a thousand years of darkness.

HEDGES: The film wasn't a commercial success. According to the reviews, it was a flop. But it developed a cult following, and it revealed that there was an untapped audience for this sort of film, which demonized America's current establishment, while lamenting the death of old-time conservatism under Reagan.

In the Face of Evil would also connect Bannon to conservative author Peter Schweitzer, whose namesake book the film was based on... he would also connect him to another rising conservative fixture Bannon met at a screening of the Reagan film in Beverley Hills, a man Bannon recalled in a Bloomberg piece, who came up to him after the showing like a bear, he said, who's squeezing me, like my head's going to blow up, and saying how we've got to take back the culture.

His name? Andrew Breitbart, a conservative commentator who for the next few years would join Bannon and Schweitzer in their efforts to establish a fresh conservative narrative with Breitbart himself focusing on an idea for a new media company. Something partly inspired by a trip to Jerusalem, and the need to create an outlet that would be unapologetically pro-freedom, and pro-Israel, he said, something that would come to fruition in 2007, and that he would call, Breitbart.com.

One of the things I admired about Breitbart, Bannon said, in that Bloomberg story, was that the dirtiest word for him was punditry. Our vision, Andrew's vision, was always to build a global, centre-right, populist antiestablishment news site. But that wasn't all. What Bannon, Schweitzer, and Breitbart, really wanted to forge, was a multi-tiered effort to push their agenda. They wanted to fund Schweitzer's books and Bannon's films. Ultimately, they wanted to create a media infrastructure big enough to pump their ideology into America's national discourse.

But they needed more investors, and they needed large investors, people who could fund this giant operation for a sustained period of time. Because what this right wing trio had set out to do wasn't to simply start a business; it was to transform America's rage.

It's largely white, rural, working class discontent into a political movement that would storm Washington first in the form of the Tea Party, and, again six years later, in the form of Trump.

That influx of cash would come from the organization more famous now for the Supreme Court decision it inspired, than for the media and political work it's done for decades, thanks in part to funders like the Koch brothers and, of course, Robert Mercer.

The pro-corporate advocacy group, Citizens United, was created in 1988 and for years it had pumped out television ads, films and other forms of media content that sought to put pressure both on Democrats, as well as more moderate Republicans, to embrace a far right, corporate-friendly, approach to politics.

CITIZENS UNITED PROMO: Remember that the left controls Hollywood, they control entertainment, they control the movies, they control television, they control mass media. They control, certainly, journalism.

RICK SANTORUM: And so what Citizens United has figured out, is that through the media they can, in fact, move public opinion, they can shape America and thereby shape Washington.

HEDGES: It was that effort that gave rise to the film, *Hillary: The Movie*, which in turn led to the Supreme Court case that changed the way politics is done in the United States. It's worth noting that the Citizens United decision to allow for unlimited campaign contributions through super PACs didn't originate from any billionaire, or corporation, directly complaining about contribution limits. It originated from this documentary, which Bannon directed, and which FEC rules barred from being shown, because it fell under the category of electioneering communications.

Essentially, union and corporate-funded groups like Citizens United couldn't air anything critical about a candidate within 30 days of the primaries, and 60 days of the general elections. The Supreme Court's decision to strike down that rule opened up the floodgates for unlimited campaign spending, which Citizens United and its billionaire and corporate donors seized upon, Citizens United has been heavily funded by the Koch brothers, and their network of donors, which Mercer joined early on.

But in 2010, Mercer decides to extend his reach and influence beyond the confines of that network. Beginning first with Breitbart News, which at the time had hit a bit of a rough patch, Andrew Breitbart had put out a misleading video that showed a Department of Agriculture official, Shirley Sherrod, making what people characterized as racist remarks towards white people.

Sherrod was fired, and when it came out afterwards that the clip had been manipulated, Sherrod sued Andrew Breitbart. The lawsuit fell on the heels of another false video exposé Breitbart had done a year earlier, involving the association of Community Organizations For Reform Now, known as ACORN, which had resulted in their loss of private and government funding. After the Sherrod video, the media virtually blacklisted him, along with his site from the mainstream. The hiccup prompted Mercer to capitalize on the event. He reportedly put upwards of \$10 million in the company later that year, making him a top investor. The next two years are spent expanding and sharpening these media connections. Bannon continues to produce documentaries, including, *The Undeclared*, featuring the rise of Sarah Palin, as well as, *Occupy Unmasked*, which aimed to discredit the 2011 protest movement.

ANDREW BREITBART: These people feel morally justified to commit crimes.

HEDGES: Schweitzer continues publishing his books, most notably, *"Clinton Cash"*, in 2015, which Bannon adapted into a documentary, and which fuelled the Right's obsession with Hillary Clinton, and the financial sources for her foundation. Meanwhile, Mercer is quietly lubricating the political and financial empire, doling out money to a whole slew of conservative non-profits, such as the Heartland Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, Citizens United and many more. Then suddenly, in 2012 Andrew Breitbart dies from a heart attack.

WOLF BLITZER: ...Andrew Breitbart, dead at the age of 43. **Breitbart was certainly a driving force in the Tea Party movement**, as well as a very influential political voice on the Internet.

HEDGES: Mercer, and Bannon, who was a board member at Breitbart, quickly rearranged leadership roles in an effort not to lose any momentum. **In fact, Breitbart's death seemed to have been a morbid blessing for the group. Breitbart, unlike his compatriots, had always been more of an old school, more moderate conservative.** He'd worked at the Drudge Report, which many saw as a bullhorn for the Bush administration. **More surprisingly, he'd been a researcher for Ariana Huffington, and helped create an early model for what would become the liberal Huffington Post.**

So, Mercer, Bannon and Schweitzer crank up the heat. In the months after Breitbart dies, Bannon is made executive chairman of Breitbart.com. Schweitzer, meanwhile, founds a new research group that focuses on feeding content to Breitbart News, and Citizens United, for their documentary projects, called the Government Accountability Institute. Where Mercer is a top funder, while Bannon sits on the board.

These shifts are all taking place in the shadows of the presidential race between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney. Romney epitomized the GOP establishment, and Mercer must have been reluctant to give to his campaign. He ended up throwing about a million dollars into a super PAC supporting Romney, a paltry number compared to the \$15 million he spent on Trump, and the \$13 million he spent on Cruz. Romney's loss was a heavy defeat for Republican voters around the country. With so many Americans still struggling to get back on their feet after the 2009 economic crisis, his defeat angered many GOP voters. Some blamed Obama and the Democrats. Others blamed the Republican establishment, including Romney himself. But at the NYU Club in New York, shortly after the news of Obama's re-election, one unexpected voice would take a small group of wealthy donors by storm, blasting the Romney team for dropping the ball on their data mining and canvassing operations. That woman was Rebecca Mercer. Robert Mercer's daughter. After Romney, Rebecca became her father's right hand. Before that, Robert Mercer's role in his political dealings was to supply money to the people he admired and trusted, people like Bannon, Schweitzer and Breitbart. Rebecca wanted to change that. She wanted accountability over the money her father spent, and Romney's failure provided an opportunity to step into the Republican arena, and assert her and her father's agenda.

Between 2012 and 2016, she would take formal leadership positions at the think tanks and non-profits her father funded. She became a director at Peter Schweitzer's Government Accountability Institute. She took over the Mercer family foundation, and more recently, she managed her father's super PAC, **alongside Kellyanne Conway**. She and her father began to engage in what you could call, a kind of sniper fire politics, investing money in very specific races and causes.

CARRIE LEVINE: You've seen Robert Mercer put money into super PACs in races that have something to do with, often tax. This cycle, he gave money to a super PAC backing up primary challenger Senator John McCain in Arizona. McCain is a Republican, and he was the co-chair of the Senate Committee that investigated Renaissance's tax strategies.

HEDGES: McCain would later say he thought Mercer was doing this because of that investigation, which was looking into whether Renaissance Technologies had avoided more than \$6 billion in taxes, over the course of 14 years. For the 2016 Republican primaries, Robert Mercer decided to put his support behind Ted Cruz, and so did Bannon. But as Cruz faltered, and took positions that ran counter to Bannon's conservative agenda -- like supporting the TPP -- Mercer and Bannon begin questioning their support of a candidate who was too obviously trying to appease both the disgruntled American voter, as well as corporate interests in Washington. **In the end, Cruz's evangelical Christian persona failed to cover up his true identity, which was as a Harvard-educated lawyer, who'd worked for years in Washington. Including as a young clerk in the Supreme Court.**

Robert Mercer seldom makes public appearances, and he never talks to the press. The only time he's spoken publicly was in 2014, after he received a lifetime achievement award from the Association for Computational Linguistics. In the hour-long acceptance speech he gives in Baltimore, Maryland, Mercer spends almost all of his time talking about his passion for computers.

ROBERT MERCER: I really loved everything about computers. I loved the solitude of the computer lab late at night, I loved the air-conditioned -- the smell of the place, I loved the sound of the disks whirring and the printers clacking.

HEDGES: None of his remarks are political, except for one comment he makes when he's talking about the time he worked at the air force weapons lab in New Mexico, and the one day he discovered how to make their computers run about a hundred times faster.

ROBERT MERCER: ...And then a strange thing happened. Instead of running the old computations in 1/100th of the time, the powers that be at the lab ran computations that were 100 times bigger. **I took this as an indication that one of the most important goals of government-financed research is not so much to get answers, as it is to consume the computer budget.**

AUDIENCE: (laughter)

ROBERT MERCER: Which has left me ever since, with a jaundiced view of government-financed research.

HEDGES: Robert Mercer doesn't quite fit into an established upper class. He isn't exactly a Wall Street type, and neither are the 300 employees, many of whom are advanced mathematicians and physicists, who work at Renaissance Technologies brainchild, the Medallion Fund.

CARRIE LEVINE: I think it's interesting to note that this is a guy, who has a programming background, a coding background, who didn't start out on Wall Street, and so he'd come to this through sort of a different route. He's spoken very little about his political giving, and so we can't say a lot about his motives, at least not what he's said.

HEDGES: *The fund is known for its secrecy.* It's been closed to outside investors since 2005, and what exactly they trade isn't fully understood. What is known is that what Mercer, along with retired Renaissance Technologies founder James Simons, and co-CEO Peter Brown have done, is master the math behind something called quantitative trading, which involves gaming the stock market using advanced algorithms and data analysis to create unprecedented profits.

BILL BLACK: All they do, is make one group of, literally, billionaires, slightly richer than another group of billionaires, and in the process they make themselves billionaires. But they add absolutely nothing to the economy, or the world effectively.

HEDGES: 2016's list of biggest political donors is stacked with billionaires who've made their money by engaging in what amount to different forms of gambling. The largest donor of the cycle, Tom Steyer, is a hedge fund manager. The second, Sheldon Adelson, is a casino magnate. The third, Donald Sussman, is a quant fund manager. Strangely enough, founder of Renaissance Technologies, James Simons, who's one of the Democrats largest donors, is number five on that list, while his colleague and Republican counterpart Robert Mercer, is number seven.

BILL BLACK: It's not a coincidence that the enormous amounts of wealth go to people who are connected with gambling. But recall that they don't gamble. Adelson is the house. (laughs) Right? The house mathematically, is going to win. And the idea at the hedge fund is, again, to have better math than the other billionaires, so that statistically you're going to win.

HEDGES: Casino capitalism has given people like Robert and Rebecca Mercer, riches and power beyond most people's imagination. But the role of activist billionaires in American politics isn't new. It's just become stronger, as wealth is concentrated in fewer hands. With the top 1% of Americans today holding onto 40% of the country's wealth, and with much of that increase taking place in the finance and energy sectors of the economy, the rise of people like Robert Mercer and the Koch brothers, reflects how billionaires have gradually taken more direct control over politicians and the state.

BILL BLACK: One of the things that is really useful, if you're a billionaire, and that you get your money by doing nothing socially useful, is to valorize what you're doing and to demonize anyone that might actually restrict it by law, regulation, even social mores.

And propaganda is historically the answer to that.

HEDGES: An essential part of Trump's propaganda, is that he represents the interests of workers, the little guy, and will take on the big corporations. But the proof of his loyalties is in his appointments. His Cabinet, the richest in history, along with his close advisors include major players from Wall Street and corporate America.

Rex Tillerson, Andrew Puzder, Linda McMahon, Stephen Swartzman, Todd Ricketts, Gary Cohn, Steve Bannon, Betsy DeVos, Elaine Chao, Wilbur Ross, Steven Mnuchin, Carl Icahn, Peter Theil. These are the true faces of a Trump presidency.

In the end, there are no workers, or little guys on the Trump team. Only the allies of rainmakers Robert and Rebecca Mercer, the billionaires whose political hedge pushed Donald Trump into the White House.

I believe the above article documents how Pence, first got people in the Trump campaign to bring him aboard, then brought a whole raft of his Alt-Right backers and he has gradually taken over. Let us consider what Vice President Mike Pence said in his speech at CPAC. "President Trump is a man of his word and we are keeping the promises we made to the American people". Mike Pence said, "We are keeping the promises We made...". Trump told Pence "Get me the best" and Mike Pence bragged about Jeff Sessions, Jim "Mad Dog" Mattis and Dr. Ben Carson, "This is the A-Team" "President Trump has assembled the strongest conservative cabinet in my lifetime, bar none." Here's the scary part when Mike Pence said,

"My friends, this is our time."

“This is the chance we’ve worked so hard, so long to see.”

I’ll just put it like this, if we let them impeach the president with Mike Pence Vice President... What Hedges says about Andrew Breitbart here in red, can also be said about Trump “...Breitbart's death seemed to have been a morbid blessing for the group. Breitbart (Trump), **unlike his compatriots, had always been more of an old school, more moderate conservative.**” Look at all of the controversy that surrounded James Comey’s two announcements concerning Hilary Clinton in the summer of 2016. The fact that he was a DOJ attorney before he became FBI Director, you might conclude that this man is not the “Hay Seed” he portrays himself to be and that he knew very well that he was throwing the election to Trump. Couple that with how he waited until General Michael Flynn became Security Advisor before taking him down over the phone conversation with Kislyak and it seems clear he wanted to make Trump look like a “colluder” for choosing a Mike Flynn. James Comey could have taken Flynn down before he became National Security Advisor, but he didn’t, he stalled until afterward. There’s a reason FBI Agents are the only people whose notes have been treated as if they were tapes and it’s because they have compromising information on Congress.

IF THE PUBLIC WANTS THE TRUTH ABOUT THE 2016 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, WE MUST ALSO DEMAND THE INDICTMENTS OF THEN DIRECTOR OF THE FBI, JAMES COMEY, MIKE PENCE, THE KOCH BROTHERS, ROBERT MERCER, STEVE BANNON AND ERIC PRINCE.

Mike Pence Could Be The Next President And He Was Handpicked By Paul Manafort Linley Sanders [Newsweek](#) October 30, 2017

The man who helped put Mike Pence a heartbeat away from the presidency is now facing federal charges. Paul Manafort, who was hit Monday with 12 counts tied to alleged financial schemes, pushed for Pence to become Trump's running mate and even managed to talk Trump out of his doubts. **As the Trump administration now works to distance itself from Manafort, his Pence pick stands among the best evidence of his impact as Trump's short-lived campaign manager.** Before Trump formally announced Pence as his vice presidential candidate, it was Manafort who made sure it happened, as [The New York Times](#) reported last year. Trump had hesitated to settle on Pence, who was serving as governor of Indiana. Trump was fielding last-ditch appeals from New Jersey Governor Chris Christie, and publicly said he had not made a “final, final decision” until advisers like Manafort reminded him the importance of uniting the Republican Party around conservative Christian values.

[CBS News](#) reported Pence was Manafort's "first choice" and Manafort even lied about mechanical problems on Trump's plane to make the soon-to-be GOP nominee stay an extra day in Indiana to get to know Pence. In a phone call, Manafort assured Trump that Pence was the right choice, and made a case that won over the real estate tycoon. Manafort would later downplay his behind-the-scenes choice, telling the *Times* later that Trump never seriously doubted Pence. The decision came during the three months Manafort served as Trump's campaign manager, after advising him earlier in the year. Just a month after the Pence pick, Manafort was out, with reports about his foreign finances and government lobbying creating a cloud around the campaign.

On Monday, Manafort surrendered to the FBI on [charges](#) that included conspiracy against the United States, after Mueller named him and his associate Rick Gates in the first indictment from the probe into the Trump campaign's suspected Russia ties. With reports emerging through 2017 about Manafort becoming a Mueller target, and The White House started [emphasizing](#) that Manafort spent "just under five months" working for Trump. Press Secretary Sarah Sanders referred to Manafort as a "volunteer" for the campaign on the day he was indicted.

The backpedaling began in March after it emerged that Manafort signed a multimillion-dollar contract in 2006 with a close associate of Vladimir Putin. Trump's team now claims Manafort merely oversaw delegate operations and that Trump was not aware of Manafort's work for other governments, including Russia. Sean Spicer, the former White House press secretary, described Manafort as someone "who played a very limited role for a very limited amount of time." In August, Trump downplayed the FBI raiding Manafort's house, remarking that it was a "pretty tough" way to wake someone up. He has not publicly defended Manafort since that press conference. I've always found Paul Manafort to be a very decent man," Trump said [at the time](#). "He's like a lot of other people, probably makes consultant fees from all over the place. Who knows. I don't know."

More recently, Trump and his staff have tried deflecting attention to Hillary Clinton and Democrats, whom Trump blames for an [explosive dossier](#) sourced from Fusion GPS, an intelligence firm. It alleged Russia supported Trump for at least five years and that there had been a contact between Russian officials and members of Trump's campaign. Trump [tweeted](#) Monday morning: "Sorry, but this is years ago, before Paul Manafort was part of the Trump campaign. But why aren't Crooked Hillary & the Dems the focus????? ...Also, there is NO COLLUSION!"

The indictment from Mueller covers "between at least 2006 and 2015," according to the full text of the document and alleges that Manafort and Gates acted as unregistered agents for Ukraine. A separate guilty plea from George Papadopoulos, a former foreign policy adviser to the Trump campaign, means collusion has been confirmed by at least one member of the campaign.

MIKE PENCE TO APPEAR AT TRUMP-SKEPTIC KOCH BROTHERS'

FUNDRAISER: TRUMP'S VP PICK TO BE FEATURED GUEST AT BILLIONAIRES' DONOR NETWORK EVENT, GIVING HIM CHANCE TO PRESS FOR FINANCIAL BACKING FOR PRESUMPTIVE NOMINEE THEY DETEST PETER STONE 7/16/2016 THE GUARDIAN

TRUMP LAWYER'S OFFICE, HOME RAIDED IN BANK FRAUD INQUIRY

BY MATT APUZZO NEW YORK TIMES APRIL 09, 2018

"Cohen's payments to the pornographic film actress, Stephanie Clifford, who is known as Stormy Daniels, (she was born on March 17, 1979, so she would have turned 27 in 2006, she hasn't accused Trump of persisting when she said no, so what exactly is the crime? He didn't pay her the money upfront, is hush money to keep your wife and the public from knowing about an extramarital affair illegal?) are only one of many topics being investigated by the prosecutors in New York, according to a person briefed on the search."

WHAT HAPPENS IF TRUMP FIRES MUELLER? EXPERTS WEIGH IN ON WHETHER THE COUNTRY IS APPROACHING A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS BY JOSEPH P. WILLIAMS, 7, 24, 2017, U.S. NEWS

"WHEN HE TOOK THE OATH of office six months ago, President Donald Trump vowed to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution. As an investigation of Russian interference in the election continues to expand, however, Trump's critics say he's been on the brink of creating a constitutional crisis. ... **"Will Trump fire Mueller? If he does, what happens next?"** There are a variety of ways in which he might act [and] all of them would raise the very serious question of whether he is effectively acting to obstruct justice by removing the person who is in charge of the investigation," says David Cole, the ACLU's national legal director. "The special counsel is protected by regulation from being fired simply because the president doesn't like what he's doing," Cole says. "The regulation

says **the special counsel has had to have** engaged in misconduct, dereliction of duty, incapacity, **conflict of interest** and other good cause, including violation of [Justice Department] policy."

This article says that all the ways the President might act to fire Mueller would raise the question of whether he is effectively acting to obstruct justice, but it states in the regulation that a conflict of interest is grounds for removal. It has been pointed out in many articles that Robert Mueller has had a long and close friendship with James Comey, whom it will be proven when all of the facts have been revealed, was guilty of using his position as FBI Director to create the illusion of collusion to get Trump impeached to make Mike Pence president but he had to first get Trump elected. It must have seemed very convenient to Comey to blame Russia when Seth Rich leaked the DNC emails, and have his men kill Seth when he agreed to a middle of the night meeting, how very convenient that **Seth trusted the FBI**. The circumstantial evidence will show that Seth Rich had an appointment to meet with the FBI, that may be the reason he turned down the offer of a ride home. It was reported that guns were stolen from an FBI vehicle near the murder scene at about the same time. **Means, motive and opportunity**. There would be no constitutional crisis for the president to fire Mueller when he had an obligation, according to the rules, to recuse himself from being appointed special counsel before he accepted the position. The only one obstructing justice is Robert Mueller, that is why congress voted him into the position with near 100% approval, to shield congress from the threat to democrats and republicans from the child sex scandal that the FBI hung over their heads. We can put an end to this threat to Congress and we can put an end to the need to fire Mueller by indicting him for his role in the destruction of evidence at the WTC. I believe Jeff Sessions should be replaced by Sally Yates and she should immediately replace Rod Rosenstein and all other top positions at DOJ with attorneys of her choice from around the country. It might take some doing to convince Donald Trump of this, but there is a reason Comey didn't turn over the responsibility of shutting down the Clinton case to her. (See full transcript of the Comey interview by George Stephanopoulos on ABC at end of this paper.) I'm going to make some recommendations for positions, admittedly based on impressions with no supporting first-hand knowledge. Bob Corker impresses me as a natural diplomat and he should be considered for secretary of state. Jeff Flake has experience with HLS in Arizona and he should be the director overseeing its' disassembly bringing in people he trusts to immediately man all top positions to preside over processing of information and disassembling the agency. I believe Baton Rouge Police Chief Murphy Paul should be director of the FBI overseeing processing of information with a special task force targeting white supremacists that have been hired in law enforcement dealing with them on a case by case basis, again, installing his own people in all top positions and working from Baton Rouge as much as is practical. Rex Tillerson should return as director of the CIA, hiring a security company he trusts from his days as CEO of Exxon-Mobile, using top executives of that security company to man the top positions of the CIA during the disassembly of the agency. Since there are so many secret agents it seems practical to order them all to the place they consider home in the US and report to the county court house to receive orders of where they will report to each day to prepare a full chronological day by day report on their career. The people carrying out the disassembly of a secret government agency or a private contractor will deliver all information to Congress to be considered for declassification.

Everything's gonna be alright
Nobody's gotta worry 'bout nothing
Don't go hitting that panic button
It ain't near as bad as you think

Everything's gonna be alright
There ain't no doubt it's gonna work out
Come on, sing it with me
David Lee Murphy & Kenny Chesney

I believe Pence was sincere when he said at CPAC that “Trump is a man of his word.” All Pence had to do was manipulate him into making the promises that served the purpose of the Alt-Right. Donald Trump also promised that he would have peoples backs. Now, we must stand up and say, “Mr. President, we’ve got your back.” Don’t forget, Trump is from NYC. He had to have lost friends and share some of the same concerns about who is responsible for the crimes committed on 9/11/2001.

OATH Terms of Service - AOL & YaHoo merged to form OATH.

These Terms should be against Federal Law: People here don’t have any other choice, so, you can take it or do without. This pits an individual against a huge corporation by coercion, taking the individuals best chance of winning a decision against a conglomerate, as well as, removing the possibility of customers joining forces when the conglomerate with potential access to all their customers finances. This cannot stand:

- a. **CLASS ACTION WAIVER. THESE TERMS DO NOT ALLOW CLASS OR COLLECTIVE ARBITRATIONS, EVEN IF THE AAA PROCEDURES OR RULES WOULD. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY OTHER PROVISION OF THESE TERMS, THE ARBITRATOR MAY AWARD MONEY OR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF ONLY IN FAVOR OF THE INDIVIDUAL PARTY SEEKING RELIEF AND ONLY TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY TO PROVIDE THE RELIEF WARRANTED BY THAT PARTY’S INDIVIDUAL CLAIM. ARBITRATION OR COURT PROCEEDINGS HELD UNDER THESE TERMS CANNOT BE BROUGHT, MAINTAINED OR RESOLVED ON BEHALF OF OR BY A CLASS, AS A PRIVATE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, OR IN ANY OTHER REPRESENTATIVE CAPACITY. IN ADDITION, INDIVIDUAL PROCEEDINGS CANNOT BE COMBINED WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF ALL OF THE PARTIES. ANY QUESTION REGARDING THE ENFORCEABILITY OR INTERPRETATION OF THIS PARAGRAPH WILL BE DECIDED BY A COURT AND NOT THE ARBITRATOR.**
- b. **JURY TRIAL WAIVER. IF FOR ANY REASON A DISPUTE PROCEEDS IN COURT RATHER THAN THROUGH ARBITRATION, YOU AND OATH AGREE THAT THERE WILL NOT BE A JURY TRIAL. YOU AND OATH UNCONDITIONALLY WAIVE ANY RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY IN ANY ACTION, PROCEEDING OR COUNTERCLAIM IN ANY WAY ARISING OUT OF OR RELATING TO THESE TERMS. IN THE EVENT OF LITIGATION, THIS PARAGRAPH MAY BE FILED TO SHOW A WRITTEN CONSENT TO A TRIAL BY THE COURT.**

This pits David against Goliath but takes away his slingshot. I’m just about done here. I’ll protest Oath by shutting it down. Like I said in my little bit of poetry when I set out to explain why I chose to use some lines from Paul Grogan’s “Vincent”, it’s all up to you. I like all kinds of music. I’m still a fan of Elton John’s music. The first concert I saw was Todd Rundgren after “Something/Anything” came out. It was in the auditorium next to the Roanoke Coliseum. Tom Flanigan and I hitched a ride with a great local musician, Fred Modad in his little orange bug and wound up sitting with a bunch of Prince-Stone-ians that took up the whole second row. The first several songs he performed he had recorded all the backup instruments himself, I believe he said

he could play seventeen musical instruments at that time. He told us that he had to tell us smoking's not allowed, then he came down off the stage while singing, he reached across the first aisle and parted with us. Esmerelda probably stills has it pinned to the wall. When my subscription to Oath runs out, the organizers can take over, or NOT! All the 911 Grassroots Organizers either think this is unfeasible, or they've been coerced into giving up. I'm not an organizer, so that has always been for others to pick this up and carry it. I'm just a simple man, I like to tell people there's a reason I'm a plumber. Because, I'm not a rocket scientist!

My all-time favorite song from the time I first heard it when it came out in '72 is still "Brandy" by Looking Glass probably because of the ancient sea faring lore of which I heard so much before I was four that my father shared with me, that he passed on from a Great-Great Grandfather, sea captain that sailed from Ireland to Canada many times and moved our family to Canada most now in the Buffalo area of upstate New York. But the song that is most personal to me is "That's My Job" by Conway Twitty because a couple of weeks before we got the news that my father had died of congestive heart failure while in Korea I woke up crying late at night and made my way to my mothers room and described to her the dream I had of my father wrecking an army jeep into a lake and drowning. She got me settled back in my bed, but she always said that she took it as being a premonition and that it helped her to be prepared for the news that later came in the usual way.

"What's Going On" by Marvin Gaye

Mother, mother. There's too many of you crying
Brother, brother, brother. There's far too many of you dying
Father, father. We don't need to escalate
You see, war is not the answer
For only love can conquer hate
You know we've got to find a way
To bring some lovin' here today
Picket lines and picket signs
Don't punish me with brutality
Talk to me So you can see
Oh, what's going on

The proposals I have presented, such as term limits and gun control laws seem to me to be the ones with the most popular support, but the government no longer represents the popular wants of the people and the main reason is our centralized government. It should have been a priority to decentralize as soon as our military was strong enough to warrant it. As for the problems overseas I don't advocate war, but we must take responsibility for the messes we have made. At this point, I believe we can be quite certain that our CIA is responsible for most of the serious problems in the world and they have made a mess out of Iraq and Afghanistan and it is our responsibility to try to fix it. Trump – Russia is garbage. If it weren't for the support of both of our leading parties Russia's economy would have gone down hard about fifteen years ago and its ex-KGB leader with it. You can bet your life, Vladimir Putin has stayed in power all this time, more by the doings of the CIA than by his leadership skills, or even, because of the power of the former KGB. Our politicians have turned over technology to Russia and China that has brought them so far along that in time they will be a real threat to our military defenses. Therefore, we must act now, because time is running out. I'm sure there will be some big surprises at who our allies are when this country once again takes on the fight for freedom through democracy. I won't venture a guess as to whom those allies might be, but I'm sure we'll be surprised at the misinformation that has come

out of our intelligence community. The Taliban and Chechens were once considered to be “Freedom Fighters”, as in, fighters for theirs and their countries freedom until the Taliban set out to burn the CIA’s poppy fields and the Chechens were declared terrorists by Putin and backed by the UN.

There is no “Constitutional Crisis” when it comes to finding fault with any of the 17 secret agencies of the federal government. The Founding Fathers were strictly against secrecy but there were powerful forces of influence that were able to “convince” them that the army and navy would require the ability to function in secrecy in times of war. Secrecy has no place in democracy and it was not given a place in the US Constitution and our secret intelligence agencies have proven themselves enemies of democracy and enemies of an individuals’ freedom. The Bureau of Investigation did not begin until July 26, 1908 and was led by the infamous “**John Edgar Hoover** (January 1, 1895 – May 2, 1972), was an American detective and the first Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) of the United States. He was appointed as the director of the Bureau of Investigation — the FBI's predecessor — in 1924 and was instrumental in founding the FBI in 1935, where he remained director until his death in 1972 at the age of 77. Hoover has been credited with building the FBI into a larger crime-fighting agency than it was at its inception and with instituting a number of modernizations to police technology, such as a centralized fingerprint file and forensic laboratories.

Later in life and after his death, Hoover became a controversial figure as evidence of his secretive abuses of power began to surface. He was found to have exceeded the jurisdiction of the FBI,^[1] and to have used the FBI to harass political dissenters and activists, to amass secret files on political leaders,^[2] and to collect evidence using illegal methods.^[3] Hoover consequently amassed a great deal of power and was in a position to **intimidate** and threaten sitting presidents.^[4]

One of his biographers, Kenneth Ackerman, writes that the allegation that Hoover's secret files kept presidents from firing him is “a myth”.^[5] However, Richard Nixon was recorded in 1971 stating that one of the reasons he did not fire Hoover was that he was afraid of reprisals against him from Hoover.^[6] **President Truman** said that Hoover transformed the FBI into his private secret police force.”

“... we want no Gestapo or secret police. The FBI is tending in that direction. They are dabbling in **sex-life scandals and plain blackmail**. J. Edgar Hoover would give his right eye to take over, and **all congressmen and senators are afraid of him**.” — Harry S. Truman^[7] From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

(The FBI's involvement in the Civil Rights Movement was a double-edged sword. It had been discovered that black leaders in the movement were teaching young black men that bisexual behavior was one of the most extensive and deeply damaging results of **slavery**. The FBI's support of the movement was aimed at discovering the identity of these leaders and targeting them for **assassination**.)

...In 1956, several years before he targeted King, Hoover had a public showdown with T. R. M. Howard, a civil rights leader from Mound Bayou, Mississippi. During a national speaking tour, Howard had criticized the FBI's failure to thoroughly investigate the racially motivated murders of George W. Lee, Lamar Smith, and Emmett Till. Hoover wrote an open letter to the press singling out these statements as “irresponsible”.^[8]

In 1960s, Hoover's FBI monitored John Lennon and Malcolm X.^[9] The COINTELPRO tactics were later extended to organizations such as the Black Panther Party, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and others. Hoover's moves against people who maintained contacts with subversive elements, some of whom were members of the civil rights movement, also led to accusations of trying to undermine their reputations.^[10]

The treatment of Martin Luther King, Jr. and actress Jean Seberg are two examples: Jacqueline Kennedy recalled that Hoover told President John F. Kennedy that King tried to arrange a sex party

while in the capitol for the March on Washington and told Robert Kennedy that King made derogatory comments during the President's funeral." From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

"To Bosch a murder book was the anchor of the case, a compendium of every move made, interview taken, piece of evidence gathered. It was a physical component with weight and substance. Sure, it could be reduced to a digital computer file, but somehow that made it less real to him, and this felt disrespectful to the dead." "The Drop" by Michael Connelly. Hannah: "Harry, do you believe there is evil in the world? Of course, ... "Where does it come from? How do people become evil? Harry, where does evil come from?" Bosch asked, "Is this the nature-versus-nurture discussion?" (This is the question I am trying to answer for you and I can tell you definitively it is nurtured (**programmed**) in our society primarily because evil is programmed by family members and by the ones we turn to for help, psychologists and psychiatrists who program their patients that their problem is they are a man living in woman's body. Neurologists are the only legitimate ones in this bunch trying to teach seizure patients to be patient with themselves, and not to say, "I can't think", when a family member is programming them to cry out repeatedly "I can't think, I can't think". Programming trumps teaching every time and frustrates neurologists to death. The worst part of this problem is how far it's gone beyond the psychologists and psychiatrists into the very fabric of our lives. The young people that have all been declared in need of counselling and some sort of drug treatment, mainly, either Prozac or Ritalin ought to know there is something seriously wrong with this picture. What is normal? Normal was defined as the majority of the population until they programmed the majority of teachers by making them teach the same lesson 5 or 6 times a day, there once was a solid commitment by teachers that there was a difference between educating students and programming them until the teachers became programmed themselves by the repetitious delivery of their daily lesson then they accepted the concept that there is no difference between teaching and programming. After that, accepting that there are no normal children in this abnormal world wasn't such a leap. Programming trumps all logical thought. We can get away from programming and back to educating if "The People" will get up on their hind legs and insist on enhanced body-cams that can, record audio and video so, each of us, can determine for ourselves whether someone is taking advantage of us using programming techniques and put a stop to it. And can also recognize whether a program or app is using subliminal audio or video to alter our thoughts. Those of you who get yourselves all worked up over the rights of the LBGT community will not be able to realize that the goal of normalizing this abnormal behavior has been the single most targeted goal of the mass programming age, until you have successfully deprogrammed yourselves and discovered the truth for yourselves. Don't let this single issue override your innate desire to regain your freewill.

"Truth has power. And if we gravitate toward similar ideas, maybe we do so because those ideas are true ... written deep within us. And when we hear the truth, even if we don't understand it, we feel that truth resonate within us ... vibrating with our unconscious wisdom. Perhaps the truth is not learned by us, but rather, re-called ... re-membered ... re-recognized as that which is already inside us." Dan Brown "The Lost Symbol".

The truth is that the FBI was led for nearly 50 years by a cross dressing sexual deviant whose ranks were filled with these types of men and their main goal was gathering compromising information, primarily of a sexual nature, to garner power over politicians

with the objective of normalizing an abnormal sexual behavior. It is naïve to believe the passage of an ethics rule had any effect on this, other than to make the Federal Bureau of Intimidation even more secretive. The wide-spread acceptance of gay and bisexual relationships between men is the result. The feminine movement was also used to advance the gay movement by taking equal treatment for women to another level, to insist that men and women are the same, they are not. Women nurture both male and female children and they are more affectionate with each-other at all ages than men are. All male mammals are territorial by nature around other males of their species. They are affectionate with their female children throughout their lives but begin to be less affectionate with their male children at three to six years old. This is instinct. Programming humans to behave in ways that are against instinct causes violent internal turmoil and self-hate. Self-hate is the goal, when you hate yourself you are capable of anything. Women have a long history of sharing space with each other when they both are actively seeking a male companion. Males sharing space is something very new. It is natural for some women to be bisexual, but it is not natural for any man. This is the difference the feminist movement fails to recognize, to be more accurate they are programmed to ignore it. The Democratic Party have redefined liberal to be sexual freedom and in doing so they have become too hardcore. So, let's call it what it is. The "Hardcore Left" has gone too far left, to the point of programming people to accept abnormal sexual behavior as normal. They want to present the "Centrist Project" as being more moderate but just as the "Tea Party" would have been more honest to call themselves the "Alt-Right" from the start, it seems clear to me that the "Centrist Project" would be more honest to label themselves the "Hardcore Left" right up front. They've already changed their name to "Unite America" well, that's what I want to do too but there are only two genders, like they say "it's Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve" so, to be a true "Moderate" you need to acknowledge that just as the racist haters on the "Alt-Right" can only get in that condition after years of programming, it is also true that "Gay" people, who display vehement hate toward anyone that speaks the truth, certainly must require even more extensive programming for them behave in ways that are contradictory to nature. I don't want to see anyone hating anyone, the "Alt-Right" and the "Hardcore Left" are victims of extensive programming and if they can be provided with the technology that would expose the source and method of their programming to themselves, they would soon overcome it. That Catholic Nun that taught my 5th grade class, also taught us that each person can defend themselves from being programmed by choosing a "Mantra" they keep strictly to themselves, to use when they recognize that someone is gaining too much power over them, provided of course, you're not already programmed to download all your secrets to your programmer. This does not mean that the entire LBGT population are illegitimate victims. The Nazi doctors brought over here after WWII put some serious "Shit in the Game" when they performed crude sex-change operations on new born babies, whisking them away before the mother saw them, then presenting their boy as a girl, or visa-versa. Which resulted in male or female genital mutilation (1997 documentary). [We can only pray they did not pass this practice on to others who have become more skilled. Even so, it should be clear by medical examination, those that need their genitals restored.](#)

College student kicked out of class for telling professor there are only two genders By [Caleb Parke](#) | [Fox News](#) 3/12/2018

The hoopla over sexual harassment is just the smoke and mirrors to keep us from looking at the hideous sexual crimes against children, and an excuse for Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Zinke to purge people from the department based merely on an accusation. This is very dangerous, when people are denied due process, it is in conflict with the constitution.

Locking human beings in cages for more than five years is cruel and unusual punishment.

This was started to make men gay and that is the sole purpose that it continues to this day. Hence, I refer to prison as **"The no-child left behind program for adults!"** There is so much going on that people just don't get. Know your history people, one man forcing another man to have sex was a phenomenon first experienced by sailors, on board a ship, where there were no women. This led to murder of one of the victims by the other, make no mistake about it, both were victims. The survivor is left with self-hate for not being able to stop it or for perpetrating it. Self-hate is a condition that renders a person capable of any atrocity. When this was discovered, over 5,000 years ago, it was exploited and then promoted by incarceration. We must use the Yukon-Koyukuk, Alaska 2,299.84 sq. miles (1,472,000 acres), population est. 5,365 July 1, 2017 to provide a free life of exile for the estimated 49,000 inmates serving a life sentence. Of the nearly 7,000,000 in the adult prison system, on review of these cases, at least 6,500,000 people will be able to walk out of prison wearing an ankle bracelet. Each county sheriffs' department will be directly responsible for monitoring their own people and the GPS signal will be transmitted directly to a receiver in the county courthouse. Those remaining will have their sentences reduced to five years or less. All inmates facing more than one year of incarceration must be provided the opportunity for a first-class legal education. If it is necessary to put them on an ankle bracelet and transport them to a law school, then that is what will be done. But this should be able to be done by computer classes. FBI: WHAT WE INVESTIGATE: "The FBI is the primary federal agency responsible for investigating allegations regarding violations of federal civil rights statutes. These laws are designed to protect the civil rights of all persons—citizens and non-citizens alike—within U.S. territory. Using its full suite of investigative and intelligence capabilities, the Bureau today works closely with its partners to prevent and address hate crime, human trafficking, color of law violations, and Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act violations." **"Well, IMAGINE THAT!"** This is the agency whose sole purpose for acting like they supported the "Civil Rights Movement" at all, was to identify the black leaders that were teaching that sexual activity between men was a devastating result of slavery, which it was. Captains of slave ships were the worst. It was their treatment of slaves, as slave owners after retiring, that has been promoted as the standard. Not so! But, J. Edgar Hoover, Yes. Trace his family tree back far enough and you'll find a slave-ship captain that was black! Well, maybe not a slave ship captain but he was an African-American.

Was founding FBI director J. Edgar Hoover an African-American man?

NICOLE MARIE MELTON 11, 25, 2011 - ESSENCE

"My grandfather told me that this powerful man, Edgar, was his second cousin, and was passing for white," says Millie McGhee, an African-American relative of Hoover's. "If we talked about this, [Edgar] was so powerful he could have us all killed. I grew up terrified about all this." McGhee began to uncover facts about the possibility of Hoover's Black ethnicity after she dug through altered court records, conducted oral interviews with both white and Black Hoovers and enlisted licensed genealogists who determined that Hoover was indeed a relative of hers.'

James Comey tweets about freedom of the press right after Trump slams CNN

by Sonam Sheth - Viewed 11-26-2017

Former FBI director James Comey tweeted out a quote about freedom of the press by the former president and founding father, Thomas Jefferson, shortly after President Donald Trump [railed against CNN](#) on Twitter.

".@FoxNews is MUCH more important in the United States than CNN, but outside of the U.S., CNN International is still a major source of (Fake) news, and they represent our Nation to the WORLD very poorly," Trump tweeted. "The outside world does not see the truth from them!"

Trump frequently [lashes out at CNN](#), claiming that it covers him and his administration unfairly and calling the channel "fake news" and "Fraud News Network."

Comey took to the social media platform half an hour later, tweeting, "'Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.'" He attributed the quote to Jefferson, who wrote it in a [1786 letter](#) to the physician, James Currie.

Does anyone else see the irony of these words coming out of the mouth of the ex-director of a secret agency that denies the right of the freedom of the press thousands of times a day? Why is it that the scariest part of this effort is to write such things about a federal agency that believes so strongly in freedom of speech? Ironic! Truth is, one of the main objectives of the FBI is to expunge from the historic record unfavorable facts.

"Redemption Song" by Bob Marley

Old pirates, yes, they rob I
Sold I to the merchant ships
Minutes after they took I
From the bottomless pit

But my hand was made strong
By the 'and of the Almighty
We forward in this generation
Triumphantly

Won't you help to sing
These songs of freedom?
'Cause all I ever have
Redemption songs

Emancipate yourselves from mental slavery
[None but ourselves can free our minds](#)
Have no fear for atomic energy

'Cause none of them can stop the time
How long shall they kill our prophets
While we stand aside and look? Uh
Some say it's just a part of it
We've got to fulfill the book

Won't you help to sing
These songs of freedom?
'Cause all I ever have
Redemption songs
Redemption songs
Redemption songs

Emancipate yourselves from mental slavery
None but ourselves can free our mind, whoa
Have no fear for atomic energy
'Cause none of them-a can-a stop-a the time
How long shall they kill our prophets
While we stand aside and look?
Yes, some say it's just a part of it
We've got to fulfill the book

Won't you help to sing
These songs of freedom?
'Cause all I ever have
Redemption songs
All I ever have
Redemption songs
These songs of freedom
Songs of freedom

Quotes from "The Sixth Man" by David Baldacci

Michelle: "Things have really gotten screwed up, haven't they?"

Sean: "Actually, they've been screwed up for a long time. Which means we all have to work a little harder to fix them."

Edgar: "That's a good attitude to have. ... The world is complicated, so people seek complicated solutions. ... But sometimes the answers are simple, and people still refuse to see them. ... the simple approach ... is better ... because ... fewer things can go wrong."

Sean: "They'll kill you ..."

Edgar: "Maybe, maybe not." **But they will kill us all if we do nothing. If we act! They'll play it on multiple fronts.** "They'll prepare for the worst but execute any plan that seems feasible."

Sidney Sheldon: "There is magic, but you have to be the magician. You have to make the magic yourself." "Life is like a novel. It's filled with suspense. You have no idea what is going to happen until you turn the page."

Dan Brown: "Peace on this earth will not be forged by military strength. It will be forged by those who come together despite their governments differences." "Deception Point"

Nora Roberts: This quote is a fabulous analogy to the United States of America and her enduring Constitution that provides for us still, the hope for change.

"The stone walls stood as they had for more than two centuries, simple, sturdy and strong. Mined from the hills and valleys, they rose in testament to man's inherent desire to leave his mark, to build and create. Over those two centuries man married the stone with brick, with wood and glass, enlarging, transforming, enhancing to suit the needs, the times, the whims. Throughout, the building on the crossroads watched as the settlement became a town, as more buildings sprang up. The dirt road became asphalt, horse and carriage gave way to cars. Fashions flickered by in the blink of an eye.

Still it stood, rising on its corner of The Square. An enduring landmark in the cycle of change. It new war, heard the echo of gunfire, the cries of the wounded, the prayers of the faithful. It new blood and tears, joy and fury. Birth and death. It thrived in good times, endured the hard times. It changed hands and purpose, yet the stone walls stood." [Will we go with the status quo until the final paragraph has come to pass?](#)

In time, the wood of its graceful double porches began to sag. Glass broke; mortar cracked and crumbled. Some who stopped at the light on the town square might glance over to see pigeons flutter in and out of broken windows and wonder what the old building had been in its day. **Then the light turned green and they drove on.**" Many might say that, compared to the promise of the fifties, before the murders of John, Martin and Bobby, that's where we are now and ["I wonder, still I wonder who'll stop the rain."](#) CCR

Long as I remember the rain been comin' down
Clouds of mystery pourin' confusion on the ground.
Good men through the ages tryin' to find the sun.
And I wonder still I wonder who'll stop the rain.

I went down Virginia seekin' shelter from the storm
Caught up in the fable I watched the tower grow
Five-year plans and new deals wrapped in golden chains.
And I wonder still I wonder who'll stop the rain.

Heard the singers playin', how we cheered for more.
The crowd had rushed together tryin' to keep warm.
Still the rain kept pourin', fallin' on my ears
And I wonder, still I wonder who'll stop the rain.

Is the Real Reason Asbestos was Found to be Unsafe Because the of the affect It had on Fire Insurance? Was Fiberglass Production in the Same Plants as Asbestos the Only Reason Asbestos has been Banned after Thousands of Years of Use? Far Fetched Conspiracy Theory? It Shouldn't be any Secret, at this Point in Time, now

that Insurance Companies are Responsible for Ninety Percent of New Laws Passed in the USA:

In 1978, when it was first reported on the radio that asbestos was a major health issue, the people working in the plants said they use fiberglass in those same plants and **it's the fiberglass that is killing us, not the asbestos**. But asbestos had too many positive aspects that the federal government needed to put an end to. Asbestos is still the most versatile and most fire-resistant product ever used in construction work and was becoming common in such products as coaches and chairs. It was used to make fireproof asbestos suits during WWII for use on aircraft carriers, so men could fight the blazing hot fires that result when a bomb penetrates an elevator shaft.

Asbestos products were beginning to make wood framed homes, with asbestos siding and asbestos wallboard and asbestos furniture nearly fireproof. It seems more likely to me that fiberglass is truly the source of these lung conditions. Fiberglass is being delivered into homes with little children. It is severely thick in the new gymnasium at the First Baptist Church in Princeton, WV and in Lowes', that stores huge bales inside their buildings. People can't see it, so they just look at me like I must be out of my mind when I try to warn them that it is in their home. At the local general store, they have a flexible duct coming into the front from the storage area that has the inner and outer linings pulled back and the dusty fiberglass hanging out in front of the blow hole. I was standing there breathing through my tee-shirt, trying to explain to the owners' son that I have worked around the stuff for years and that it is deadly. He just rolled his eyes and said he already had a serious respiratory problem, so it couldn't possibly matter, **well hello, is anybody in there? Is anybody out there? Who's talking crazy now?** I used to recover much more quickly and I use a power respirator when I know that attic or crawl space I'm going to be working is full of fiberglass but when I go into someone's home whose heating system was poorly done I rarely realize how bad the air was until after I have left and I since it on my cheeks. My sister bought me a real nice respirator that cost over \$400.00. When I checked out the filters they looked and felt like cotton, so I put it on and tried it out. A short time after I put it up I began to bleed from both nostrils. The filters were made fiberglass, so I tore them off and modified it, using the cotton filters for my old \$70.00 power resperator and I still can use it, but it's sad, really sad.

Mesothelioma Justice Network: Drywall and Asbestos Exposure

Hazards / Problems Associated with Fiberglass Duct Liner and HVAC Insulation

Guidance for Insulating New HVAC/Ductwork DC Indoor Air Quality Work Group Background
Fiberglass (fibrous glass or glass wool) internal duct liner has been used as acoustical and thermal insulation in many Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems. Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) complaints may arise when the fiberglass internal duct liner deteriorates over time.

U.S. BORDER OFFICERS TOLD A MEXICAN TEEN TO DRINK LIQUID METH. HIS FAMILY RECEIVED \$1 MILLION FOR HIS DEATH.

By [Kristine Phillips](#) 3, 21, 2017 Post Nation (See 60 Minutes video of Valerie Baird, break down realizing that she had been programmed to do something she cannot believe she did.)

GOVERNMENT AGENTS 'DIRECTLY INVOLVED' IN MOST HIGH-PROFILE US TERROR PLOTS **THE GUARDIAN** BY SPENCER ACKERMAN, 7/21/2014

"In some cases the FBI may have created terrorists out of law-abiding individuals by suggesting the idea of taking terrorist action or encouraging the target to act," the report alleges.' ... and can cajole people toward a plot "who perhaps would never have participated in a terrorist act on their own initiative", the study found.' ... informants played an "active role" in incubating plots leading to arrest, according to studies cited in the Human Rights Watch report.' ... But the report is a rare attempt at a critical overview of a system' ...

60 Minutes Investigates First ISIS – Claimed Attack in US and what the FBI Knew by Anderson Cooper 3/26/2017

The following is a script from "Attack in Garland," which aired on March 26, 2017. Anderson Cooper is the correspondent. Graham Messick and Steve McCarthy, producers. Jack Weingart, associate producer.

"I can't tell you whether the FBI knew the attack was gonna occur. I don't like to think that they let it occur. But it is shocking to me that an undercover agent sees fellas jumping out of a car and he drives on."

"Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men's views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it." — **Woodrow Wilson, The New Freedom**

By the time you become the leader of a country, someone else makes all the decisions. You may find you can get away with Virtual Presidents, Virtual Prime Ministers, and Virtual Everything. - Bill Clinton

Years from now, when we look back on Bill Clinton's presidency, its defining moment may well be Clinton's rationalization to the grand jury about why he wasn't lying when he said to his top aides that with respect to Monica Lewinsky, "there's nothing going on between us." *"It all depends on what the meaning of the word is, is."*

"IF YOU SHUT UP THE TRUTH AND BURY IT UNDER THE GROUND, IT WILL BUT GROW, AND GATHER TO ITSELF SUCH EXPLOSIVE POWER THAT THE DAY IT BURSTS THROUGH IT WILL BLOW UP EVERYTHING IN ITS WAY."
- FRENCH AUTHOR EMILE ZOLA

"TREASON DOES NEVER PROSPER. WHAT'S THE REASON? WHEN IT PROSPERS, NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON."
SIR JOHN HARRINGTON

**NOVEMBER 22, 1963
DALLAS, TEXAS
IN LESS THAN**

ALLEGATIONS OF CIA DRUG TRAFFICKING

Detailed documentations, CIA response, Mena, Arkansas, **Mexico, Honduras, Nicaragua**, The movie about these events was called *Kill the Messenger*.
PANAMA, VENEZUELA

The CIA, Drug Kingpin to the World, Doesn't Exist. It's Just a CT.

Jack Armstrong: "When I was in the army and we'd go on patrol, I always analyzed everything. Some of the guys liked to wing it. And sometimes in combat you have to do that. But being prepared because you've done your homework is the best way to survive. I hope you understand. **I want to do my best to do this right. For all of you.**" David Baldacci "One Summer".

What ignited the character assassination that began 1987? It seems kind of strange now, but the petition I wrote in 1984 was about building two border fences along the Mexican border about 200 yards from each other with a two-lane road running down the middle. The outer fence would be 12ft high, easy to get over but with motion sensors, so the Border Patrol could move in before they could get over the taller, more difficult to cross second fence. **I wasn't interested in deporting anyone.** I wanted the two fences to swing north around Big Bend National Park and build a vetting center there and let the people have a neutral zone while finding a place for them and making most of them citizens in about a six-month period. When anyone was refused they didn't have to go back, I thought the Big Bend could hold a small town of those denied entry that stayed but most would be in transition. I've since found that Big Bend is a pretty rare and special environment. Seeing as how that was 30 years ago, I've had a lot of time to mull this over. And I saw in the news, that the towns east of Big Bend don't want to change the way it is because their economy depends on the workers that cross the border every day. We do need powerfully strong borders to defend our country against terrorism with an entirely overt strategy.

Starting out west, I propose that we build a three-lane border bridge (the symbolic wall), that runs along the top of a hundred or more check points, however many are needed to keep traffic moving and so every vehicle can be thoroughly inspected from end to end removing everything inside a tractor-trailer, family car or FedEx truck, so no-one has to wait very long in the hot sun. If the four people that work in a check point are not needed they hop in a Humvee and head east into the mountains on patrol. If they are needed they're just called back in. When you drive off the top of the wall the road moves a hundred yards from the border with the low sensor fence on the border and the 30ft tall

see through fence 100yds north of the three-lane road. I propose that these two fences and the three-lane continue, uninterrupted from the Pacific to the Gulf. With the 12ft fence being about 100yds from the floodplain of the Rio Grande when the fences get to where the Rio Grande runs along the border.

Decision to restore citizenship question to census draws protest

By KEVIN FREKING and HOPE YEN, Associated Press, Tuesday, March 27, 2018

The tech industry needs one million workers now Andy Serwer 1/25/2018

DOJ TINKERS WITH IMMIGRATION COURTS TO SPEED

DEPORTATIONS YAHOO! NEWS CAITLIN DICKSON 4/13/2018

YouTube interview with Attorney Elizabeth Beck.

Elizabeth Beck and her husband Jared had sued the DNC for collusion and fraud. She said that Seth Rich was an informer and Shawn Lucas was her process server. Shawn Lucas was about to provide evidence to the courts on service of process when he suddenly passed away. Both Rich and Lucas were to be witnesses in the DNC case. Mrs. Beck was alone in this first interview that I tried to do a fair job of paraphrasing, but she speaks very fast and was clearly scared of what might happen to her and her family. Sorry, couldn't find way back to document interviewer.

H. A. Goodman interview with Attorneys, Jared Beck and his wife Elizabeth. Jared Beck talks at length about the problems with the courts no longer giving people who are not rich a chance. He said that when a court dismisses a case early in the process, he tells his client, at least they didn't wait until you had spent a great deal more money and dismiss at the last minute before the case is scheduled to go to trial. At one point, Jared says the country needs a period of deprogramming. The problem with ever achieving any useful level of deprogramming is that everyone always takes sides, closing off any beneficial discussion with their programmed bias animosity. This is my impression from an interview by H. A. Goodman with the Becks. I'm sorry to say it, but both are very distraught from repeatedly being frustrated by the system. Jared Beck expressed a considerable amount anger himself, but once he got that out of his system, he regained his composure and made some very powerful points and could offer "The People" a great deal more if he were alone in the room. Both have a great deal to offer and it would be nice to see H. A. Goodman do another interview with them, in which, Jared is watching the children and the interview from another room, while Goodman asks Elizabeth about her mother's life and what she feels it revealed about our current situation. Then, they could trade places and Goodman could get Jared's thoughts on what his wife had to say and then go on to discuss in depth the writings of Plato in his eighth book. Trading places a couple of times to pick these two Attorneys brains on where we are and how we should proceed.

Jared says that rigged juries happen far more often in this country than most people realize. This is something I would like to address along with several other problems with the present system that work together to favor the rich in a very profound way. Any one of which, taken by itself, we can understand how they were argued in favor of, but the people who got it done that way new what they were doing.

First, the secret grand jury. They may have claimed they wanted it kept secret to protect the innocent from being wrongly smeared in public. That is really of little benefit when you realize

how much this helps the well-connected rich. A grand jury being made up of 16 to 23 people with a 2/3 to 3/4 majority required to indict. When a rich person has a case brought before the secret grand jury, they are often warned that they may be indicted. This affords them the opportunity to use their wealth and influence to kill the case before going to trial.

Second, the plea agreement process, the most hideous part of this does not involve the judge, but it is very prevalent. Many defense attorneys use untold levels of intimidation to scare their clients into taking a plea and sadly, large numbers of innocent people take a plea. If the judge is determined to give a guilty or innocent person more than the plea agreement calls for, they can agree to hear the plea, insist on some level of admission of guilt as the defense attorney has coached or coerced the defendant into agreeing to. Then, the judge can still reject the plea agreement. You are naïve if you believe the jury won't hear about that admission of guilt.

Third, the trial judge has too much power. The first is that they choose the entire jury pool that the defense and prosecution gets to choose from. Which is probably the main reason Jared Beck said that rigged juries happen more often than most people realize. The second is that they can suppress information from being presented to the jury. Information that could determine the outcome of more trials than anyone can know.

Fourth, the jury must retire to a room together, to deliberate on their decision without the benefit of contemplating both sides free of distraction. This alone, can also determine the outcome of the decision by one person dominating the proceedings and causing others to concentrate on their domineering point of view before having the opportunity to make-up their own mind.

Before I present my proposals to address these issues, first and foremost, we need this federal law. That there be no place that live-feed body cams with audio are banned. So, everyone that feels safer providing a live-feed to their family, while they go about their business cannot be denied no matter where they go. Having said that, I would like to present some significant changes to the way our courts are required to proceed that I believe addresses the above four concerns:

First, that Grand Juries no longer be secret, that they be documented with audio and video that is available in the court house as part of the public record, although not a live-feed. That every other aspect of the legal system from law enforcement, to Magistrate Courts, to Circuit Courts, to State Supreme Courts, to Lawyer Disciplinary Boards, to Judicial Investigative Commissions, to Federal Courts, right up to the US Supreme Court be documented by audio and video that is live-feed. Law offices must start recording audio and video, (not live-feed), anytime an attorney, employee, or anyone is in the office and that if a client did not record it, or live-feed it their self, that a copy be provided to them before leaving the office. And that the client be in control of the attorney client privilege and that exposing this documentation is their privilege.

Third, the prosecution and the defense will be required to share all available verifiable information and all information can be presented during the trial at the discretion of the prosecutor and at the discretion of the defendant. Either side can object information being presented that had not been shared with them.

Fourth and second problem addressed together, do away with time saving plea agreements and save time by doing away with choosing a jury from the judges' pool by creating a 200-question test from the live coverage of the trial. Half of the questions from the defense and half from the prosecution. Anyone over the age of fourteen can take the test, but they must take the test immediately after watching the live-feed and only those that score above 90% on the test will have 24 hours to express their opinion on what the outcome should be. The decision will be based on a 3/4 majority. If twelve or more people express concern that the defendant was found innocent due to excessive bias of family and friends participation, it will be advertised for one week in a county,

at least 100 miles away within the state that a rerun of a contested trial will be aired and participation is requested even though you may not know the people involved.

Trump's attempt to have the Seth Rich murder investigated resulted in the revelation that the FBI - Clinton Political Machine can silence the President of the United States. Trump could still get the satellite surveillance of the area. It could identify Seth Rich and the ones responsible for his murder. Personally, I believe the FBI reported the guns being stolen, let it leak that Seth was to meet with them and had the club owner offer him a ride home all so they could throw it in the face of the public. Doesn't matter if the family wins three million dollars in a lawsuit, their confident they'll still be drawing a paycheck. These patriots only participate in baby raping torture to keep the country safe and they have to get our elected officials to participate to get incriminating and compromising information on them, so they can control them to protect us from them. That's what they've been saying about Trump almost from the start, that they have to control him to protect us from him, that's why John Kelley is such a wonderful chief of staff. The Alt-Right wants Mike Pence to lead them to the righteous Christian White Supremacy that all evangelicals have been striving for, but Pence is young enough they can let Trump stay as long they have control of him.

SETH RICH MURDER: 3 ODD THINGS SURROUNDING DNC

STAFFER'S DEATH BY [BUDHADITYA BHATTACHARJEE](#) 8/25/2016, MORNING NEWS USA

Seth Rich was a DNC Voter Expansion Data Director when he was shot multiple times in the back a block away from his home on July 10, 2016.

Another Mysterious Death: Activist and Sanders Supporter Who Served Papers to DNC on Fraud Case Dead by Jim Hoft August 4, 2016, Gateway Pundit

Shawn Lucas was thrilled about serving the papers to the DNC before Independence Day. (The following is the lead-in to the recording of the live-feed.) "On June 28, 2016, supporters of presidential candidate Bernie Sanders and donors and members of the Democratic Party, sued the DNC and its Chairwoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz in an unprecedented nationwide class action for fraud. On July 1st, 2016, Shawn Lucas, process server at One Source Process of Washington, D. C. attempts service on the defendants. Independent filmmaker Ricardo O. Villalba is also there with his camera."

If you watch the tape you will see that the Head of Security at the DNC finally came out to the front desk and when he realized Mr. Villalba was videoing he began trying to intimidate him into turning it off, but Mr. Villalba just told him he was not taping and that it was a live-feed with over 200 people watching. Then the head of security came out from behind front desk in a much more intimidating manor telling Mr. Villalba he wasn't allowed to record in the DNC but Mr. Villalba just backed away and the head of security returned behind the desk. While continuing the live-feed Mr. Villalba asked a female guard what the process was to share the democratic process in action, she responded she didn't know, but he couldn't continue without permission. Mr. Villalba said they would have to leave and go through the proper procedure and return.

This was before Wikileaks released documents proving the DNC was working against the Sanders campaign during the 2016 primary. Shawn Lucas was found dead this week.

It's all probably just a strange coincidence, right?

BREAKING WIKILEAKS BOMBHELL! MURDERED DNC STAFFER SETH RICH WAS DNC LEAKER: "HE WAS MY WHISTLEBLOWER" 4/8/2017

While Wikileaks Julian Assange was being interviewed by John Pilger, he brought up the death of Seth Rich. Watch Assange's strange and somewhat cagey reply.

Here is part of the conversation:

Julian Assange: Whistleblowers go to significant efforts to get us material and often very significant risks. As a 27 year-old, works for the DNC, was shot in the back, murdered just a few weeks ago for unknown reasons as he was walking down the street in Washington.

Reporter: That was just a robbery, I believe. Wasn't it?

Julian Assange: No. There's no finding. So... I'm suggesting that our sources take risks.

EXCLUSIVE: Family of slain DNC staffer Seth Rich demands D.C. police reveal details of its murder investigation after reports claimed he may have been the source of Wikileaks emails By Alana Goodman For Dailymail 5, 24, 2017

KIM DOTCOM HINTED SOMEONE NAMED 'PANDA', WHO HE BELIEVES WAS SETH RICH, CONTACTED HIM ABOUT PLANS TO LEAK DNC DOCUMENTS IN 2015. RICH'S FAMILY HAVE DISMISSED THESE CLAIMS SAYING THERE IS NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE TO PROVE THIS IS TRUE

MURDERED DNC STAFFER SETH RICH WAS ALIVE AND CONSCIOUS WHEN FOUND BY POLICE

Posted on [May 17, 2017](#) by [Dr. Eowyn](#) | [51 Comments](#)

SETH RICH WAS STILL ALIVE WHEN THE POLICE FOUND HIM: **Rich was shot in the back, not the head, and was still alive and conscious when police found him.**

BREAKING: FBI Comes Forward, Admits Seth Rich Murder Bombshell

As information arises, the Seth Rich case becomes more complex — and the extent of the Democrat establishment's deceit becomes more clear.

It turns out that just hours before Rich was murdered in Washington, D.C., **burglars broke into a nearby FBI vehicle and stole firearms which may have been used in Rich's murder. If these two crimes are related, it means that the same burglar who stole the FBI firearms killed Rich. And, even more startling, what if Rich's killer worked for the FBI and came up with the burglary story to cover his tracks?**

The real problem is that both sides, republicans and democrats, have a lot to lose if the truth came out about DNC emails, regardless of their source. That is why there was nearly 100% approval for Rod Rosenstein and Robert Mueller. Both sides were in jeopardy when James Comey delivered his "veiled threat" to congress during the senate hearing on 6/8/2017.

COLLINS: Did you limit that statement to counterintelligence investigations, or were you talking about any kind of FBI investigation?

COMEY: I didn't — I didn't use the term "counterintelligence." I was speaking to him, and briefing him about some salacious and unverified material. It was in the context of that that he had a strong and defensive reaction about that not being true. And my reading of it was it was important for me to assure him we were not personally investigating him. And so the context then was actually narrower, focused on what I had just talked to him about. It was very important because it was, first, true. And second, **I was worried very much about being in kind of a — kind of a J. Edgar Hoover-type situation. I didn't want him thinking that I was briefing him on this to sort of hang it over him in some way.** I was briefing him on it because we were (ph) — had been told by the media it was about to launch. We didn't want to be keeping that from him. **COMEY:** And if there was some — he needed to know this was being said. But I was very keen not to leave him with an impression that the bureau was trying to do something to him. And so that's the context in which I said, "Sir, we're not personally investigating you."

EVERYTHING YOU WANT TO KNOW ABOUT SETH RICH STORY Murdered DNC staffer rumored to have sent 40,000 internal emails to WikiLeaks **WND CRIME** 05/15/2017 Updated: 08/01/2017

DEMOCRATIC 'CRISIS COMMUNICATIONS' PR AGENT HIRED TO SHUT DOWN SETH RICH "CONSPIRACY THEORIES" COVER-UP SURROUNDING MURDERED DNC STAFFER NAMED AS POTENTIAL WIKILEAKS SOURCE? [PAUL JOSEPH](#)

[WATSON](#) | INFOWARS.COM — 8,11,2016

"Truth has power. And if we all gravitate toward similar ideas, maybe we do so because those ideas are true ... written deep within us. And when we hear the truth, even if we don't understand it, we feel that truth resonate within us ... vibrating with our unconscious wisdom. Perhaps the truth is not learned by us, but rather, the truth is re-called ... re-membered ... re-recognized ... as that which is already inside us." DAN BROWN, *The Lost Symbol*. "Peace on this planet will not be forged by military strength. It will be forged by those who come together *despite* their government's differences." DAN BROWN, *Deception Point*

The FBI and later the CIA used the gathering of compromising information and programming to gain control of our democratic republic. Our intelligence community has used programming to get members of Congress commit ever more hideous crimes. The information detailing these crimes has served them well to keep the government in check. But it did not make the internal conflict go away, I believe it has made these politicians more desperate to end this hideous cycle of abuse.

President Donald Trump often says something that is very moderate and positive only to turn around and say something totally Alt-Right that leads me to believe Mike Pence is capable of putting words in the presidents' mouth which can only be explained by programming. The people need to be assured no elected official is under someone else's control. The only way for President Donald Trump, or any other elected official that has come under the control of the intelligence community is going to be able to regain their free will is by recording their interactions 24/7 while serving in an elected office. And this must be one of our demands.

LITTLE RIVER BAND "COOL CHANGE" AS WRITTEN BY GLENN BARRIE SHORROCK

If there's one thing in my life that's missing
It's the time that I spend alone
Sailing on the cool and bright clear water
It's kind of a special feeling

When you're out on the sea alone
Staring at the full moon, like a lover
Time for a cool change
I know that it's time for a cool change

Now that my life is so prearranged
I know that it's time for a cool change
Well I was born in the sign of water
And it's there that I feel my best

The albatross and the whales they are my brothers
There's lots of those friendly people
And they're showing me ways to go
And I never want to lose their inspiration

Time for a cool change
I know that it's time for a cool change
Now that my life is so prearranged
I know that it's time for a cool change

I've never been romantic
And sometimes I don't care
I know it may sound selfish
But let me breathe the air

Let me breathe the air...
Well I was born in the sign of water
And it's there that I feel my best
The albatross and the whales they are my brothers

It's kind of a special feeling
When you're out on the sea alone
Staring at the full moon, like a lover
Time for a cool change

I know that it's time for a cool change
Now that my life is so prearranged
I know that it's time for a cool change

“Let's roll!”

In memory of Todd Beamer

Senate Judiciary leaders ramp up fight with FBI over Comey

By [Tal Kopan](#), CNN, 9/26/2017

Washington (CNN) The leaders of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Tuesday escalated their feud with the FBI and Justice Department, accusing the bureau of obstructing their ability to investigate the firing and actions of former Director James Comey. Republican Chairman Chuck Grassley excoriated the FBI for putting in place what he said amounted to "gag orders," demanding the bureau turn over what his committee has asked for regarding Comey, his firing and statements he made publicly during the campaign about the investigation into former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's email server.

"Why now? Why was the FBI so focused on keeping Congress in the dark? Why is it so afraid of shining the light of day on the controversial decisions Mr. Comey made in the months before he was fired?" Grassley said at the beginning of a hearing on legislation that would protect special counsels. Grassley and Democratic Sen. Dianne Feinstein have flexed their muscle on [possibly subpoenaing](#) witnesses and documents related to Russian interference in the election and any possible obstruction of justice. Grassley was specifically referencing the move by the FBI to enter into a nondisclosure agreement with the Office of Special Counsel before turning over information related to a personnel investigation of him by the Office of Special Counsel (which is unrelated to Special Counsel Robert Mueller.) The FBI only turned information over to the counsel's office on the grounds it wouldn't be shared with Congress, per the agreement, according to Grassley. The Office of Special Counsel declined to comment.

"Nondisclosure agreements are essentially gag orders -- plain and simple," Grassley said. "They thwart transparency, accountability and seek to obstruct congressional oversight." Grassley referenced "two heavily redacted witness interviews" the committee obtained that suggested [Comey had begun drafting](#) his Clinton statement in advance. He added this is the first time OSC recalled this happening with the FBI or any agency. He reiterated his request for the FBI to turn over all witness interviews and documents related to Comey's decision making on the statement he ultimately delivered mid-campaign clearing Clinton while still calling her behavior deeply concerning.

"The executive branch cannot avoid congressional oversight by assigning agreements," Grassley said. "If there's any whiff of partisan or political influence in these institutions under any president or any party, this committee has a responsibility to get to the bottom of it." Feinstein said she agreed with the "general thrust" of what Grassley said -- and said she had asked the CIA to turn over classified intelligence that she believes is relevant to the committee's work. Feinstein noted she sent [a letter](#) to CIA Director Mike Pompeo, co-signed by Grassley, on Monday asking for the Judiciary Committee to have access to materials given to the Senate Intelligence Committee for its Russian election interference investigation that she has reviewed from her position on that committee. "I have been privy to certain pieces of intelligence ... that when I saw it, it was relevant to this committee's oversight and yet this committee cannot receive it," Feinstein said. *CNN's Liz Stark and Manu Raju contributed to this report.*

I get rough on the ex-director of the FBI, but it is his willingness to speak rather than conceal that will be the greatest aid to the success of ending secrecy in government. So, take my words with a grain of salt, knowing that I acknowledge that, at the end of the day, James Comey will be owed a great debt of gratitude for his unprecedented willingness to share with the public a behind the scenes look at the thinking behind the inner workings of the FBI. Mike Pompeo should be doing his share of revealing his career in the CIA, not using that power to make an even bigger mess out of the middle east, and the rest of the world as secretary of state.

Hillary Clinton Was Going to Win Election, Comey Writes, And That's Why He Announced His Email Probe Greg Price NW 4/13/2018

“We the People” want full disclosure, no, we demand all secret agencies come clean, full disclosure of each agents’ career in the intelligence community to congress, so we can clean the slate and move forward with an entirely overt security strategy. Order all US citizens to return home from abroad to provide cover for agents’ safe return. Netanyahu has got to go. Fix the Palestinian problem in Israel by removing all barriers and give Palestinians control of all land promised to them in 1968, immediately. Working through Qatar, Kuwait and Israel, secure the borders of Iraq and Lebanon to welcome all refugees from Syria and disarm them. Afghanistan’s borders must be secured for welcoming and disarming refugees. The Poppy crop must be eradicated along with HW and corn, tomatoes, garlic and a wide variety of fruits, vegetables, herbs and spices planted in their place. The CIA’s drug dealing days are over. I am totally against torture, but it is time to put the Bush family and Dick Cheney in front of a firing squad and promise them a quick, painless death the old-fashioned Mafia way, one bullet to the head one to the heart or they can begin divulging everything they know about the estimated 250 Trillion Dollars in drug money in the dark CIA accounts.

I believe we need to work with Native Americans on the prospect of moving beyond the casino’s the FBI has put into place and build international airports to bring in refugees. I believe many of these refugees will prove to have tremendous educational assets. I do not want to build homes on tribal property. I propose a native American approach handing out yurts. The casinos exist, and they can be put to better use as free schooling for Native Americans in return, through the highest level of college education and R&D in technology.

We want to rebuild our manufacturing and industry using green electricity. We want Steel Mills producing the worlds' strongest steel that burns coal with zero pollution by retaining the smoke until all pollutants have been removed and there is nothing left except hot air. We want all new cars sold in 2020 to be fully electric with four-wheel steering. We want all gas burners changed over to propane by 2020. Anyone that cannot afford to have their gas burner changed to propane will be provided a new electric car in 2020. Auto makers should be able to produce a four-wheel steering front-wheel drive electric car that meets all safety requirements for less than \$5,000.00. We need some new start-ups with fresh ideas in the auto industry. We should preserve gas burning automobiles in the racing industry to explore zero pollution technology in automobiles.

"Everything Good" by Robert Casey

It's all been done
Nothing new under the sun
Everything good about the world is old fashioned
It's just gone out of style,
Won't be back for a while
Everything good about the world is old fashioned
The horse and carriage
The traditional marriage
Living life wild and free
Finding out about the birds and bees
Everything good about the world is old fashioned
Music with meaning
Food with seasoning
Broad dark clouds of birds
Deep, powerful, political words
Everything good about the world is old fashioned
It's just gone out of style,
Won't be back for a while
Martin Luther King, Bobby and John
Wish I had a magic wand!
Where oh where is that bluesy gospel song
Music that just makes you want to sing along
Hey Merle. "Are the Good Times Really Over for Good"
When the night has come
And the land is dark
And the moon is the only light we'll see
No I won't be afraid

"Stand by Me" The Drifter

Oh, I won't be afraid
Just as long as you stand, stand by me
So darling, darling
Stand by me, oh stand by me
Oh stand, stand by me
Stand by me
If the sky that we look upon
Should tumble and fall
Or the mountain should crumble to the sea
I won't cry, I won't cry
No, I won't shed a tear
Just as long as you stand, stand by me
And darling, darling
Stand by me, oh stand by me
Oh stand now, stand by me
Stand by me
So darling, darling
Stand by me, oh stand by me
Oh stand now, stand by me, stand by me

“Take it Easy” Eagles

Well I'm a runnin' down the road
Tryin' to loosen my load
I've got seven women on my mind
Four that wanna own me
Two that wanna stone me
One says she's a friend of mine

Take it easy, take it easy
Don't let the sound of your own wheels
Drive you crazy
Lighten up while you still can
Don't even try to understand
(You damn sure better try to understand)
Just find a place to make your stand
And take it easy

Well, I'm a standin' on a corner
In Winslow, Arizona
Such a fine sight to see
It's a girl my Lord in a flat-bed Ford
Slowin' down to take a look at me
Come on, baby, don't say maybe
I gotta know if your sweet love
Is gonna save me

We may lose and we may win
Though we will never be here again
So open up I'm climbin' in
So take it easy

Well, I'm a runnin' down the road
Tryin' to loosen my load
Got a world of trouble on my mind
Lookin' for a lover

Who won't blow my cover
She's so hard to find
Take it easy, take it easy
Don't let the sound of your own wheels
Make you crazy

Come on baby, don't say maybe
I gotta know if your sweet love
Is gonna save me
Oh, we got it easy
We oughta take it easy

“Desperado” Eagles

Desperado,
Why don't you come to your senses
You been out ridin' fences
For so long, now

Oh, you're a hard one
I know that you got your reasons
These things that are pleasin' you
Can hurt you somehow

Don't you draw the Queen of Diamonds, boy
She'll beat you if she's able
You know the Queen of Hearts
Is always your best bet

Now, it seems to me some fine things
Have been laid upon your table,
But you only want the ones that you can't get

Desperado, oh, you ain't gettin' no younger
Your pain and your hunger,
They're drivin' you home
And freedom, oh freedom,
Well that's just some people talkin'

Your prison is walking through this world all alone
Don't your feet get cold in the winter time?
The sky won't snow and the sun won't shine
It's hard to tell the night time from the day

You're losin' all your highs and lows;
Ain't it funny how the feeling goes away?

Desperado,
Why don't you come to your senses?
Come down from your fences;
Open the gate

It may be rainin', but there's a rainbow above you
You better let somebody love you,
Before it's too late

My brother, Michael Charles Casey, was a psychologist for the state of California during the '70's and '80's and I hitched out to visit him in '79. My cousin, Kenneth Connor Jr. had ridden a 10-speed to Seattle in 1976, in the Bike-Centennial from Philly. When he arrived in Seattle he decided to continue riding south along the coast to visit Mike in LA. When he got to San Francisco he stopped calling home, so my Uncle Ken called Mike to see if he could find out if anything was wrong. Mike told him Kenny had just called and everything was fine. He had met a good group of people and wanted Mike to come up to San Francisco to meet them. Ken insisted that Mike make the trip as soon as possible to make sure everything was alright since everyone was worried about why he stopped calling home. Mike made the trip that Friday and stayed until Sunday. Kenny and the group were going to Colorado to live on a farm that Sunday and they wanted Mike to go with them. They had spent the weekend telling Mike about the farm and how wonderful it was to live there. Mike told them that he would join them later, but he had to go back to LA and quit his job and close out his condo. Mike called Ken when he got back home Sunday and told him his plans. When Mike got up Monday morning he called Ken back and told him that he realized he'd been had, he told Ken he felt like he had been run through a system, like he and the rest of the new people had been processed like a herd of cattle and that Ken should get out there right away to see if they could get Kenny off of the farm. To make a long story, short, the group was the Sun Myung Moon Cult and it took a while to get Kenny out of the cult. My uncle was still involved in helping other parents get their kids out for many years after that.

When I got to Mike's in LA, I met his girl and we went to a party that one of Mike's patients was having for the group therapy. It turned out, they were all men except for the girl that came with us and they were all gay. When we got back I asked why his patients were all gay men. Some of them were made up like women but I could tell they were men. What surprised me was that Mike said some of them actually were women, but they looked like men. What surprised me even more was the answer to my question, why? Mike's answer was that no matter what problem a man or woman came to see him about, eventually, after many visits and extensive psycho-analysis the answer to their problem was always the same: You're a woman living in a man's body or you're a man living in a woman's body. I had nothing to say to that, but I kept mulling it over and it just didn't seem right.

Mike started talking about going to San Francisco the following Friday. He wanted to show me what it was like to be inducted into a cult, so I would recognize what was going on and be able to get out before the programming started taking effect. He insisted that I be responsible for making sure we left Friday night because he was afraid that he might be susceptible to falling under their spell again since it had happened before. He also cautioned me that they had attractive young women that would seem overly interested in being friendly, who would encourage me to stay the night. He said we absolutely must not stay the night because the food they give you is vitamin deficient and it weakens your will to resist. We had a weak soup for supper with them and watched some videos about life on the farm in Colorado and the evening went just as Mike predicted except he was not taken in and we got out of there about 10:30 PM. We stayed the weekend in a nice resort and it was on the ride south on Highway 1 that I, first heard the story about Mike's first trip, how he liked the experience and wanted to sell all his belongings and return. Until he had time to sleep on it and realized the next morning that they were processing people like cattle. That's when I told my brother that it seemed like he was doing the same thing! What do you mean? All of your patients are being made gay as the solution to all of their problems. He said, there's nothing I can do about it, that's the states indoctrination of how I am required to do my job. Well, it wasn't true about you, was it? Now, what are you talking about? You remember what we talked about when we were replacing the bathroom floor at moms, right after you graduated from college you said they had convinced you that you were always more interested in boys than girls from a young age. I told you then, that, that was a damn lie, because you scooped me off the floor when I fell out off the top bunk and landed on my hands and knees right beside where you were sleeping. I was six and you were sixteen and you sure didn't mess with me, we slept there beside of each other. Well, that's true and you convinced me they were wrong, but I feel I have to keep up the pretense that I'm gay just to keep my job. That doesn't bother you, you are an actor on the side, so I guess it's just like, practice! Right. It's good pay with great benefits, so let's just drop it! I was a lot younger then and more idealistic, but I do get that now.

"Simple Man" Lynyrd skynyrd

Mama told me when I was young
Come sit beside me, my only son
And listen closely to what I say
And if you do this
It will help you some sunny day
Oh take your time, don't live too fast
Troubles will come and they will pass
Go find a woman and you'll find love
And don't forget son
There is someone up above

And be a simple kind of man
Oh be something you love and understand
Baby be a simple kind of man
Oh won't you do this for me son if you can?
Forget your lust for the rich man's gold
All that you need is in your soul
And you can do this if you try
All that I want for you my son
Is to be satisfied

And be a simple kind of man
Oh be something you love and understand
Baby be a simple kind of man
Oh won't you do this for me son if you can?
Oh yes I will
Oh don't you worry, you'll find yourself
Follow your heart and nothing else
And you can do this oh baby, if you try
All that I want for you my son
Is to be satisfied

And be a simple kind of man
Oh be something you love and understand
Baby be a simple kind of man
Oh won't you do this for me son if you can?
Baby be a simple, be a simple man
Oh be something you love and understand
Baby be a simple kind of man
Momma told me to be a gentleman
Not in the classical sense, because that's the
Worst kind of beast! It's just that
You must figure it out for yourself,
Be kind to old people, don't cuss,
Be a gentle man with women & children

"Life During Wartime" Talking Heads
Heard of a van that is loaded with weapons,
Packed up and ready to go
Heard of some grave sites, out by the highway,

A place where nobody knows
The sound of gunfire, off in the distance,
I'm getting used to it now
Lived in a brownstone, lived in a ghetto,
I've lived all over this town
This ain't no party, this ain't no disco,
This ain't no fooling around
No time for dancing, or lovey dovey,
I ain't got time for that now
Transmit the message, to the receiver,
Hope for an answer some day
I got three passports, a couple of visas,
You don't even know my real name
High on a hillside, the trucks are loading,
Everything's ready to roll
I sleep in the daytime, I work in the nighttime,
I might not ever get home
This ain't no party, this ain't no disco,
This ain't no fooling around
This ain't no Mudd Club, or C. B. G. B.,
I ain't got time for that now
Heard about Houston? Heard about Detroit?
Heard about Pittsburgh, P. A.?
You oughta know not to stand by the window
Somebody see you up there
I got some groceries, some peanut butter,
To last a couple of days
But I ain't got no speakers, ain't got no
headphones,
Ain't got no records to play
Why stay in college? Why go to night school?
Gonna be different this time
Can't write a letter, can't send no postcard,
I ain't got time for that now
Trouble in transit, got through the roadblock,
We blended in with the crowd
We got computers, we're tapping phone lines,
I know that that ain't allowed
We dress like students, we dress like
housewives,
Or in a suit and a tie
I changed my hairstyle, so many times now,
I don't know what I look like!
You make me shiver, I feel so tender,
We make a pretty good team
Don't get exhausted, I'll do some driving,
You ought to get you some sleep
Burned all my notebooks, what good are
notebooks?
They won't help me survive
My chest is aching, burns like a furnace,
The burning keeps me alive

Analysis: With Comey Interview, It's All-Out War Against Trump

WASHINGTON — If there was any chance that President Trump and James B. Comey could avoid all-out war, it will end Sunday night. That is when ABC News will broadcast an hourlong interview with Mr. Comey, the president's fired F.B.I. director, as he seeks to publicize his searing tell-all memoir, "A Higher Loyalty." Clips aired by the network show Mr. Comey questioning Mr. Trump's character as he says that Mr. Trump repeatedly pressed him to conduct an investigation to refute a salacious allegation that he had cavorted with prostitutes in Moscow.

In the book, which is scheduled to be formally released on Tuesday, Mr. Comey goes just as far, dropping any pretense of comity with the president he briefly served. He calls Mr. Trump unethical and says he is a serial liar who could be vulnerable to blackmail by the Russian government. He compares the president to a mafia boss and says his tenure has been like a forest fire that is incinerating the country's important norms and traditions. "Donald Trump's presidency threatens much of what is good in this nation," Mr. Comey writes in the book. **The interview with Mr. Comey and the weeklong media blitz he plans for his book amount to a remarkable public assault on a sitting president by someone who served at the highest levels of power in the government.** The stakes for both men could not be higher. **Mr. Comey seems likely to be the star witness in any obstruction of justice case brought against the president by Robert S. Mueller III, the special counsel in the sprawling Russia investigation.** Mr. Trump's legal fate, as well as his political fortunes in Washington, may depend on whether he succeeds in undermining the credibility of Mr. Comey and the law enforcement institutions he views as arrayed against him. The ABC interview is Mr. Comey's first major attempt to prevent that from happening, and in it he speaks with the abandon of a man who finally feels unleashed. But Mr. Comey's liberation is all the more combustible because it is aimed directly at a president who has said with pride on Twitter that "when someone attacks me, I always attack back...except 100x more."

As if on cue, hours before the interview aired, Mr. Trump called Mr. Comey a "slimeball" for the second time in three days, saying in a pair of early-morning tweets that he belongs in jail for what the president said were lies to Congress and leaks of classified information. In another tweet, Mr. Trump said Mr. Comey would go down in history as "the WORST FBI Director in history, by far!"

The big questions in Comey's badly reviewed book aren't answered like, how come he gave up Classified Information (jail), why did he lie to Congress (jail), why did the DNC refuse to give Server to the FBI (why didn't they TAKE it), why the phony memos, McCabe's \$700,000 & more? — Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) April 15, 2018

Slippery James Comey, a man who always ends up badly and out of whack (he is not smart!), will go down as the WORST FBI Director in history, by far! — Donald J. Trump

Mr. Comey responded later in the day with a more subtle dig of his own. "My book is about ethical leadership & draws on stories from my life & lessons I learned from others," he tweeted. "3 presidents are in my book: 2 help illustrate the values at the heart of ethical leadership; 1 serves as a counterpoint." It is unclear where the epic battle of wills will lead, other than to a sustained escalation of insults between two men who have each admitted to having outsize egos. **But it is certain to be a test of powerful forces** in the modern media landscape: the presidential megaphone, amplified by 50 million Twitter followers, and the global reach of an adversary on a seemingly endless, 24-hour, cable-news-driven book tour.

Parts of the interview that have already been aired suggest that Mr. Comey talks in detail about the interactions he had with Mr. Trump, including meetings and phone calls about which he says he meticulously wrote down notes afterward for posterity. (In another tweet on Sunday morning, Mr. Trump said that Mr. Comey's "'memos' are self serving and FAKE!")

Some of the most startling assertions by Mr. Comey about Mr. Trump in the interview revolve around his first meeting with the president-elect at Trump Tower just days before the inauguration. That day, intelligence officials, including Mr. Comey, briefed the incoming president

on Russia's attempt to meddle with the election. Mr. Comey says in the interview that Mr. Trump and his aides seemed interested only in what the former F.B.I. director called the "P.R. and spin" about the issue. "The conversation, to my surprise, moved into a P.R. conversation about how the Trump team would position this and what they could say about this," Mr. Comey said in a preview of the interview that aired on Sunday morning. "No one, to my recollection, asked: 'So what's coming next from the Russians? How might we stop it? What's the future look like?'" "It was all, 'What can we say about what they did and how it affects the election that we just had?'" Mr. Comey said.

It was at the end of the meeting that Mr. Comey says in his book that he asked to speak to Mr. Trump alone to brief him on the salacious "Steele dossier," which contains unverified allegations about Mr. Trump, including a claim that the Russian government has video recordings of him watching prostitutes urinate on each other in a Moscow hotel room in 2013. Mr. Comey says in the ABC News interview that Mr. Trump denied the allegations that day, saying, "Do I look like a guy who needs hookers?" Weeks later, in a telephone call from the president after the dossier was published by BuzzFeed, Mr. Trump again denied the account in graphic terms, Mr. Comey said.

"There's no way I would let people pee on each other around me," Mr. Trump said, according to Mr. Comey's account in his book. **Mr. Comey said the president also raised the idea that the F.B.I. should investigate the claim as a way of proving that it never happened. Mr. Comey said he warned Mr. Trump that doing so would add to "the narrative" that the president was under investigation.** Mr. Comey said in the interview that it was an "out of body" experience to be talking with the incoming president about whether the incident had taken place, or whether the Russians had material they could use to blackmail Mr. Trump. "I was floating above myself looking down saying you're sitting here briefing the incoming president of the United States about prostitutes in Moscow," Mr. Comey says in the interview. **Asked whether he believed Mr. Trump's denials, Mr. Comey said he was not sure.** "I honestly never thought these words would come out of my mouth, but I don't know whether the current president of the United States was with prostitutes peeing on each other in Moscow in 2013," he said. **"It's possible, but I don't know."**

On ABC's "This Week" on Sunday, Sarah Huckabee Sanders, the press secretary, unloaded on Mr. Comey, calling him a "self-admitted leaker" and a liar. For his part, Mr. Comey appears unrelenting as well. **In the book, he compares Mr. Trump's demands for his loyalty to the induction ceremonies favored by Sammy the Bull, the boss of the Cosa Nostra.** Holding little back, Mr. Comey argues that Americans in both parties should be wary of the damage Mr. Trump is doing to the country. "What is happening now is not normal," he writes. "It is not fake news. It is not O.K."

"Slime-Ball!" When I saw that Trump had called Comey this, I thought, boy I wish you could be more subtle, Mr. President. Then I read this about the interview to be aired tonight, 4/15/2018. **Then I thought, I can't believe the audacity of this "Slime-Ball" to brief the president on unsubstantiated claims by a foreign power that has a long history of producing propaganda to discredit the leaders of our country and when the President tells the "Slime-Ball" it's propaganda and you need to do your job and investigate it to validate the truth of what I am telling you. The "Slime-Ball" has the audacity to admit he doesn't know if it's true but clearly, he thinks the President is a bigger liar than the Russians. "Mr. Comey seems likely to be the star witness in any obstruction of justice case brought against the president by Robert S. Mueller III, the special counsel in the sprawling Russia investigation."** This fact was well known when Robert Mueller accepted the position as special counsel and the rules plainly state Mueller's close friendship with James Comey made it imperative that he recuse himself. Mueller did not recuse himself because he, like his friend, believes he is untouchable.

Mr. Comey said the president also raised the idea that the F.B.I. should investigate the claim as a way of proving that it never happened. Mr. Comey said he warned Mr. Trump that doing so would add to "the narrative" that the president was under investigation. Mr. Comey said in the interview that it was an "out of body" experience to be talking with the incoming president

about whether the incident had taken place, or whether the Russians had material they could use to blackmail Mr. Trump. "I was floating above myself looking down saying you're sitting here briefing the incoming president of the United States about prostitutes in Moscow," {What a nut-job.} Mr. Comey says in the interview. **Asked whether he believed Mr. Trump's denials, Mr. Comey said he was not sure.** "I honestly never thought these words would come out of my mouth, but I don't know whether the current president of the United States was with prostitutes peeing on each other in Moscow in 2013," he said. **"It's possible, but I don't know."**

The President tells Mr. Comey to do his job, either substantiate the dossier, or through it in the trash, it has been around for almost 2 years and they've proven it was generated with an agenda, but Comey is still treating it as if he thinks it is just as valid as his memo's. Beating a dead horse! Slippery James Comey, a man who always ends up badly and out of whack (he is not smart!), will go down as the WORST FBI Director in history, by far! — Donald J. Trump

My "Conspiracy Theory" puts Comey right up there at the top if I am proven correct that Comey colluded with Mike Pence to throw the election to Trump to get Pence in the White House then use the Russia collusion conspiracy theory to get Trump impeached. That would be really awful, but Mueller is going to have to answer to his role in the 9/11 cover up that was clearly "High Treason" executed by the Bush family and big Dick visa v the CIA. At minimum Mueller as Director of the FBI played the top role in the destruction of evidence at a crime scene that killed nearly 3,000 American citizens and lead the effort in the obstruction of the investigation that didn't happen. Personally, I have to give the prize pig to Mueller, but the President is entitled to his opinion. What about JEH?

Every morning I wake up and worry, what's gonna happen today? Hoe down, it's a show-down. And you know it's gettin' stronger. I can't last very much longer. Just hold out. There's a change in the wind, you know the signs don't lie. Such a strange feelin' and I don't know why it's takin' such a long time. There's something happening here. Just what it is ain't exactly clear. But this much is clear, **when your lookin for your freedom, nobody seems to care!** You've got to fight for the right, to think for yourself! I'm taking my time, choosing my lines, trying to decide what to do. My eyes have seen the years and the slow parade of tears without crying. Now I want to understand. I have done all that I could to see the evil and the good without hiding. You must help me if you can. People you've got the power over what we do, you can sit there and wait, or you can pull us through. We've got such a long way to go, to make it to the border of Mexico, we've got to ride, ride like the wind, to be free again. I hope you never fear those mountains in the distance. **Never settle for the path of least resistance.** Living might mean taking chances but they're worth taking. Lovin' might be a mistake but it's worth making. Don't let some hell-bent heart leave you bitter. **When you come close to selling out reconsider.** Give the heavens above more than just a passing glance. And when you get the chance to sit it out or dance. **I hope you dance!** **People you've got the power! Over what we do.** Don't just hold out, don't let your love be sold out, but when you get the chance. Oh, won't you dance, please, please, please say you will!

EAGLES - "How Long?" PLUS

So, what are you doing, these days?
 Me, I'm just waiting, like everyone else!
 I'm just waiting, like a book on the shelf.
 Just waiting and wondering, how long,
 How long, till you stop hating yourself.
 I'm just waiting, like everyone else,
 "But I never minded standing in the rain"
 Like a blue bird with his heart removed,
 Lonely as a train
 I've run just as far as I can run
 If I never see the good old days shinin' in the sun
 I'll be doin' fine, (doin' time) and then some

How long, how long
 Woman will you weep
 How long, how long
 Rock yourself to sleep
 Well I been doin' time in lonesome prison,
 Where the sun don't shine
 Just outside, the freedom river runs
 Out there in that shiny night,
 With blood hounds on your mind
 Don't you know it's the same sad situation?
 How long, how long
 Woman will you weep
 How long, how long
 Rock yourself to sleep

Everybody feels alright you know,
I heard some poor fool say (Somebody Ooooo)
Everyone is out there on the loose
Well I wish I lived in the land of fools,
No one knew my name
But what you get is not quite what you choose

Tell me, how long, how long
Woman will you weep
How long, how long
Rock yourself to sleep

Me, I wish I lived in the land of fools,
Where all I knew was my name!
But it's the same old story, the same old game.
We're still standing, but we're still standing in the rain.
Wish I could say, I'm feeling no pain. (Ooooo)
But all of this confusion on the ground
So many people starving, all around
I ask myself why, why so madly?
I can feel it so deeply, it hurts me badly
Letting the days go by, so sadly (Ooooo)

How long, how long
Woman will you weep
How long, how long
Rock yourself to sleep
Tell me, how long, how long,
Until you let me help?
I can assure you this, I can help,
I've got two strong arms, I can help
It would sure do me good to do you good
Let me help
It's a fact that people get lonely, ain't nothing new
But a woman like you, baby,
Should never have the blues
Let me help, I've got two good eyes, let me help
"I can see clearly now" I can help
It would sure do me good to do you good
Let me help
Tell me, how long, how long
Woman will you weep
How long, how long
Rock yourself to sleep
When I go to sleep at night,
You're always a part of my dreams
Holding me tight and telling me everything
I want to hear, don't forget me, baby,
All you gotta do is call
You know how I feel about you,

If I can do anything at all
Let me help, I can help
{Billy Swan – "I Can Help"}

How long, how long
Woman will you weep
How long, how long
Rock yourself to sleep

{“Once in a Lifetime” Talking Heads}
And you may find yourself
living in a shotgun shack
and you may find yourself
in another part of the world
and you may find yourself
behind the wheel of a large automobile
and you may ask yourself
where does this highway go?

Don't you know?
It's the same sad situation
same as it ever was...
same as it ever was...
same as it ever was...

and you may ask yourself
am I right? Or am I wrong?
and you may tell yourself
my god! What have I done?
letting the days go by/let the water hold me down
letting the days go by/water flowing underground
into the blue again/in the silent water
under the rocks and stones/
there is water underground.

Don't let my fear hold me down
Dear God, don't let me drown.
Won't you ever set us free
Dear God, don't just "Let it Be"
The same as it ever was...
same as it ever was...
same as it ever was...
same as it ever was...

James Comey's Attacks on Trump May Hurt a Carefully Cultivated

ImageBy JULIE HIRSCHFELD DAVIS and JONATHAN MARTIN - The New York Times - April 16, 2018

WASHINGTON — For decades, James B. Comey cultivated an image of purity as a lawman who stood above politics and politicians. With the release of his memoir this week and a set of high-profile media interviews to publicize it, Mr. Comey — whose firing by President Trump made him a hero to the president's critics — has veered onto risky terrain, shedding the trappings of a high-minded referee and looking instead like a combatant in the country's partisan battles. Mr. Comey's description of the president as an unethical liar "morally unfit" for office; his call for voters to decide Mr. Trump's fate at the ballot box in 2020; and even his observations about Mr. Trump's appearance — his "orange" skin, his too-long ties, his hands — are stark departures from the law-enforcement mission of his old agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The personal potshots in particular have surprised some former colleagues who thought of Mr. Comey as relatively sober and serious. Observers on both the left and right — including many who count themselves as fierce critics of Mr. Trump’s — say that in embarking on his star turn, Mr. Comey may be undercutting his own indictment of the president’s character and conduct. “The real impact of having the former head of the F.B.I. calling the president unfit is dependent on the just-the-facts professional image of the F.B.I.,” said Michael Steel, a Republican strategist who has been critical of Mr. Trump. “To the extent that the former director appears petty and anything less than high-minded, it diminishes the impact of his critique.” “In a time when almost every public debate is defined by people lining up with their respective tribes,” Mr. Steel added, “he’s managed to alienate both.” Mr. Comey, in remarks promoting the book, says he is trying to rouse the country to see Mr. Trump through the lens of “ethical leadership,” arguing that the president “does not reflect the values” of Democrats, Republicans or independents. Asked on ABC if Mr. Trump should be impeached, Mr. Comey said he hoped it would not happen because voters were “duty bound” to “go to the voting booth and vote their values.” Mr. Comey has cast himself as a truth-teller before, sometimes to the irritation of colleagues or superiors. He threatened to quit his job at the Justice Department in the George W. Bush administration rather than sign off on a domestic surveillance program the White House demanded, and he refused Mr. Trump’s entreaties to back off of the investigation of Michael T. Flynn, his former national security adviser. Mr. Trump fired Mr. Comey a few months later, calling him a “grandstander” and citing the F.B.I.’s investigation into his administration’s ties to Russia. “After he was fired, he finally became the martyr he always held himself out to be,” said Matthew A. Miller, who served as a top Justice Department official under President Obama when Mr. Comey led the F.B.I. “By doing a tour like this where you kind of get down in the gutter the way he has, you sacrifice your claim on being a martyr.”

Even before the release of his book, “A Higher Loyalty,” the White House, working in concert with the Republican National Committee, began an all-out campaign to besmirch “Lyn’ Comey” — the name of a website the party created to make the case — as dishonest, self-serving and driven by partisanship. But with his one-liners and cutting asides about the president, Mr. Comey only appeared to play into the hands of allies of Mr. Trump, who are eager to paint the former F.B.I. director as just another figure working for the president’s defeat. And Mr. Comey has drawn bipartisan criticism with his latest efforts to explain — and, to some degree, recast — his much-criticized handling of the investigation into Hillary Clinton’s use of a private email server. Mark Mellman, a longtime Democratic pollster, said Mr. Comey’s standing had been undermined by the one-two punch of liberal attacks over his role in the 2016 election and the more recent assault led by Mr. Trump and his Republican allies. “Trump has tried to define him as a bad operator, and the problem for Comey is that you can quote a lot of Democrats saying the same,” Mr. Mellman said. At this point, it seems unlikely that Mr. Comey’s book or his performance in interviews to promote it will sway public opinion in a country that is already intensely polarized along partisan lines. Mr. Trump’s approval ratings have been similar for months, and the roughly 40 percent of Americans who support him have proven remarkably unshakable, while the 56 percent who disapprove will probably not change their views on Mr. Comey’s account. While Mr. Comey is sure to captivate the public for a few days with his biting descriptions of the president and dramatic of interactions with him, the combination of the supercharged news cycle and the looming — and far more consequential — investigation by Robert S. Mueller III, the special counsel probing Russia’s meddling in the 2016 election, is sure to eventually overshadow his memoir. “It keeps the story of cover-ups and corruption on the public radar while Mueller is doing his investigation, but Comey is just a pit stop along the way of that,” said Stephanie Cutter, a veteran Democratic strategist. “Much to Comey’s chagrin, his moment has passed. There’s nothing in this book we don’t already know. He just adds one more hole to a ship that’s already sinking.” Mr. Comey plainly considers himself to be a figure who is above the political fray, driven and guided solely by facts. His friends and advisers say he wants the book to stir a conversation about the value of honesty. “Telling the truth should not be seen as a political act,” said Keith Urbahn, Mr. Comey’s book agent. “It should just be the truth.” Yet there is a twist: **While he professes to be uneasy with the country’s growing polarization and appears to disdain partisanship, Mr. Comey has in effect weaponized himself against a Republican president** by calling for him to be voted out of office. Mr. Comey may not want to be used as anybody’s “political battering ram,” as one associate put it, but he recognizes that is precisely how his book will be deployed. Friends say Mr. Comey expected his memoir would be criticized because of how it would inevitably be construed: either as airbrushing history and not being honest about Mr. Trump’s transgressions, or as a self-serving and score-settling account with the man who ended his career in law enforcement. Still, Mr. Comey’s former colleagues rejected any notion that he has transformed himself into a political actor or hurt his reputation. “Jim Comey is as upright, honest and decent a person and public servant as I have ever met,” said Jack Goldsmith, who served with

him in the Bush Justice Department. As for his willingness to engage in Trumpian insults, invoking the size of the president's hands, his allies argue that he is simply attempting to paint vivid scenes and does the same with the other presidents he served. Mr. Miller, however, said Mr. Comey tends to be "at his best when he's coloring inside the lines and following the rules," as prosecutors are trained to do. "What you see in the book is not just a factual recitation, but also a lot of spin on the ball," he said.
(Comey's got nothing on the ball. He's totally, off the wall!)

Transcript: James Comey's interview with ABC News chief anchor George Stephanopoulos BY ABC NEWS Apr 15, 2018

ABC NEWS' CHIEF ANCHOR GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS' INTERVIEWED FORMER FBI DIRECTOR JAMES COMEY FOR A SPECIAL EDITION OF "20/20" THAT AIRED ON SUNDAY, APRIL 15, 2018 AHEAD OF THE RELEASE OF COMEY'S BOOK, "A HIGHER LOYALTY." THE FOLLOWING IS THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE INTERVIEW:

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Simple start. **Why did you write this book?**

JAMES COMEY: I r-- I was never going to write a book. But I decided I had to write this one to try and be useful. That was my goal after I was fired, to be useful. And it occurred to me maybe I can be useful by offering a view to people, especially to young people, of what leadership should look like and how it should be centered on values. And so--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You lay out qualities of an ethical leader. What are they?

JAMES COMEY: First and foremost, it's someone who realizes that lasting values have to be at the center of their leadership. Whether they're in government or in the private sector or leading a university, they have to focus on things like fairness and integrity and, most of all, the truth. That the truth matters.

He dropped the charges on Hillary because nobody warned her that what she was doing was against the law and because she didn't lie to the FBI!

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And you have-- there's almost a sense of-- of alarm underneath the whole book. **You say it's a dangerous time in our country?**

JAMES COMEY: I think it is. And-- I chose those words carefully. I was worried when I chose the word, "Dangerous" first. I thought, "Is that an overstatement?" And I don't think it is because--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why not?

JAMES COMEY: I worry that the norms at the center of this country-- we can fight as Americans about guns or taxes or immigration, and we always have. But what we have in common is a set of norms. Most importantly, the truth. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," right? Truth is the fourth word of that sentence. That's what we are. And if we lose that, if we lose tethering of our leaders to that truth, what are we? And so, I started to worry. Actually, the foundation of this country is in jeopardy when we stop measuring our leaders against that central value of the truth.

Calling out the truth!

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Are we losing it?

JAMES COMEY: I think we are in part. But I think the strength of this country is that we're going to outlast it. That there will be damage to that norm. **But I liken President Trump in the book to a forest fire.** Going to do tremendous damage. Going to damage those important norms. **But a forest fire gives healthy things a chance to grow that had no chance before that fire.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: How do we put it out?

JAMES COMEY: We put it out in two ways. We put it out first by not becoming numb to the fact that the truth is being assailed every day. **By not deciding that it's just too much** to pay attention to because that's the path to losing truth as the central value in this country. So, all of us have to constantly be involved and **call it out** when we see the truth endangered, when we see lying. And then next, we need to get involved. **The American people need to stand up in the public square** and in the voting booth and say, "Look, we disagree about an awful lot. But we have in common something that matters enormously to this country. And, our leaders must reflect those values."

Calling out the truth! It's inside the FBI files.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And-- and **why the title**, "A Higher Loyalty?"

JAMES COMEY: Well, in part, the title comes from a bizarre conversation I had with the president in dinner at the White House in January of last last year, where he asked for my loyalty personally as the F.B.I. director. **My loyalty is supposed to be to the American people and to the institution.** But more than that, it grows out of a lifetime of my trying to be a better leader and figure out what matters in a leader and realizing from a whole lot better leaders than I, that there must be a loyalty to something above the urgent, above the political, above the popular. We have to think, **"What are the values that matter in the institution I'm involved with and in the country that I care a lot about?"**

Calling out the truth! The only values that matter to the FBI is normalizing the abnormal, by advancing the gay movement. When the FBI files are exposed, the FBI will be exposed for what it is, political.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You look at your career over the last four decades, you're like the Zelig of modern law enforcement?

JAMES COMEY: I stick out 'cause I'm so tall. I appear in every picture--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Y-- that's only part of it. You've taken on the mob, [Martha Stewart](#), right in the middle of huge controversies over government surveillance, over torture. What are the big lessons you take away from that?

JAMES COMEY: The big lesson from that-- and I've had a strange and wonderful career. And I don't know how I've ended up in all these spots. But the lesson I've learned is that it's important when you're involved in a difficult situation with loud voices to in your mind, rise above it and ask, "So what matters in the long run? What does this institution stand for? What does my country stand for?" It helps you see things more clearly and realize **things like truth matters, integrity matters.** Those ethical values are what are going to last. And when you have to explain what you've done someday to your grandchildren, that's what will matter. Your grandkids won't understand that people-- angry at me, or **the vice president of the United States was telling me people were going to die because of me.** What they'll want to know is, "What was your North Star? Why did you make the decision you made?" And I hope your answer's going to be, "Cause I took the time to think about what matters. What my institution stands for and what my country stands for."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Right at the beginning of your career, you're involved in prosecution of major mafia figures. How does that form you?

JAMES COMEY: Well, it's a tremendous education to get-- a view inside La Cosa Nostra, the mafia, both in the United States and in Sicily. And **to realize that the mafia is an organization like any other organization.** Has a leader, has underlings, has values, has principles. They're entirely corrupt. And it is the antithesis of ethical leadership. But I didn't know it at the time. But it was forming my view that the truth has to be central to our lives and that leadership has to be focused on important and ethical values. And not what's good for the boss, how do I accomplish what's good for the boss and get the boss what he wants.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Truth at the center of our lives.** That's **the--** at the center of the Martha Stewart case as well?

JAMES COMEY: Yes. The Martha Stewart case was a case that I initially hated.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why?

JAMES COMEY: And didn't want any part of. We had a lot of big cases going on at that point in time. **WorldCom, Adelphia. Enron was going on. We were trying to investigate corporate fraud, massive corporate fraud, and send a message to the American people that the system isn't rigged, the rich aren't going to get away with frauds,** and that's really hard and important work. And in the middle of this, walks on this case involving a famous person who appears to have lied during an investigation of insider trading. And my initial reaction was, **"You know, that's kind of a small thing. That'll be a big distraction.** People will throw rocks at me. But more than that, **it'll take away from this other work we're doing."**

Calling out the truth! Comey speaks the truth, that's why the Justice Department did it, to create a distraction by imprisoning Martha Stewart, while giving a slap on the wrist to the ones that could have made significant difference to the future if they had stayed focused on them.

And folks don't realize this, but I almost hesitated and **almost didn't bring the case against Martha Stewart**, in hindsight, **because she was rich and famous.** And decided that if she were anybody else, any other ordinary person, she would be prosecuted. And what helped me come to that conclusion was I

remembered a case I'd been involved in against an African American minister in Richmond when I was a federal prosecutor there, who had lied to us during an investigation. And I begged this minister, "Please don't lie to us because if you do, we're going to have to prosecute you." He lied. And at the end of the day, we had to prosecute him. And he went to jail for over a year. And as I stood in my office in Manhattan, I'm looking out at the Brooklyn Bridge, I remember this moment. And I'm thinking, "You know, nobody in New York knows that guy's name except me. "Why would I treat Martha Stewart differently than that guy?" And the reason would only be because she's rich and famous and because I'll be criticized for it. The truth matters in the criminal justice system. And if it's going to matter, we must prosecute people who lie in the middle of an investigation.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You don't lie to investigators, you don't lie under oath?

JAMES COMEY: You can't or the rule of law breaks down. And there once was a day when people were afraid of going to hell if they took an oath in the name of God and violated it. We've drifted away from that day. And so, in its place (The FBI is god, all must fear the FBI, the fire and brimstone god!) has to be a fear that if you lie and the government can prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, they will prosecute you in order to send a message to all the others who might be called upon to give evidence. You must tell the truth. It matters enormously.

Calling out the truth! The truth does matter, the truth has power.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You mentioned that Vice President Cheney-- at one point said, "People are going to die because of what you're doing right now." Take us inside that room?

JAMES COMEY: It was the chief of staff's room in the West Wing of the White House. And we were engaged-- I was at the Justice Department, the number two person at the Justice Department then, the deputy attorney general. And we were in a dispute with the White House about whether there was a lawful basis for surveillance activities that the president had authorized the NSA to engage in in the United States. And we had concluded, very smart lawyers working for me had concluded and I agreed, that there wasn't a lawful basis for a big part of these activities. And so, we were not going to sign onto it. And there was a meeting to pressure me to change my view. And Vice President Cheney presided at the meeting. He sat at the head of the table. I sat just to his left. And he looked me in the eye and said, "Thousands of people are going to die because of what you're doing." W-- what he meant was, "Because you are making us stop this surveillance program," because there was no lawful basis for it, "people are going to die 'cause of what you're doing." And my reaction was, and I said it to him, "That's not helping me. That makes me feel badly. I don't want people to die. I've devoted my life to trying to protect innocent people. But I have to say what the Justice Department can certify to, what we find lawful. And that you really want it or that it's important doesn't change the law. And so, I-- I can't my view." And so, it was thick with tension and it was-- I felt like I was going to be crushed like a grape, frankly. But in a way, there was no other way I could act. The law was clear. And so how could I possibly, as the leader of the Justice Department, sign up to something that we had no lawful basis for. And so, we stood our ground.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That same issue led to a now famous confrontation in the hospital room of the attorney general at the time, John Ashcroft. You sped to that room. Why?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I did. I think it was the next day after the meeting with Vice President Cheney when I was on the way home, driving along Constitution Avenue. So, on my left, I could see the Washington Monument. On the right, we're coming up on the ellipse where you can see the White House. And the phone rang. It was-- the attorney general, my boss was John Ashcroft. He was in intensive care. Very, very seriously ill at George Washington Hospital. And his chief of staff was on the phone, telling me that although we had told the White House we can't certify to this, I'm the acting attorney general, we can't certify to its lawfulness. And so it has to stop. He was calling to alert me that the president was sending two of his top people, the White House counsel and the chief of staff, to the intensive care unit at George Washington Hospital to see the attorney general. And so I hung up the phone, told the driver, "Ed, I have to get to George Washington Hospital immediately." And he didn't need to hear more than the tone in my voice. And so, he turned on the lights and siren and drove this armored vehicle like it was a NASCAR race to George Washington Hospital. We pulled up in front. I jumped out with my security detail. And I ran into the hospital and ran up the stairs. Didn't wait for the elevator to get to that floor because I needed to be there to make sure a desperately ill man wasn't asked to sign something when he wasn't competent to sign it and I was the acting attorney general. (Super Comey, to the rescue.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And in the end, he didn't sign it?

JAMES COMEY: In the end, he was remarkable. I went into that hospital room and got there before they did. And I tried to orient Attorney General Ashcroft as to time and place. And he didn't seem to be following

me. He looked gravely ill, gray and lying in his bed, barely conscious. And I then sat down next to him as close to him as I am to you. His wife stood on the other side of the bed the entire time and never let go of his arm. And I waited. And two of my staff members stood behind me. I didn't know that one of them was taking notes the whole time. But in came the White House chief of staff and the-- the-- the White House counsel. And they were carrying an envelope. And they were going to try and get John Ashcroft to sign off on this program that we had said couldn't continue because it didn't have a lawful basis. And they started speaking to him. And he shocked me by pushing himself up on his elbows and blasting them. And telling them he had been misled, he hadn't understood what they were doing. They had deprived him of the legal advice he needed. And then exhausted, he fell back. And as he fell back, he said, "But that doesn't matter because I'm not the attorney general." And then he pointed at me and said, "There's the attorney general." And the two men didn't acknowledge me. They just turned. One said, "Be well" to the attorney general, and then they walked out. (Why is it, that you are moving up the latter when you go from DAG of the DOJ to the investigative branch as the Director of the FBI?)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And in the book, you describe an incident after that, a tender moment between Robert Mueller and Mr. Ashcroft?

JAMES COMEY: Yes. I called Bob Mueller-- as the armored vehicle was being driven like it was a NASCAR race to the hospital, I called Bob Mueller, then the F.B.I. director. He was out at dinner with his family. And I told him what was happening. He had been following the conflict with the White House. **The F.B.I. was a key participant in the program.** And so, **Bob Mueller's view was, "If the F-- if the Justice Department can't find a lawful basis for this, there's no way the F.B.I. is participating."** The F.B.I., as folks may know, is a separate organization, but it sits within the Justice Department. And so, I called Bob and told him what was happening. And I wanted him to know about it because of his stature and his ability. He and I weren't close, we weren't friends in any social sense. But I knew he saw it the way I did. And I knew that his gravitas, his-- his experience, his weight, would be important. And he said, "I'll be right there." And then he started a race to the hospital. He didn't get to the hospital until after the two senior White House officials had turned and left. But he came in moments later and he stood and s-- leaned down and spoke to the desperately ill attorney general and told him that, in every man's life, there comes a time when the good Lord tests him. And then he said, "You've passed your test tonight." And I was-- it was a really hard time. And I was overcome with emotion, hearing that. And-- had this sense that the law held. The law held. It-- it felt like a dream to me, that we were in a hospital room with senior officials trying to get the desperately ill attorney general to sign something. But it wasn't a dream. And **the law held.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: In that same administration-- **you had the controversy over torture,** whether or not it could be justified and legal. And there's-- a remarkable moment with your wife, Patrice. She doesn't know all the details of what you're going through, but she says?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, that was remark-- it actually irritated me a little bit. I love her desperately. But she's great at giving me feedback. And she had seen on the news-- didn't know what I was working on but had seen on the news all the controversy around the treatment of prisoners at a U.S. prison in Iraq called Abu Ghraib. And there was a great deal of news and debate about whether the American government was engaged in torture. She knew that, and she also knew I was under some sorta great stress. This is after the stress of the surveillance battle. And **she said** to me one evening, "Don't be the torture guy." And I said, "Wha-- you know I can't talk to you about that kinda stuff." And she said, "I don't want to talk about it. Just don't be the torture guy." And she repeated that periodically thereafter. And I've since told her, "Look, that was not helpful except your voice echoed around my head an awful lot during that." What she meant was, "Rise above and remember, someday you're going to explain to your grandchildren how you conducted yourself."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You still think it wasn't helpful?

JAMES COMEY: Oh, it was helpful. In the moment-- it w-- it was helpful. In-- in the moment, it was irritating because I wanted to say, **"You have no idea how hard these legal issues are."**

You have no idea that Congress defined torture in American criminal law differently than you and I would understand it.

So, saying, 'Don't be the torture guy,' I don't want to be. But my job as a lawyer is to say, **'Here's what the statute means.'**

And there's a whole lot that would pass muster under the statute, that I would think that any normal person would think is torture.

Calling out the truth! Why is this true? Could it be contained in the proud FBI files that the FBI was holding compromising files over their heads when they made that decision, the FBI files must be exposed.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Explain that to-- to everybody watching at home because I think that it would be hard for people to understand. You really can't talk to your wife about the things you're working on?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. It adds to your level of stress. The-- the way the rule works-- the rules are, if you're dealing with a classified matter, you may only discuss it with someone who has a need to know it, a work-related need, and the appropriate clearance. Well, your spouse has neither-- I guess unless your spouse works with you in the government, on that particular matter. But as much as I loved her and as important as an advisor she's been to me my whole life, she didn't have a need to know anything about the classified topics I worked on. And she didn't have the appropriate clearance. She's an extraordinarily trustworthy person, but she doesn't have the appropriate clearance. And so she would know, during surveillance and during torture, something was disturbing my sleep. Something was making me come home very late at night, leave very early in the morning. But she could only guess what it was. In the surveillance fight she couldn't guess 'cause it was totally secret. In the torture battle, she could have some idea 'cause she could see it on the news.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Right at the top of the book, y-- you write that you're aware that it could be seen as an exercise in vanity.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What are you worried about there?

JAMES COMEY: Well, that's why I was never going to write a book. It always felt like an exercise in ego. And **one of the things I've struggled with my whole life is my ego** and-- and a sense that I-- **I have to be careful not to fall in love with my own view of things**. And so that battle with ego and my sense that memoirs are an exercise in ego convinced me I was never going to write a book. And I'm sure friends of mine from college and law school are out there laughing right now, saying, "Ah-ha, he wrote a book." I never wanted to write a memoir. And I hope folks will read the book 'cause **my goal was to be useful**. It's not a memoir. Lots of stories about my life that aren't in there, important stories. But I tried to pick stories that relate to leadership to try and explain, including mistakes I've made, how I think about ethical leadership and what I think it ought to be. **I'm not a perfect leader. There-- I don't think there are any perfect leaders**. But I've learned from working with great people, from making a lot of mistakes, and from working for people who aren't effective leaders, here's what I think it should be. And so that's what I'm trying to offer in the book.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: As you say, no one's perfect. What's James Comey's rap on James Comey?

JAMES COMEY: How much time do you have? Yeah. **My rap on myself** is that-- **is that ego focus**. That I-- since I was a kid, I've had a sense of confidence. That **I know I'm good at certain things**. And there's a danger that that will bleed over into pride, into not being open minded to the fact that I could be wrong and other people could have a better view of it. And so, I think that's **my primary worry about myself, is an overconfidence** that can lead to that-- that pride, that closed mindedness. I've tried to guardrail that my whole life. First of all, by marrying someone who will tell me anything at any time. But then also surrounding myself with people who will cut through that and say-- "No, no, no, no. Slow down. Have you thought about this? Have you thought about that?"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, **you don't mind--** and you write this as well, **the uncomfortable questions?**

JAMES COMEY: I have to have them because, again, if what I worry about myself most is that I'll be-- convince myself that I'm doing the right thing, if I don't have people who will push through that, who will try and pierce whatever certainty I'm feeling, I may make a bad decision. I may make a big mistake. And part of that is just aging and getting to realize that doubt is not a weakness. Doubt is a strength. Always remembering I could be wrong until the moment you make a decision is important. And that's great to tell yourself. **But it's also important to have people around you who will poke at you, poke at you.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Another short chapter in your career, **you were part of the Senate Whitewater investigation of the Clintons**. Wha-- **what exactly did you do?**

JAMES COMEY: I worked for five months as a staff lawyer on the banking committee's special committee I think they called it on the Whitewater investigation. My role was to focus on the suicide of a White House official who was the deputy White House counsel--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Vince Foster?

JAMES COMEY: --named Vincent Foster, yeah. And whether any documents were taken from his office and mishandled. I was only there five months. Patrice and I had a personal tragedy. We had a healthy baby boy, Collin Comey. Was born after I'd been there five months and died unfortunately of an infection that was preventable. And so, I never went back.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And later, you also were involved in-- the prosecution or at least investigating whether Bill Clinton as president did anything improper in the pardon of Marc Rich?

JAMES COMEY: That's right. When I became U.S. attorney in Manhattan after 9/11, I inherited from my predecessor, Mary Jo White, an investigation into whether there was any corruption associated with a pardon that President Clinton had given to a fugitive named Marc Rich and his codefendant, Pincus Green. These were guys who had been charged with a massive tax fraud case and-- and trading with the enemy and had fled to Switzerland and had been there for many years. And President Clinton, on his way out the door, pardoned them, which was extraordinary. Actually, I've never heard of another case where a fugitive from justice was pardoned. And so, the F.B.I. and the U.S. attorney's office were investigating were there promised contributions made to the Clinton Library or something else to secure that pardon. And so, as the new boss in Manhattan, I oversaw that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And what you found?

JAMES COMEY: Concluded there was not sufficient evidence to bring any charges in that case. And so, we closed it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did you draw any conclusions about the Clintons, about Hillary Clinton, from those experiences?

JAMES COMEY: No.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: None at all?

JAMES COMEY: No. I had-- first of all, I've never met her. And my engagement was very limited. The five months on the Whitewater case was focused on Vince Foster and his office. One of the questions was had the-- the then first lady, Hillary Clinton, caused anyone to go remove documents from his office. I don't remember what the conclusion was, but I didn't re-- reach any conclusion about her. And same with the pardon business. President Clinton's pardon of Marc Rich took my breath away. Th-- the notion that the president of the United States would pardon a fugitive without asking the prosecutors or the investigators, "What do you think," was shocking to me. But it didn't give me any view of Hillary Clinton.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, what did you think of Hillary Clinton before the email investigation began?

JAMES COMEY: Seemed like a smart person, very hardworking. Had been obviously a U.S. senator and had a reputation-- again, I get only this-- I get this from the media, as a very hardworking person. Had worked very hard as secretary of state. That was really about it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And then on July 6th, 2015, there's a referral about her email case. What do you do?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, in early July the inspector general for the intelligence community, which is an-- an organization that looks for fraud, waste and abuse or violation of standards in the intelligence community, sent a referral that was public actually to the Department of Justice and the F.B.I., raising concern that there might've been mishandling of classified information on Hillary Clinton's email server, which was a personal email server device she had in her basement. And that came in in early July. I didn't focus on it. Shortly thereafter, the F.B.I. opened a criminal investigation. And I didn't know when we'd opened it. I was b--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, this was far below your level?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. F.B.I.'s an enormous organization. It was opened in the ordinary course in our counterintelligence division. Then eventually, it got briefed up to me by the deputy director, who's the senior agent in the organization, telling me that we've opened this criminal investigation of Secretary Clinton.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But that's the kinda thing that gets briefed up pretty quickly, doesn't it?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, yeah. I'm just saying, I didn't know-- I didn't know bef-- as I recall, I didn't know before they opened it that they were opening it, but nothing untoward about that-- (Except he didn't get the chance to kill it before it ever got off the ground, maybe I'm reading too much into this but to me, he seems regretful.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And it wasn't your order to open the investigation--

JAMES COMEY: Correct. Correct.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And describe what exactly was at issue, what you were looking at?

JAMES COMEY: The question was, was classified information mishandled. And what that means is did anybody talk about classified information outside of a system that you're supposed to talk about classified information on? Did anybody give classified documents to someone who shouldn't have them? What it centered on there was Secretary Clinton used this personal email domain to conduct all her business as secretary of state. She didn't use government email. And what the inspector general raised was in emailing, in doing her work on that unclassified system, did she and those around her talk about classified topics? Classified information is either the lowest level confidential, the next level secret, the top level top secret. And there's rules about how you can email about that information and where you should talk about it. And the question was, did they talk about topics on an unclassified system that shouldn't have been on an unclassified system?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And this had come right on the heels of a very famous case-- involving General David Petraeus for his mishandling of classified information. Something that was-- prosecuted. He eventually had a plea. As you know, many of your conservative critics-- say that the David Petraeus case was far [less] serious than the Hillary Clinton case. Yet, you chose not to prosecute. Answer that.

JAMES COMEY: Well, the David Petraeus case was, to my mind, not a close case at all. He was the director of the C.I.A. He was having a romantic relationship with a woman who was also an author, going to write a book about him. He had taken home and stored in a backpack, notebooks full of notes about some of the government's most sensitive secrets. Classified at the top level in the government, including conversations with President Obama about special access programs, some of our-- our most closely guarded secrets. And he had given these notebooks to this person who had neither a need to know, nor the appropriate clearance. And he'd actually allowed her to photograph pages containing top secret information. And then, when the F.B.I. interviewed him about it, he lied about it. And so you had clearly intentional misconduct by a guy who's in charge of the country's secrets as the director of the C.I.A., involving huge trove of our top level classified information. And then obstruction of justice. It was not a close call. In fact, I thought David Petraeus should've been prosecuted not just for the mishandling of the classified information, but also for lying to the F.B.I. because lying is-- strikes at the heart of our rule of law in this country. And in the end, the attorney general at the time, Eric Holder, decided he would be charged only with the misdemeanor mishandling of classified information.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Y-- you also write that you-- you knew from the start that the Clinton case was unlikely to be prosecuted. Some of your critics, including President Trump, think that-- that you brought a prejudgment to the case?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. There's wrong-- what-- what the F.B.I. brought to the case-- folks forget I didn't actually do this investigation. I supervised an organization that did it, is a knowledge about how these cases are handled in the counterespionage world. That's the world where mishandling of classified information is investigated. And so, we have a 50-year history of knowing what will the Department of Justice prosecute? They'll prosecute cases like David Petraeus'. But they're very unlikely to prosecute a case unless you can show the person, like Petraeus, clearly knew they were doing something they shouldn't do. There's evidence of obstruction of justice or disloyalty to the United States, spy-- indications. But without those, sloppiness, even extreme sloppiness, is handled through administrative discipline. Somebody is not prosecuted. And I've gone through 50 years of cases. I don't know of a case where anyone has ever been prosecuted for just being careless, even extremely careless. And so, when the case was open, we know that history. And so, the investigators knew that, unless they found something that was a smoking gun, where someone told Secretary Clinton, "You know, you shouldn't be doing this," or where she acknowledged it or where somehow there's an indication of her obstructing justice, the case was unlikely to be prosecuted.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: One of the things that President Trump and his allies bring up is that at some point, her staff smashed Blackberries, also whitewashed the server?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. There was evidence that old Blackberries, after she was finished with them, they destroyed them, which I think a fair number of people do to make sure that if it's resold, someone doesn't end up with your information. And that after they produced information back to the d-- to the Department of State, they used-- a software program to clean the server to make sure there was nothing on it, or clean laptops to make sure there's nothing on them. They did that. But as investigators, our question is, when they did that, are they trying to obstruct justice in some ways? And we could never establish, develop the evidence-- evidence is a different thing from what people say. Evidence that anybody who did that did it with a corrupt intent. And most importantly, any indication that Secretary Clinton knew that was happening and knew that it was an effort to obstruct justice.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You did know from the start that this case was going to be trouble for you. You tell of a scene with your deputy director?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. I knew this was a no-win situation, this case. America is in an unusually polarized state. We've just opened a criminal investigation of one of the people who will likely be candidate for president of the United States in the middle of that viciously partisan atmosphere. One half of the partisan divide is going to be angry at us no matter what we do. Of course, at the time, I had no idea that I could make both halves angry at us, but we'll come to that later. But **the deputy director** who was a great deputy director and a longtime special agent, looked at me and **said, "You know you're totally screwed, right?"** And I smiled. And I said, "Yup. **Nobody gets out alive.**" And, of course, it was gallows humor. And it was funny because it was an actual gallows. If we decide there is no criminal case there and we recommend no prosecution, the Republicans will be screaming that we let, you know, **the greatest crime go since the Rosenbergs** were executed for selling our nuclear secrets. And if we prosecute her, the Democrats will scream that we're just doing it out of some sort of partisan bias because I'm a former Republican appointee and so the system is rigged against Hillary Clinton. Either way, we were going to be attacked. And this may sound strange, that's kind of freeing. If you know you're totally screwed and you know that people are going to be angry at you no matter what you do, y-- you can't do anything about it. And so, you just put your f-- head down and you do your job. And you let the facts and the law decide what you should do.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: First big controversy comes up-- late that summer, **September, 2015**. You have a meeting with the attorney general Loretta Lynch because you've decided to say publicly there is a criminal investigation-- of Hillary Clinton, which many considered a break with precedent?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, it was not a break with precedent, but y-- you're right. In the late summer after the investigation had been opened for three months and the whole world was talking about it, 'cause you remember, it began with a public referral from the inspector general. So, the candidates were talking about it. Congress was talking about it. The people we were out there interviewing were talking about it. I went to the attorney general and said, "You and I are both going to have public events coming in the next--" I think it was a few days later. "Do you think it's time to do what the Department of Justice policy permits, in the appropriate case where there's a public interest that justifies it, confirming that you have an investigation?" And she agreed.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: She-- but-- **she agreed. But** you write that **she didn't want to call it an investigation?**

JAMES COMEY: That's right. She agreed. Loretta Lynch I had a great relationship with and still have a lot of respect for. **And she said, "I agree. But call it a matter."** And I said, "Why would I do that?" And she said, "Just call it a matter." And I didn't know exactly why she was doing that, but I decided in that moment that the whole world would miss the distinction between investigation and matter. And so, I dropped it at that point. At my press event, I said-- used the term matter, and I was right, the press missed it and said we'd confirmed an investigation.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did **you think she was doing that to protect Hillary Clinton?**

JAMES COMEY: I didn't know. It worried me. It gave me an uncomfortable feeling because the Clinton campaign, **since the matter had come in**, the investigation had started in July, **had been trying to come up with other words to describe it. They had used "Review" I think, "Security referral," things like that.** And it did worry me that the attorney general's direction was tracking that effort to avoid using the word "investigation." And so, to be honest, it gave me a bad feeling. And maybe I should've pushed harder in the moment.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Yeah, did you push her on it?

JAMES COMEY: I didn't because I've known Loretta for a long time. We worked a case together in the early 1990s. And she's a very smart person. And if she'd had a reason that I couldn't see in Justice Department policy or something, she'da given it to me. But **her answer, "Just do it,"** told me this is an order from the attorney general. So, it's not improper, it's a little bit off axis from the actual facts. But people are going to miss the distinction. And so, I'm not going to fight this new attorney general. This is not going to be our first battle.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You think you should have?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I probably should have. Given that I respect Loretta, I probably should've pushed harder in the moment.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: The investigation proceeds. And **your initial instinct-- is confirmed by the investigation.** So that by-- I guess it is **by spring, 2016**, you're pretty clear you're not going to prosecute-- Hillary Clinton. And you say you took one weekend, I think it was **in May, 2016**, and **began to draft-- a statement explaining the decision.** Again, President Trump looks at that and says you were "Writing the r-- the conclusion even before you interviewed Hillary Clinton. That is just wrong."

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I've heard that an awful lot, not just from President Trump, but from a lot of former prosecutors and former government people saying, "This shows that you had prejudged the matter." Here's my reaction. And the reason I smile a little bit is anybody who's actually done investigations knows that if you've been investigating something for almost a year and you don't have a general sense of where it's likely to end up, you should be fired because you're incompetent. If you've been investigating for a year, you know that, unless things change, we're going to head in this direction. Prosecutors and investigators all the time draft indictments before they finish the investigation. Their mind is open that if they find something that changes their view, they won't bring an indictment. But they know where it's headed after a year of investigation. Same thing here. We had looked all around and scrubbed thousands and thousands and thousands of Hillary Clinton's emails. We had a very clear picture after nine or ten months of investigation of this case. Our mind was open to a couple of facts. Maybe something will change in the final month of the investigation. Or maybe she'll lie to us during the interview, which is a whole 'nother kettle of fish. Or maybe we'll need to do additional investigation. But after nine or ten months of investigating, it looked like on the current course and speed, this is going to end without charges. And so, what will we do? Smart people, competent people plan ahead. If you're going to charge, you plan ahead. If you're not going to charge, you plan ahead. And the hard part about this investigation was going to be not charging because the Obama Justice Department could bring charges against Hillary Clinton without claim of bias, political bias, because they're Democrats. What would be hard for the Obama Justice Department for a bunch of reasons is not to bring charges about Hillary Clinton. That will be hard to do without jeopardizing the reputation of the institutions of justice. So, it required thought to think about, "So how will we end this in a way that maximizes confidence that we did it in the right way, that the system was not rigged?" So that's what I'm doing in the beginning of May, is trying to think through, "So how will this end if it continues on this course that it's on now?" (There it is, perfectly clear, the system is rigged, and Comey went right along with it, he just spent a great deal of time trying to spin it, so it didn't appear rigged.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And to those who say you should've brought Hillary Clinton before a grand jury?

JAMES COMEY: Look, I understand why people ask that. We would actually prefer-- most people haven't been in front of a grand jury. We would prefer with a subject of an investigation to do an informal interview. Lot more flexibility there. You can bring a lot more people and have a lot more people involved in the questioning. And it offers us an opportunity in a less formal setting to poke at someone. They're still required to tell the truth. That's another thing that gets lost--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, President Trump says you should've put her under oath.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. President Trump's not-- I'm-- I'm sure his lawyers, given his situation, are focusing him on this. It's still a crime to lie to the F.B.I. and federal prosecutors, whether or not you're under oath. It doesn't matter. If you knowingly tell a false statement to the F.B.I., as Martha Stewart did, as David Petraeus did, as so many others have, you will be prosecuted for it. It doesn't matter whether you're under oath or not.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You interview Hillary Clinton I guess it was July 2nd-- 2016. But actually, you're not there?

JAMES COMEY: No 'cause I'm the dir-- at that point, the director of the F.B.I. Only on TV is the director jumping out of helicopters and conducting interviews. My job is to make the final decisions. The pros will do the interview, the agents who had actually been investigating her and crawling all around her life for a year. And that's the way it should be.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And after the interview, what did you learn?

JAMES COMEY: Spent a lotta time on the phone with the team that afternoon and learned that we didn't find anything, the team didn't, that changed their view of the case. That this was a case that the Department of Justice would never prosecute. And, most importantly, they didn't want to do additional investigation. There was nothing she said that they believed we could prove was false. And there was nothing else they needed to run down to see if she was testifying to us falsely. And so, the view of the team was, "We're done here. Our view of this case is firm. No prosecutor would prosecute this case."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, if no prosecutor would prosecute this case, why not put out a one-line statement, "We decline to prosecute"?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. It's a great question and a reasonable question. And the reason I thought that would be inappropriate is the faith and confidence of the American people in the Department of Justice and the F.B.I. are at the core of those organizations. If they're not believed to be honest, independent and competent, they're done. If you issue a one liner from the Obama Justice Department about one of the two candidates for president of the United States, in this case the Democratic nominee for president of the United States, and say, "We're done here," in the absence of any kind of transparency, corrosive doubt creeps in that the system is rigged

somehow. And so, my view was-- and this is a longstanding practice of the Department of Justice, that in rare cases, you should offer transparency, so the American people can take a look at what you did and know that it was done in an honest, competent, independent way.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: The Department of Justice, but not the F.B.I. director?

JAMES COMEY: That's right. What was unusual about this, in fact unprecedented in my experience, is that I decided it was important that I speak separately from the attorney general. In the-- in the ordinary case, what we'd do is what I said publicly, we'd have sent that to the Department of Justice. And the attorney general could announce it in any way the attorney general chose. What was different here is I decided, given some things that had happened, that to protect the institutions, we actually had to step away from the Department of Justice and tell the American people, "Look, here's what we did. Here's what we found. Here's what we think. You can count on the fact this was done in an apolitical way. Your organization of justice acted the way you'd want it to be. And that if I'd done the normal thing, that wouldn't have happened, and the institutions would've been damaged."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Your critics say this is where your ego got the best of you. This was your original sin? (SO, or SO WHAT, this is, no big deal compared to the stuff you know nothing about!)

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I hear that. And, look, there's always a risk that I'm blind to how I'm acting. I don't think so. I knew this would be terrible for me personally. So, if it was about ego, why would I step out in front of the organization and get shot a thousand times? I actually thought, as bad as this'll be for me personally, this is my obligation, to protect the F.B.I. and the Justice Department. Given all that had gone on, the attorney general of the United States could not credibly announce this result. And if she did, it would do corrosive damage to the institutions of justice.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Dig into that. Why could the attorney general not credibly announce the results of this investigation?

JAMES COMEY: Well, for a bunch of reasons. And it sort of built over the course of the investigation. First of all, we had the problem that President Obama had twice publicly basically said, "There's no there, there." In an interview with-- on Fox, an interview on 60 Minutes I think, both times he said that. So that's his Justice Department. (There, there now, nobody told you, you were being a bad girl.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did that surprise you?

JAMES COMEY: It really did surprise me. He's a very smart man and a lawyer. And so, it surprised me. He shouldn't have done it. It was inappropriate--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did you think he was trying to color the case?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. I don't think so. He didn't have any insight into the case, at least as far as I know, more than anybody reading the newspaper did, which was zero 'cause there were no leaks. {Imagine That! Not even DOJ leaking into the White House.} I think he felt a pressure in the political environment because he wanted Hillary Clinton to be elected, to give her a shot in the arm. And so, he spoke about an investigation. And he shouldn't have done that. But that, as you can imagine, created this drumbeat that the Obama Justice Department, the fix is in because the president has told them what result they should reach.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So that's one reason that the Justice Department is compromised. What's reason number two?

JAMES COMEY: Reason number two. And I have to talk about it very carefully. Classified information came into the possession of the U.S. intelligence community in the early part of 2016 that indicated there was material out there that raised the question of whether Loretta Lynch was controlling me and the F.B.I. and keeping the Clinton campaign informed about our investigation. Now, I don't believe that. And I don't believe that's true. But there was material that I knew someday, when it's declassified, and I thought that would be decades in the future, would cause historians to wonder, "Hmm, was there some strange business going on there? Was Loretta Lynch somehow in -- carrying water for the campaign and controlling what the F.B.I. did?"

Lynch lacked credibility to announce details of Clinton inquiry:

Comey: Again, it wasn't true. But there was material that would allow that to come out someday in the long future when it's declassified. That all changed when someday, in my mind, became maybe tomorrow. That was in the middle of June, when the Russian government, using some fronts, started dumping stolen material that had been hacked from organizations associated with the Democratic party in the United States. And all of a sudden, it dawned on me that that someday decades from now when this material comes out actually may be now, tomorrow. And again, even though I didn't believe it, the material was real. Whether what it said was true

or not, I didn't know. But it would allow people, partisans and even people who were partisans, to strongly argue that something was wrong with the way the investigation--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did you investigate it?

JAMES COMEY: We did.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And what did you find?

JAMES COMEY: Found no indication that it was true.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Boy. So, **you find no indication this is true. And yet-- you write that this is the reason you went out on your own--**

JAMES COMEY: One of the reasons.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: One of the reasons. **Doesn't that cast a cloud over the attorney general, an unjustified cloud over the attorney general?**

JAMES COMEY: In a way, yeah. I mean, I like Loretta. As I said, I respect her even today. And so, in a way, it's unfair to her. But when you're in the business of running a Justice Department institution, what people think matters. Public faith and confidence is everything to the Justice Department. And so, whether or not it was true, the fact that it would be out there and allow people to argue that something terrible was going on in this investigation cut in favor of more transparency. I'm not saying it's true. But because it will undermine confidence in our work, the way to react to that is show people your work. And again, Justice Department policy allows for this. What made it different was the separation between the F.B.I. and the Justice Department. Now, that-- of course, that material-- so-- I'm talking about it carefully because it's still classified, that was just one brick in the load. The-- the major brick in the load happened just before--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: H-- how--

JAMES COMEY: --the Clinton email--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --yeah, and I want to get to that--

JAMES COMEY: --entered.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --in a second. But I know you can't talk about it, but I've read about it. I think a lotta the country has read about it as well. **These are emails or memos released by the Russians. The F.B.I. knows they're junk.** How can you then allow that to influence this decision?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, that's tricky for me 'cause-- 'cause the F.B.I.'s told me that I have to be very careful speaking about this 'cause it's still classified. What I can say is the material is legitimate. It-- it is real. **The content is real. Now, whether the content is true is a different question.** And again, to my mind, I believed it was not true. I-- I didn't see any indication that Loretta Lynch was trying to cover this investigation for the Clinton campaign or direct me in any way. **She stayed away from it as far as I could tell.** But the point of it is I knew there was material that might hit the public square any moment, that would allow people to argue powerfully that there was monkey business going on--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **But then wouldn't-- your obligation then be you get up and say, "No, there's no monkey business. I know that. I've investigated it. I've looked into it. It's not true"?**

JAMES COMEY: Well, sure, if I could do that, **given the rules of classified information**, but I couldn't. But what I could do instead is offer unusual transparency to the American people about the investigation. Tell them, "Here's what we did, here's what we found, here's what we think about it. **You can trust us** because we're showing you our work." Again, which Department of Justice policy permits in an unusual case. And so, it was frustrating. I'm sure it's frustrating to Loretta Lynch that-- that this material was out there. But it-- to my mind, it added to the case that we need to do something unusual to offer the American people transparency. **And then the capper happened at the end of June.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Yeah, I want to get to that in one second. One final point on this. The New York Times quoted former Department of Justice officials saying, "The F.B.I. never uncovered evidence tying Ms. Lynch and the document's author and are convinced that **Mr. Comey** wanted an exers-- **wanted an excuse to put himself in the spotlight.**"

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Look, I-- I understand why people say that. That's just not true. I'm telling you how we evaluated the information. We didn't have any reason to believe that what the document said was accurate. That is, that Loretta Lynch was a channel to the Clinton campaign and controlling us. But there's no doubt that **it would've allowed people** to argue strongly **that that was the case.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Di-- d-- did you tell-- Congressional officials in a classified setting that this was not true?

JAMES COMEY: That what was not true?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That thi-- that this information was not true? That you'd investigated, looked into it and it was not-- it was-- it was not valid?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I c-- I can't say what I said in a classified setting, so let's set that aside. I can tell you right now-- we looked into it and found no evidence to support its truth.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Third brick. **The tarmac meeting.**

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, the biggest brick of all. **Loretta Lynch and Bill Clinton had a conversation on an F.B.I. plane** which transported the attorney general in Phoenix in late June. And I didn't pay much attention to it. I saw news accounts of it early on. And it quickly blossomed into a very big deal the last week of June. I don't know what they talked about. **I credit Loretta Lynch 'cause I think she's an honest person**, saying, "We talked about grandchildren and other things." I find it hard to believe that Bill Clinton would've tried to obstruct justice by walking across the tarmac in front of--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Kind of public.

JAMES COMEY: --in front of a bunch of F.B.I. agents up the s-- up the stairs and onto an F.B.I. plane. And so, look, I-- I credit Loretta's account that-- what they talked about. I think she's telling the truth about that. But again, the confidence of people that the system is working in a fair way, that **Lady Justice has kept her blindfold on**, matters. And so, what happened the last week of June is a big storm blew up about what was going on there. And the attorney general did something that, to my mind, was strange. At the end of that week-- so I think **Friday, July the 1st**, she put out a public statement which I didn't know was coming, saying, **"I'm not going to remove myself from the investigation."** "Recuse" is the official word. "I'm not going to step outta the investigation. **But I will accept Jim Comey's recommendation** and that of the career prosecutors." And at that moment, I decided I have to step-- **as much as I like her**, I have to step away from her and show the American people the F.B.I.'s work separately. {I must fix this, I just have to make it go away!}

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Wasn't there another route? **Couldn't you have just gone to her privately**, personally and said, **"You've gotta recuse. You've gotta get out of this completely"?**

JAMES COMEY: Maybe. But she's my boss, one. Two, w--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You've stood up to bosses before.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, yeah, yeah. And so that's why there's a two. Two, she announced publicly what she was doing before talking to me. And so, I really didn't think there was a prospect that, having announced publicly, she would accept my recommendation and that of the career prosecutors, that I would be able to convince her to recuse. Now, **what I did think about was, "Should I call for the appointment of a special prosecutor?"** Someone outside the normal chain of command who can then take our work and announce it separately from-- so I don't have to do this, can do it separately from me. And I decided that would be brutally unfair to the subject of the investigation, Hillary Clinton. And that's not a political judgment, that's an ethical judgment.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: No, but there's a third route. You-- you-- you push her to recuse and then it goes through the normal Justice Department channels. **The deputy AG, Sally Yates, makes the decision, makes the announcement?**

JAMES COMEY: Sure, maybe. Maybe. And-- and I-- **I suppose a reasonable person might have done that.** But my judgment was she's just announced publicly that she's not going to recuse herself. And she'll accept my recommendation that of the career prosecutors. And so, what more is there to do at that point?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, you make the decision to make a public statement-- **July 5th.** Take us inside your head. Tell us what you were thinking.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, my goal was to try to offer as much transparency as I could, consistent with the law and policy, to the American people, with the goal of convincing them, first of all, that we're not on anybody's side. We're not on the Democrat side or the Republican side. That we did this in a competent way, an honest way, an independent way. **And there's no there, there.** That no reasonable prosecutor would prosecute this case. And you can rely upon that 'cause we did this well and in an apolitical way. And so, we crafted a statement that we worked on endlessly to get it right. And I decided that I would read it, say it out loud, so that people could hear the tone in my voice. **But that I wouldn't take any questions.** And that was the goal, to give a report to the American people and then step away from it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You even thought about the tie you'd wear that day?

JAMES COMEY: I did. We're in such-- we're still in such a vicious partisan time. I don't know whether folks notice this, but in Washington Democrats tend to wear blue-- men tend to wear blue ties. Republicans tend to wear red ties. And so, **I chose a gold tie that morning 'cause** I didn't want to wear either of the normal **gang colors.** Which seems crazy that I have to think about that, but given the times we were operating in and we're still in, **I was hoping the American people would see us as apart from this craziness.** That these are people I can

trust. And **part of that was not just the way I dressed.** But by offering them a lot of information. Sh-- let me show you my work so you can understand we did this in the way you would want us to do it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Your critics say you offered way too much information. The way they put it, "Listen, in the F.B.I. we simply do not bloody up people we choose not to prosecute."

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, and I get that. Look, that's fair criticism. But here-- here's my response to it. The Department of Justice has long done that in the appropriate case, where it's necessary to the credibility of the work. There was controversy for the first couple years of my time as director over whether the IRS had targeted Tea Party groups. And the Department of Justice and the F.B.I. did a criminal investigation and in a detailed report that was public as to what we had done-- the department did this, they criticized people but said no criminal case was warranted. This is just consistent with that practice. **What I'd ask those people is would the work really have been credible if I wasn't honest?** That-- that Hillary Clinton's c-- conduct on that personal email server was extremely careless. It just was. And if I wasn't honest about that, how am I achieving the goal of showing the American people this is your justice system working in the right way?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Y-- you-- you cited her for extreme carelessness. In an original draft of your statement-- the words, "Gross negligence" were there instead of "Extreme carelessness." And-- and President Trump's allies say that's a sign that you personally went easy on her.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I don't. **All these allies who think I went easy on her have a hard time explaining so why did I do what I did in October,** but I'll stay in July. I wasn't trying to go easy on her or hard on her. I was trying to be honest and clear with the American people. What she did was really sloppy. Clinton's actions with the email server were 'really sloppy'. Not-- you know, there's all the time people mishandle a classified document or maybe have one conversation on email that they shouldn't. **This was over the course of four years, dozens of conversations on email about secret topics. And I think eight about top secret topics. So, this is more than just ordinary sloppiness.** So, if I'm going to be honest, I have to say somehow, it's more than ordinary sloppiness. So my first draft, which I wrote myself, said, "Gross negligence." It's a lawyer term. And the reason I used that term is I wanted to also explain that I don't mean that in the sense that a statute passed, 100 years ago means it. And then my staff convinced me that that's just going to confuse all kinds of people, if you start talking about statutes and what the words mean. What's a colloquial way to explain it? And elsewhere in my statement I had said, "Extremely careless." And so, they said, "Just use that." And so that's what I went with.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And to Hillary Clinton supporters, that sounded like you're accusing her of a crime even though you don't prosecute.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I get that. And then the other said saying, "You're admitting she committed a crime, you didn't prosecute her." The goal was-- and-- and one of the mistakes I made is I don't know what it would be. I should've worked harder to find a way to convey that it's more than just the ordinary mistake, but it's not criminal behavior, and find different words to-- to describe that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Even your family had some criticism of that press conference?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, they did. They did. God love them, they have criticism of nearly every press conference. But this one, their feedback was, "You Seacrested it, Dad," which I-- they explained to me was a reference to Ryan Seacrest, the TV host, who I guess will frequently say-- he's about to announce a result and then say, "But first, this commercial." And what they meant was I made people wait till the very end to say what the conclusion was we were reaching, when folks wanted to hear that at the beginning. And I actually think that's fair feedback. And I-- I think that's an example of my ego sneaking through. That-- that I thought I knew the best way to present this was not to give them the headline up front 'cause I thought then they won't listen to the rest of it--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You wanted people to listen.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. But-- I think I was wrong about that. In fact, I know I was wrong about that 'cause it led to a lotta confusion. "Where is he going?" And people thinking that I was somehow burying the lead for dramatic purposes or-- or something. So that feedback from my family, as usually is, was accurate.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And you also would not use the words, "Extreme carelessness" today?

JAMES COMEY: No. I'd find some-- I don't know what it would be, sitting here. Find some other way to convey, 'cause I wanted to be honest and transparent. **This wasn't your ordinary bureaucrat who just mishandles one document. This was something more than that. But not something that anybody would prosecute.** And-- and that's one of the things about the criticism that drives me crazy. Nobody who has done counterespionage work would think this is a case that's been prosecute-- would be prosecuted, ever. And so I needed to find a way to both convey that and to capture that **it was more than just ordinary carelessness.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But do you think that the F.B.I. would be in better shape today, the institution you love, would be in better shape today if you had simply put out that one-line statement, "We decline to prosecute"?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. I've asked myself that a million times. It's hard-- hindsight is a wonderful thing. I'm not sure that it would have. And-- here's why I say that. Because we would've taken a tremendous amount of criticism for being fixed. The system fixed, no detail. And I still would've been dragged up to Capitol Hill all that summer to justify the F.B.I.'s work. And so surely, I would've said something about how we did the work. And so, I-- I'd kinda be in the same place, except I'd be playing defense like a cornerback backpedaling. There'd be this tremendous hit the institution would take. I'd be trying to explain to people, "No, no, we did it in a good way. We did it in a good way." **And none of it, by the way, would change what I faced in late October.** Even if we'd just done the one liner, we'd still have the nightmare of late October.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Y-- you laid out a series of reasons that led you to do-- do the July press conference-- even going back to Loretta Lynch calling this a matter not an investigation. President Obama weighing in. The classified information about Loretta Lynch, the tarmac meeting. **Can you assure people today-- can you assure them that the Obama Justice Department was not protecting Hillary Clinton?**

JAMES COMEY: **Yes.** And if there were people who were secretly trying to protect Hillary Clinton, we didn't know about it. The FBI drove this investigation and we did it in a competent and independent way. I would bet my life on that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: While this is all going on in July of 2016, the FBI also opens an investigation into the Trump campaign. **Why?**

JAMES COMEY: Well-- to be more clear, we opened an investigation into whether there were any Americans associated in any way with the Trump campaign who were working with Russia as part of Russia's effort to influence our election. And so, **in late July, the FBI got information that** there was somebody who had had-- was **a foreign policy advisor named Papadopoulos** to the Trump campaign.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: George Papadopoulos.

JAMES COMEY: Right, who had been talking to someone in London about getting dirt that the Russians had on Hillary Clinton as part of their effort to influence our campaign-- the-- our election. And the reason that was important was that was long before the-- there was any public indication that the Russians had material they were going to dump, which they started dumping in mid-June. And so we opened, our counterintelligence division, in late July, an investigation to try and figure out-- **we know the Russians are trying to mess with our election. Are any Americans working with them, trying to help them?**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You also had had your eye on Carter Page, who had also been working with the Trump campaign.

JAMES COMEY: Correct.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And what was your concern there?

JAMES COMEY: Similarly, trying to figure out is he in any way coordinating with the Russians, as part of their effort to influence our-- our election? We hear the word "collusion" all the time. "Collusion" is not a word that's familiar to me from my work. The question is, is anybody conspiring or aiding and abetting, helping, the Russians accomplish their goal of interfering in the American election? That's what the counterintelligence investigation was about.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: S-- so **what impact did the Steele-- the so-called Steele dossier have on the FBI investigation?** Did that trigger the FBI investigation in any way?

JAMES COMEY: No. No, in fact, as I said, the information that triggered it was the Papadopoulos information that came in **late July.** The FBI didn't get any information that's part of the so-called Steele dossier, as I understand it, until after that. And so, the investigation was triggered entirely separately from the Steele dossier.

Comey says Trump asked him to investigate 'dossier'

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, the FBI is investigating Russian interference in our campaign, and whether or not any individuals associated with President Trump are cooperating with that interference. What are you thinking then? As you see President Trump invite the Russians to release Hillary Clinton's emails, as you see him refuse to criticize Vladimir Putin?

JAMES COMEY: I'm thinking the questions that we're asking ourselves, which is, is anybody-- is the Trump campaign in any way working directly with the Russians? Is there-- because the-- the fact that the president is calling for the release of the emails could cut both ways. You could argue it's an indication that they don't have a secret channel with the Russians, or you could argue it means they're in bed with the Russians and there must

be connections that we can find. And so, it was obviously of interest to us, but we already had the investigation underway.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And the refusal to criticize Vladimir Putin?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know what's behind that. I mean, that's-- that mystified me even after President Trump became president 'cause I discovered that he wouldn't criticize him even in private, which-- I can understand a president making a geopolitical decision that, "I ought not to criticize an adversary country's leader for some reason publicly." But I discovered President Trump wouldn't even do it privately, and I don't know why that is.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You first were briefed on the Steele dossier in **August of 2015**. What did you make of it?

JAMES COMEY: That it, at its core, was consistent with the other information we'd gathered during the intelligence investigation. That there was a massive Russian effort underway to interfere with our election with three goals: to dirty up the American democracy so it's not a shining light for others around the world; to hurt Hillary Clinton, who Vladimir Putin personally hated; and to help Donald Trump become elected president. Th-- those allegations are at the core of the Steele dossier, and we already knew that was true from totally separate information. And so at its core, it said something that was consistent with what we believed. It was coming from a credible source, someone with a track record, someone who was a credible and respected member of an allied intelligence service during his career. And so it was important that we try to understand it, and see what could we verify, what could we rule in or rule out?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did you think it was a credible document?

JAMES COMEY: Well, certainly the source was credible. There's no doubt that he had a network of sources and sub-sources in a position to report on these kinds of things. But we tend to approach these things with a bit of a blank slate, trying to figure out, "So what can we replicate?" This guy, who's credible, says these things are true. Okay. That means we should try and replicate that work to see if we can develop the same sources.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: A-- and at the time, did you know it had been financed at the beginning from President Trump's-- by President Trump's political opponents?

JAMES COMEY: **Yes**, I-- I was told at some point that it was-- the effort had originally been financed by a Republican source to develop-- material-- opposition research on Donald Trump. Then after the Republican nominating process ended, the effort was taken up and funded by a Democratic aligned group trying to get opposition research on Trump. I never knew which-- who the groups were, but I knew it started with Republicans paying for it and then Democrats were paying for it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And-- and all through August and September-- there's a great debate going on inside the Obama administration: What to reveal about Russia (SIC) was doing, what to reveal about your investigation. Describe that.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Not the second part. Y-- actually was not a hard question about whether to talk publicly about the fact that we'd opened in-- counterintelligence investigations on a small number of Americans because it was far too early. We didn't know what we had, and we didn't want to tip them off that we were looking at them. So consistent with our policy-- again, very different than the Hillary Clinton case, which began with a public referral. Everybody knew we were looking at her emails. So when we confirmed it three months later, there's no jeopardy at all to the investigation. This was very different. We did not want these Americans to know that we had reason to believe they might be working with the Russians 'cause we gotta run this down and investigate it. So actually, what was debated was a different and harder question which is what should we tell the American people about the fact that the Russians are messing with our election? Trying to hurt our democracy, hurt Hillary Clinton and help Donald Trump. What should we do about that? And one of the options debated was should we inoculate the American people in some way by telling them, "The Russians are trying to mess with you. You should know that, so you can take that into account when you see news or see particular approaches to things."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: W-- we-- we know that-- there were s-- there were strong objections in-- by Republicans in the Senate to being public about this. But at one point, you actually volunteered to put it all on paper?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah-- I think **it was in August**, I volunteered that-- that I would be-- I remember saying that I'm a little bit tired of being the independent voice on things, after the beating I'd taken after the July 5th announcement. But I said in a meeting with the president, "I'm willing to be the voice on this and help inoculate the American people. But I also recognize why this is such a hard question, because if you announce that the Russians are trying to mess with our election, do you accomplish their goal for them? Do you undermine confidence in our election by having the president of the United States, or one of his senior people, say this

publicly? Will the Russians be happy that you did that?" And so I-- I wrote an op-ed, was going to go in a major newspaper that laid out what was going on. Not the investigation, 'cause that was too sensitive to reveal, but that, "The Russians are here and they're screwing with us. And this is consistent with what they've done in the past," and they never took me up on it. The Obama administration deliberated until the beginning of October.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And-- and **one of the things you write that was influencing the president and his administration was the assumption that Hillary Clinton would win.**

JAMES COMEY: I think so. In fact, I heard the president say, as-- as I recount in the book, "Putin backed the wrong horse." That is, all of us were operating in a world where the polls were showing that Donald Trump had no chance. So, I think what the president meant by that was the Russian effort is wasted, and so why should we help them by announcing what they're doing when their work is not going to achieve their goal?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And it would give people reason to question the outcome of the election.

JAMES COMEY: Right. Donald Trump was already saying, "If I lose, that means the system is rigged." And so if the Obama administration comes out saying, "The Russians are trying to help elect Donald Trump," that walks right into his narrative that's, "See, I told ya," that the whole system is fixed and you can't trust the American democratic process. And the Russians would have accomplished their goal.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Eventually the-- administration does announce-- that they've found that Russia is interfering-- yet, and this is-- this confounds me. I-- I'm-- I'm puzzled by this. Yet, when they decide to come out with a joint statement of the intelligence committees, **you as the FBI director refused to sign it. Why?**

JAMES COMEY: Because of the way we approach action in the run-up to an election. The-- it's not written down, despite what you might have heard, but **there's an important norm that I've lived my whole government career-- obeying. If you can avoid it, you should not take any action in the run-up to an election that could have an impact on the election.** By that, I mean the FBI or the Department of Justice. And so, we were being asked, in October, to sign onto a statement that says, "The Russians are messing with our election." In my view and the view of the FBI leadership was it's too late. And we can avoid action here. Because the goal's already been accomplished. The American people already know this because lots of government officials have been on background talking to the press about this, members of Congress have been talking about it, the candidates are talking about it. So, the inoculation has already been achieved, and it's October. So, **we can avoid action here consistent with our policy that, whenever possible, we try and avoid action. So, we won't sign this.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But doesn't that undercut the weight of the statement?

JAMES COMEY: I don't think so. I mean, coming from the director of National Intelligence, I don't think anybody noticed at the time that the FBI wasn't on the statement. It was the secondly of Homeland Security, and the director of National Intelligence, my boss. I reported to the attorney general and the director of National Intelligence. And so I don't think it un-- undercut the statement. **But it allowed us to be consistent with our standard which is, if possible, we should avoid action in the run-up to an election that might have an impact.** Here, it is possible because the goal's been achieved already.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did anybody try to convince you to sign it?

JAMES COMEY: I think I was asked to sign it-- by the director of National Intelligence, Jim Clapper. And I think I explained why-- I thought the FBI shouldn't sign up at this point. I don't remember any pushback on that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: At the same time, **the Hillary Clinton email investigation comes back.** When did you first know you were going to have to deal with this again?

JAMES COMEY: Really, **October 27th.** Somebody earlier in October, the b-- in the beginning of October sometime, mentioned to me that there may be a connection between emails found on Anthony Weiner's laptop and the Clinton email investigation. I don't remember.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Was this Andrew McCabe?**

JAMES COMEY: I think it was Andy McCabe, but I'm not certain. I didn't store that in any prominent place in my brain 'cause how could that possibly be true?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **But how could that not be something you remember?**

JAMES COMEY: That's a great question. I think the answer is because how could that possibly be true? How could there be a connection between Anthony Weiner's laptop and Hillary Clinton's emails? And so I think it was sort of a passing comment to me, and I'm sure I stored it away thinking, "Okay, well, that doesn't make any sense, but I'm sure they'll tell me if it does." And they did. They c--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: It's I-- **it's led your critics to say that the FBI, for several weeks, sat on the knowledge that they had several thousand Hillary Clinton emails.**

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, more than several thousand, hundreds--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Hundreds of thousands.**

JAMES COMEY: --of thousands on Anthony Weiner's laptop. And I don't know the answer to that criticism. I don't know whether the Bureau team could have moved faster to-- to bring it to me for a decision. All I know is that they did bring it to me on the morning of October 27th. And so, there's an inspector general investigation going on-- about our work on that investigation. I'm sure they'll say, which I think is great. But I don't know the answer to that now--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So th-- and-- and-- and-- and to be clear, between that first mention and October 27th, you didn't hear anything about Hillary Clinton's--

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I don't--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --emails?

JAMES COMEY: --remember hearing anything else about it until I walked into a conference room early in the morning on October 27th. So we're now less than two weeks from the election. The deputy director emailed me at about 5:30 in the morning and said, "The midyear team," which was the code name for the Clinton email investigation, "needs to meet with you." And it's unusual to email me at 5:30 in the morning. And so I m-- arranged to meet with the team. And I walked in with a stupid smile on my face, I think, and said, "The band is back together." 'Cause they were sitting in the same seats they'd sat in so many times. And I didn't smile again for a long time like that-- after that. And what they told me was, "We have found, for reasons we can't explain, hundreds of thousands of Hillary Clinton's emails on Anthony Weiner's laptop. And something much more important than that. Thousands of emails from Hillary Clinton's Blackberry domain." She used a Blackberry for the first three months or so of her tenure as secretary of State before setting up the personal server in the basement. And the reason that matters so much is, if there was gonna be a smoking gun, where Hillary Clinton was told, "Don't do this," or, "This is improper," it's highly likely to be at the beginning. And we never found those emails. And so now they're telling me, "For reasons we can't explain, thousands of those Blackberry emails are on Anthony Weiner's laptop." And so, I said, "Okay. We gotta go get 'em. How fast can you review these?" And the answer was, "We can't possibly finish before the election because we have to read tens of thousands of emails. We can't ask recruits to come in and review them because you have to know the context." And so, I'm sitting there on the morning of October 27th, they're telling me there's material that may change the conclusion in this case. We all agree, including the Department of Justice, we've gotta get a search warrant to go get these. And then the question for me now is, "So what do we do now?" Remember the-- {stupid smile on my face,}-- the standard is, the norm is, "If you can avoid it, you take no action that might have an impact on an election." And I'm sitting there, on the morning of October 27th, and I can't see a door that's labeled, "No action here." I can only see two doors, and they're both actions. One says, "Speak," the other says, "Conceal"--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, no. You-- you c-- you could you f-- try to find out first whether or not they were indeed relevant. Whether they-- there was evidence there of a crime.

JAMES COMEY: Well, maybe. And maybe another director might have done that. My view is that would be a potentially deeply irresponsible and dangerous thing to do, to gamble-- remember, the team is telling you, "We cannot evaluate this material before the election."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But we don't know what's in it?

JAMES COMEY: Well, we know there are hundreds of thousands of Hillary Clinton's emails there, including Blackberry emails. And so, there is reason to believe that this is evidence in our case and may change the result. And so maybe what you do is gamble and say, "I'll be quiet about it," but that comes back to my doors. That's an affirmative act of concealment, {the FBI would never conceal} right? Because I've told Congress and the American people-- the whole point of July 5th was transparency. "Look, American people, what we've done. We did it carefully, we did it well. There's no there, there. You can take that to the bank. You can rely on the FBI. We're done. Everybody can get on with their lives." It's October 27th, that's not true anymore, in potentially a huge way. So, you could speak about it, or you could not speak about it. But the not speaking about it is an action.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Senior Justice officials weren't convinced that you actually had an obligation to tell Congress that at that time. What was their argument, what was your response?

JAMES COMEY: Their argument was that it was not consistent with our policy, and that we don't normally comment on investigations, all of which I agree with. And that they would advise against it. Actually, never spoke to me about it personally. I had my chief of staff call over to the leadership's chief of s-- staffs of th-- the attorney general and the deputy and say, "The director thinks that its between speaking and concealing. Speaking is really bad; concealing is catastrophic. If you conceal the fact that you have restarted the Hillary Clinton email investigation, not in some silly way but in a very, very important way that may lead to a different conclusion, what will happen to the institutions of justice when that comes out?"

Especially, given the world we're operating in, when Hillary Clinton's elected president? She'll be an illegitimate president, but these organizations will never recover from that. You hid from the American people something you knew gave the lie to what you told them in Congress repeatedly. And so, the director thinks that we have to speak. And he would be happy to talk to you about it. Let him know."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Even though you didn't know what was in-- what was in those emails, you could have predicted what President Trump and his allies would do with it once you released this information. It's exactly what happened. Everyone says, "This must be significant. This must be real."

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I totally get that, and-- which is why we worked so hard. And although they didn't want to talk to me about the decision, the leadership of the Department of Justice did give input on what I should say to Congress. And the goal was to say as little as possible, because we didn't know, "Is this going to change our result or not?" But j-- of course I know what's going to happen. It's going to be distorted one way, just as if it-- when the later thing came out, it would be distorted the other way.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That concern, when it dealt with the classified information about Loretta Lynch, something you didn't believe but were worried about how it would be used, didn't seem to affect you here. Here you know that President Trump is going to say-- that candidate Trump at the time is going to say, "This proves everything I've been saying about Hillary Clinton is right."

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. And the question is so what do I do? Given that that's going to happen, what do I do? Does-- does that mean I conceal? And my judgment, and reasonable people can disagree about this-- my point is not to tell people-- "You should believe I'm right." But I want people to know where the decision came from. That's between speaking and concealing. It would destroy the Department of Justice and the FBI to conceal that information from the American people.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That's the judgment you made. **Boy, you seem to be alone in that judgment.** You look at previous attorney generals for President Bush, for President Ford, for President Obama, Justice Department officials for President Clinton; **they all disagree with you. They say this crossed a line.**

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I've-- I've heard a lot of that. And in fact, all that was put together allegedly to be the reason for my firing. What I would hope is that they would, by reading the book, come with me to October 28th. Come with me and sit there with me. Not knowing the future. And sit there with me, look at the doors I looked at, and tell me then what you would do. Tell me which you would pick? And th-- **that's what I would**, in my mind's eye, **scream at the television.** I wouldn't scream at the television, but I'd say, "Tell me what you would do. **Tell me which door you would pick.**"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: They have a pretty clear answer. You say you don't break with longstanding Justice Department norms, you don't reveal information like this?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Okay. And so that means-- and first of all, the Justice Department norms allow you, in appropriate cases, to comment on an investigation, to comment on the facts you found in an investigation, all the things we talk--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But there's no-- there's-- there's no precedent for-- putting out information like this at the end of a campaign?

JAMES COMEY: Oh, I've never heard of it before. I-- I-- as I say in the book, I-- I think I did it the way that it should have been done. I'm-- I'm not certain of that. Other people might have had a different view. I pray to God no future FBI director ever has to find out. I-- I hope so much this is just a 500-year flood we never see again. We have the FBI's criminally investigating one of the two candidates for president of the United States during the campaign. And-- and just over a week before the election, we find on Anthony Weiner's laptop-- and by the way, I-- I know this is obvious, but I didn't put the emails on Anthony Weiner's laptop. Right? I would so much rather Anthony Weiner had never had a laptop. I'd rather never have heard about this situation. But a week or so before the election, we find material on Anthony Weiner's laptop that may change the result, including the missing Blackberry emails. My question for all those op-ed pieces is, "So what do you do?" And maybe you would choose conceal, but you gotta explain to me why and how you think ab-- again, not with the benefit of hindsight. But how you think about the damage to the institutions--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: We just don't get involved two weeks before an election.

JAMES COMEY: Right. To my mind, that is a narrow way to answer that question without considering the damage to the institutions you lead. I mean, "We don't get involved." We get involved if it is the least bad option, right? That's a terrible option, to speak. It made me sick to my stomach to speak. I've devoted my life in government to institutions that have no impact on elections. Speaking is going to have some impact, potentially. But concealing is going to destroy the institutions that I love.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Hillary Clinton's convinced that that letter defeated her. What do you say to her?

JAMES COMEY: I hope not. I-- I don't know. I honestly don't know. I sure hope not. But-- the honest answer is, it wouldn't change the way I think about it. I mean, my hope-- I didn't write the book for this reason. But talking about leadership, it was important to tell the email story because it's me trying to figure out how to lead well. That people will read that story and try to put themselves in my shoes. Try to realize that **I'm not trying to help a candidate or hurt a candidate; I'm trying to do the right thing.** And you can come up with different conclusions. Reasonable people would have chosen a different door for reasonable reasons. But it's just not fair to say we were doing it for some illegitimate reason.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: If you knew that letter would elect Donald Trump, you'd still send it?

JAMES COMEY: **I would.** I would. In fact, that was a question asked by one of my best people-- a deputy general counsel in the FBI who is a very thoughtful and quiet person, who didn't speak a lot. And that-- that morning we were making that decision, **she asked, "Should you consider that what you're about do to may help elect Donald Trump president?"** And I paused, and then I said, "Thank you for asking that question. That's a great question. But the answer is not for a moment because **down that path lies the death of the FBI** as an independent force in American life. If I ever start considering whose political fortunes will be affected by a decision, we're done. We're no longer that group in America that is apart from the partisans, and that can be trusted. We're just another player in the-- in the tribal battle."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But-- but at some level, **wasn't the decision to reveal influenced by your assumption that Hillary Clinton was going to win?** And your concern that she wins, this comes out several weeks later, and then that's taken by her opponent as a sign that she's an illegitimate president?

JAMES COMEY: **It must have been.** I don't remember consciously thinking about that, but it must have been. 'Cause I was operating in a world where Hillary Clinton was going to beat Donald Trump. And so, I'm sure that it-- that it was a factor. Like I said, I don't remember spelling it out, but it had to have been. That-- that she's going to be elected president, and if I hide this from the American people, she'll be illegitimate the moment she's elected, the moment this comes out. (Quote from above: **"All these allies who think I went easy on her have a hard time explaining so why did I do what I did in October,?"** Because he was afraid she going to win, in spite of how he trashed her in July, she was going to win the election, so he had to do some thing to prevent that from happening, or all of the work he had done building a case against Trump would be wasted if Mike Pence wasn't the Veep.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: An-- and **doesn't that also explain, at some level, your decision to conceal the fact that you're investigating the Trump campaign for possible ties to Russia?** You conceal it, so you don't give him an excuse to say, "Hey, this thing is rigged."

JAMES COMEY: Well, no. Not with respect to the counterintelligence investigation of those small number of Americans. That-- that was actually not a hard call, given the sensitivity of the matter and that it was ongoing. We didn't want to tip anybody off. What-- you're right though, with respect to the decision by President Obama, as to how to talk about the Russian interference with the American people. I think it was-- I mean, he said it to me-- in that meeting I described, "Putin backed the wrong horse." He was clearly thinking, "I don't want to, given that Trump's going to lose, be-- look like I'm putting my finger on the scale."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You've said that a few times now. You think it's not a close call. Boy, your critics say this is a clear, clear, clear double standard. **You revealed information about Hillary Clinton; you concealed information about Donald Trump. That elected Donald Trump.**

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I get that. I get that-- why they say that. But what I'd ask them to do is take a step back and stare at the two cases and the posture they were in. The Hillary Clinton email case, which began with a public referral, and so was public, th-- and we were actually investigating the candidate herself; and the counterintelligence investigations trying to figure out whether a small group of people, not Donald Trump-- we were not investigating Donald Trump. Whether this small group of Americans was coordinating anything with the Russians. We had just started the investigation. Didn't know whether we had anything. So, it would have been brutally unfair to those people to talk about it. And it woulda jeopardized the investigation. As I said, the Department wouldn't agree to talk about that, and only in a general way, until the following March. So, I hope those critics-- I get the initial reaction. It seems inconsistent. But if you take the time and look at the posture of the two cases, they're very, very different. And actually, illustrate the rule that we're following.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **If Attorney General Lynch had ordered you not to send the letter, would you have sent it?**

JAMES COMEY: **No.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: No way?

JAMES COMEY: No way. I-- I believe in the chain of command. I followed her instruction to call it a "matter," because she told me to call it a "matter." And I didn't believe it was unethical or illegal. And so, yes, I would have followed their instruction.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why do you think they didn't order you not to send it?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. I don't know. Part of me thinks-- given an encounter I had with Loretta after I sent it, that she may have understood what I was doing. And-- and so didn't want to be involved in the decision, didn't want to approve it, but didn't want to give me the instruction not to send it. Sorta let me take the hit for that. And I could be wrong about that, but-- but I think that's consistent with-- with-- an encounter I had with her privately.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What did it feel like to be James Comey in the last ten days of that campaign after ya sent the letter?

JAMES COMEY: It sucked. Yeah, it was-- it was a very painful period. Again, **my whole life has been dedicated to institutions that work not to have an involvement in an election.** I walked around vaguely sick to my stomach, feeling beaten down. I felt, when I went to the White House-- I don't want to spoil it for people, but there's a movie called "The Sixth Sense" **that I talk about in the book where** Bruce Willis doesn't realize he's dead.

That's the way I felt. I felt like I was totally alone, that everybody hated me. And that there wasn't a way out because it really was the right thing to do. And that-- that, in a way, I'm ruined. **But that's what I have to do. I had to do it the way.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And during that time, you actually talked about this encounter with Loretta Lynch.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, the Monday I sent the letter-- I learn about the emails, get briefed on the need for a search warrant on the 27th of October. We debated and debated and debated and decide on the 28th to send the letter. We had a regular meeting with Loretta on Monday, so that woulda been the 31st. And she emailed me the Sunday night before and said, "Hey, can I meet with you after our regular terrorism threat briefing on Monday morning?" Said, "Sure." And at the end of the meeting, she asked could she meet with me? Which of course we'd al-- I'd already agreed to meet. But our staffs were all there, and so they then knew the two of us were going to meet. And they all waited outside. And Loretta took me into an office in the FBI that's reserved for the attorney general, and I walked in first, and she walked in and closed the door and then turned and just walked towards me with her head down and her arms out. And I'm not a big hugger, but especially-- there was an awkward difference in our height, I guess as there is with me and most people. But she pressed her face against my chest and wrapped her arms around me and then I reached down, as I explain in the book, and kinda awkwardly hugged. And then we-- parted and she said, "I-- I thought you needed a hug." And she was right. I'm sure it showed on my face how beaten I felt. And then we sat down and she said, "How are you doing?" Loretta Lynch is a really good person and has known me a long time. She said, "How are you doing?" And I told her that I felt terrible, that I felt beaten, and-- but that I didn't see that I had a choice. And then she said something that floored me. She said, "Would they feel better **if it leaked** on November the 4th?" And my reaction was-- and I said to her, "Exactly, Loretta." And so, I don't know, was she telling me, "You've done the right thing?" And, in a way, hugging me because she feels badly I've taken this incredibly brutal hit? I don't know. But I interpreted that as, "First of all, I feel badly for you. And even if you hadn't made this decision, once you start going to get a search warrant for Anthony Weiner's laptop to look at hundreds of thousands of Hillary Clinton emails, it's likely to leak out anyway," she's telling me. And remember, the Department of Justice had thought, "We gotta go get a search warrant," in the week before the election. And so that's how I took it. Again, I-- I could be wrong about that, but that's how I took it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: One of the reasons it was-- **you feared it was going to leak out is-- 'cause you were dealing with a rogue element of FBI agents and former FBI agents up in New York who were really pushing to get this out there. Were you aware of that?**

JAMES COMEY: I knew that there were leaks coming-- or appeared to be leaks about criminal investigation of the Clintons coming out of New York. And I don't know exactly where that was coming from. I commissioned an investigation to find out. I don't know what the investigation found. But, yeah, I was worried about-- the-- the team that had done the investigation was in the counterintelligence division at headquarters, of the emails. And there were no leaks at all, very tight. But the criminal folks in New York were now involved in a major way, and I don't want to single anybody out 'cause I don't know where it was coming from. But there'd been enough up there that I thought there was a pretty reasonable likelihood that it would leak, and that's what Loretta was reflecting.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You had your-- your former boss, Rudy Giuliani, out there on television saying something big was coming.

JAMES COMEY: Yes, I saw that. And I don't know whether that was-- it's part of what I ordered investigated. I don't know whether that was part of a leak outta the-- FBI office in New York that knew about the search warrant. But that was my concern, that once you start seeking a search warrant, especially in a criminal case-- counterintelligence is different. They're so used to operating in a classified environment. They're much tighter. But once you start involving people whose tradition is criminal, and in New York which has a different culture, there is a reasonable likelihood it was going to get out anyway.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, **were you gamed here by people who had political motives?**

JAMES COMEY: I don't think so. I mean, I-- I don't think anybody with political motives put hundreds of thousands of Hillary Clinton's emails on Anthony Weiner's laptop, for heaven's sake. And so, I-- I don't think so.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Is one of the lessons here that, as hard as you tried to stay outta politics, it actually is unavoidable? That because you have to make political assumptions as ya-- as-- as you're closing in on an election, you're thrown into politics no matter which decision you make?

JAMES COMEY: Oh, I think that's right. And that-- that wasn't a new lesson. That was why Mark Giuliani said at the beginning, "You know you're totally screwed." The FBI's an independent organization, but it's operating in a very, very difficult partisan environment in the United States. And investigating one of the two candidates for president of the United States. That's what he meant, "You're totally screwed." And-- one of my kids-- I stayed off Twitter during that period of time. One of my kids shared with me a tweet that's become one of my favorites where someone said, **"That Comey is such a political hack. I just can't figure out which party."** And I took that as a compliment, but also an illustration of what I'm talking about. You're the FBI, you're supposed to be finding the facts. And you're finding the facts in a world where everybody's on a side and can't possibly understand you're not on a side. And so, you're inevitably going to get hammered from all points, and you're going to be involved in politics in some sense, because you're in the middle of it--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But does that--

JAMES COMEY: --trying to find out what's true.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --lead to the conclusion do what you're going to do, don't talk about it?

JAMES COMEY: Yes, except that you're an institution that depends upon public trust. And so, again, those people who say, "You should have just closed the Clinton investigation without saying a word about it," I don't think you're thinking about the public trust in the institutions of justice, and the damage that would have done to people's faith and trust that the justice system is working.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But hasn't the public--

JAMES COMEY: It's the reason that you talk about cases-- again, cases of great interest you talk about all the time. It was really important that the Department of Justice put out a report about what happened in Ferguson, Missouri. An 80-some-page report. Now, they could have said, "We don't talk about our investigations," but folks wanted to know what happened in Ferguson, Missouri? For reasons I totally understand. And when you're the Justice Department, you've got to tell people, when you can, "This was done in the right way, and here's what you should know--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But aren't you concerned that that public trust has taken a hit because of the decisions you made?

JAMES COMEY: Oh, of course I am. Yeah, I've thought about it a lot. And I was going to say a million times. Probably haven't thought about it a million times, maybe a thousand or more, and asked myself, "So should I have done something differently?" And I think it's fair to say somebody else in my shoes might have done something differently. **The honest answer is I screwed up a couple of things**, but in the main, I think given what I knew at the time, these were the decisions that were best calculated to preserve the values of the institutions. It was terrible for me, terrible. But I still think it was the right thing to do. And my hope in this book is, not that people agree with me, y-- **they may still walk outta this thinking I'm an idiot**, but I'm an honest idiot. And I really was deliberative and didn't do this alone. I had a team of very bright people who argued and fought and debated trying to figure out, "So what's the right thing to do?"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Your general counsel, I believe, thought you shouldn't release the letter, correct?

JAMES COMEY: **No**. There was o-- there was one senior executive who thought we shouldn't send the second letter, November the 8th, saying, "We have finished looking at these emails and it doesn't change our result." But other than that-- I mean, we debated a ton of different options. The senior team of the FBI, including the general counsel, thought we have to.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Election Day 2016. You didn't vote.

JAMES COMEY: No.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why not?

JAMES COMEY: I'm the director of the FBI. I'm trying to be outside of politics so intentionally tried not to follow it a lot. And that I shouldn't be choosing between the candidates. I'm trying to lead an institution that should be separate and other.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Were-- were you aware-- you say you try not to follow it, but you must have been aware of-- what the candidates were saying about the letter in those final ten days.

JAMES COMEY: Yes, I was. Yeah. Because, again, I'm leading an institution that public trust and confidence in that institution really matters. So, I try to keep track of, "So what are-- what are folks saying about us and how we're conducting ourselves?" 'Cause even though I was raised not to care what other people think, when you're the director of the FBI or the attorney general, you have to when it relates to the institution you lead.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And take us through that day. Where were you as the returns were coming in?

JAMES COMEY: I don't even remember. I think I was home that day. Yeah, I think I was home that day, that night. 'Cause I think it was a fairly late evening. And I was surprised that Donald Trump was elected president, as I think most-- maybe Donald Trump was too, but as-- as a whole lotta people were.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And what part of you is thinking, "I helped elect Donald Trump"?

JAMES COMEY: Well, no part of me, 'cause I don't know the answer to that. But a whole lot of me was thinking, "Oh my God, did we have some role in this? Did we have some impact on the election?" And it's an incredibly painful juxtaposition, but also thinking, "I really wouldn't-a done it any differently. God, I hope we had no impact. I hope we had no impact." But it-- I know-- I worry it sounds arrogant to say, but it-- it wouldn't change the result. It just makes it more painful to think that we might have had an--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: It wouldn't--

JAMES COMEY: --impact on the--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --change?

JAMES COMEY: It wouldn't. I-- even if I had a time machine, I can't go back in time and as director of the FBI say, "I'm going to make this decision because I don't think Donald Trump will be a good president of the United States." That's not the FBI's role. And so, I'm glad-- I'm glad for a lotta reasons I don't have a time machine, but that's what I mean when I say it doesn't-- it doesn't change the result. We-- we tried to, and I believe did, make these decisions without regard to political Russia. Without regard to how it would affect and who it would affect, based on, "So what's the right thing to do? Should we speak, or should we conceal? And given the values and traditions of the institutions of justice, which is the right thing to do?"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You said you hoped it didn't change the result, but what does your gut tell you?

JAMES COMEY: I really don't know. I've read a fair amount, 'cause-- 'cause I'm-- again, I hope very much. I'd love to have a group of academics establish it had absolutely no impact on the election. I've read people argue that it had. I don't know.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Nate Silver has a pretty persuasive-- analysis that suggests it made a huge difference.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I-- again, I don't know the answer. And in a way, I care about the answer, and in a way it doesn't matter at all.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And-- just take us inside your house at that point. You-- you've written about this. Your wife, Patrice, Hillary Clinton supporter.

JAMES COMEY: Oh yeah. And-- and the-- the-- I didn't take a poll among all the kids, but I'm pretty sure that at least my four daughters, probably all five of my kids, wanted Hillary Clinton to be the first woman president. I know my amazing spouse did. My)-- my wife and girls marched in the women's march the day after President Trump's inauguration. There was a lotta passion in this house for Hillary Clinton. And I-- I get that. But again, I hope it illustrates to people that I really wasn't making decisions based on political fortunes.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: S-- so what did she say to you? What did you say to her?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I don't-- I-- she knew enough, Patrice, the pain that I was in that-- and how hard these decisions were that I don't think she spent a lotta time-- I think she got actually where I was. I d-- she didn't spend-- she expressed frustration. She hated the fact that I had to make these decisions, and 'cause she loves me dearly, she hated the fact that I personally was stepping in front of the institutions to get shot repeatedly. She would say, "Look, I get what you're doing. I get that you're trying to protect the institutions. But why does it have to be you? Why do you have to be the one that everyone's going to hate?" And my answer was-- "'Cause I'm stuck. I would rather not." Like I said, I would rather Hillary Clinton have used the State Department for her email system. I would rather that Anthony Weiner have not had a laptop at all. I would rather have had-- I've

still never met Hillary Clinton; I would rather never have been involved. But what am I going to do? We were involved. The inspector general sent us a referral, we had to open a case, and we were totally screwed.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: If she were sitting right here today, what would you tell her?

JAMES COMEY: Hillary Clinton? I-- I realize it sounds like I'm pumping my book, "I hope you'll read those chapters of the book. Not so that you walk away agreeing with my decisions, but that you understand better where they came from. And-- and frankly, the kinda person who was trying to make those decisions. Even you think they're wrong, that look at how we made those decisions and why." And I-- I think-- look, I haven't talked about this. I've gotten the daylight beat outta me-- this is the first time I've talked about this. And I'm sure a whole lotta people have a view of me based on that. And what I'd ask them to do is please try to come into those rooms. Read the book and come into those rooms and see how we tried to make these decisions. And if possible, ask yourselves, "What would I have done, and why?" And you may come out thinking, "I've done it differently," but I don't think you'll come out thinking that-- as Hillary Clinton wrote in her book, I shived her. I mean, that sounds like I was trying to knife somebody, I was out to get her. And it's illustration of our polarization here that you've got the Trump camp, which I guess thinks I was trying to save Hillary Clinton. They don't quite explain what I was doing in October. And then Clinton camp thinks I was trying to shiv Hillary Clinton. Both can't be true, but **in our polarized world, people live in separate bubbles.** I would hope both camps will read this and, I hope, see a deeply flawed human surrounded by other flawed humans trying to make decisions with an eye, not on politics, but on those higher values.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you wouldn't change the big decisions. What are you sorry about?

JAMES COMEY: Oh, I'm-- well, I'm sorry about a number of things-- I'm sorry that Seacrest-ed the announcement. I'm sorry that I-- caused all kinds of confusion and pain with the way I described her conduct that led people into all kinds of side roads. I'm deeply sorry that I was involved at all, but-- that's something I can't avoid. And I'm sorry there wasn't an opportunity, especially with the second one, to explain more. To say, "Look, here's what we're doing." 'Cause I got that chance-- the only time I've actually gotten that chance was in a private setting with the whole U.S. Senate where Senator Franken-- we were th-- I was there to talk about Russia. But S-- then-Senator Franken stuck his hand up and said, "**Can we talk about the elephant in the room?** What you did to Hillary Clinton?" And so, I turned to Senate Majority Leader McConnell, who was running the meeting, and said, "Can I answer that?" And he said, "**Yeah, take all the time you need.**" And so, I answered, and I laid out what we've laid out. "Look, here's where I was on July 5th and why. Here's October 28th." And-- and Senator Franken actually interrupted and yelled, "But you didn't find anything." And I said, "Senator, you have hindsight bias. I know now I didn't find anything. But you have to come with me to the 28th of October. Sit there with me. What would you do? **I see two doors.** I can't find a door that says, "No action." I see two actions: speak or conceal. Speaking would be terrible. Concealing would be catastrophic."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Not necessarily. Tough it out and take your lumps?

JAMES COMEY: Take your lumps. I mean, y-- you lead the institutions of justice that would be maybe forever, but certainly for a generation or more, be unimaginably damaged by conspiring to conceal that you had lied to the American people. And you had restarted the Hillary Clinton investigation in secret in a way that you thought might change the result. Fair-minded people, and there are a lotta them in America, fair-minded people would look at that and say, I think, "**How on earth could you do that? You told us we were done.** You told us this was finished. And all of a sudden, it's not finished, and not just in a small way. You think the result could change. And you didn't tell us that?" And so, again, people can weigh that differently, but that's how I thought about it. And so again, in that-- in that session with the Senate, I got the chance to lay that out. And I was most struck that Senator Chuck Schumer came up to me afterwards, who had been a very, very vocal critic of my decisions, and took my hand, and he had tears in his eyes, and he started poking me in the center of the chest. He said, "I know you. I know you. You were in an impossible position." He wasn't telling me he agreed with my decisions, but I think once he came with me to October 28th, he understood better. I think President Obama understood it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You met with President Obama after the election?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, he held me back after one of the very last meetings I had with him, after the election, and said he didn't want to talk to me about any particular case, 'cause he was very scrupulous about that. And he said, "But I want to just tell you something generally. I appointed you to be FBI director because of your integrity and your ability." And then he looked me in the eye and he said, "Nothing has happened, nothing, in the last year that has changed my view of that." And, look, he wasn't telling me, "I agree with what you did." He wasn't telling me, "You made the right decision." He was telling me, "I know where it came from. I know you're not a partisan hack. I know you're trying to do the right thing." And it meant a lot to me. I mean, I had not been a

political supporter of President Obama's. I came to deeply respect him, and his higher loyalty to the values I care a lot about. And I g-- I almost got emotional in that moment 'cause, again, I'd been walking around like Bruce Willis in "The Sixth Sense." And have the president of the United States say, "I still respect you for the reasons I did originally," meant a lot to me.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That was a real, in some ways a very raw conversation, in your telling. What else did you tell him?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I said to him-- "Mr. President," first of all, I said, "Thank you, Mr. President. It has been a nightmare. I'm just-- I've just tried to do the right thing." And he said, "I know. I know." And then I said, "I think my wife would kill me if I didn't take this chance to thank you, and to tell you how much I'm going to miss you. And-- and also to t--" **I told him that, "I dread the next four years.** But in many ways, I feel great pressure to stay to try and protect the institution I lead."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What were you dreading?

JAMES COMEY: Well, I had some sense of the nature and character of the new president of the United States. And I worried very much that there would be an effort to erode the independence of the FBI. The FBI sits in the executive branch, it should. The FBI director reports to the attorney general and the director of National Intelligence, and they report to the president. They should. But the FBI always has to be a little bit alien to the executive branch 'cause we have to investigate the executive branch. It's the reason Congress gave the FBI director a ten-year term, to signal that need for independence. Not-- not total independence, but independence of spirit. And I worried, given what I had seen during the campaign, that-- that that effort to remain apart-- might be challenged in-- in a Trump administration. And-- and I was right, but that's what I worried about.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Even your harshest critics will concede what you're just talking about right now-- you've lived your life trying to be a person of integrity, trying to live by honesty, trying to protect the institutions you serve. But in the words of Eric Holder, you're a good man; good men make mistakes.

JAMES COMEY: Oh, they sure do. And I-- I've made a million of them. But again, I think, even with hindsight, that the process we used to make decisions in the email investigation, and the things we considered, and the ultimate decisions, were the best ones. I could be wrong about that; I don't have a monopoly on wisdom. But-- but I'm proud of the way we made those decisions. And I keep saying "we." Again, they were my decisions; I'm accountable for them. But we made them by insuring there was a buncha of people banging it around and arguing with each other. And came to a result that we all thought, "Okay, this is the best thing to do in a terrible circumstance."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What did it cost you?

JAMES COMEY: What did it cost me? Well, (SIGH) I'm sure the respect of a lotta people that-- who couldn't see what I was seeing, couldn't understand, couldn't possibly understand why I was doing what I've done. It-- in a way, I-- it didn't cost me much beyond that 'cause I don't want to be anything else. I-- never going to run for office. I wanted to be the FBI director for another six years. It had no impact on my awesome family who still thinks I'm a knucklehead but loves me dearly. And-- but I think that's what it cost me, that it caused a lotta people to question whether I was a political hack. Whether I was in some way-- acting in an unprincipled way. And that's painful. But at the end of the day, you have to make a decision and make it in a principled way. You can't control what people think about you. You'd like people to understand your reasoning, and I'd be lying if I said I don't hope people will come outta this thinking, "Oh, okay. I understand better." But the end of the day, you gotta look at yourself in the mirror. And you've got to make the decision-- the right decision, but most of all for the right reasons.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So-- so it's-- January 2017. The intelligence community and the F.B.I. have reached their conclusions about what-- what Russia did during the election and so you have to go tell the president-elect. But first, I guess, the day before--

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --you brief President Obama. Take us inside that room.

JAMES COMEY: Sure. It was right-- January 5th in the oval office. Director Clapper, the head of the-- the director of national intelligence, the head of the C.I.A., the head of the N.S.A., and myself met with President Obama, Vice President Biden, and their senior national security team in the oval office, sitting in the sitting area by the fireplace. The president and the vice president in arm chairs with their back to the fireplace and I was sitting slightly off to the right so the president would have to look slightly left to see me. Director Clapper was sitting in the center and he briefed them on the findings of the joint intelligence community assessment and the conclusions about what Russia had done. And there were a variety of questions, especially focused on, "So how do we stop it from happening in the future," questions about sources and whatnot and how certain we were.

And he conveyed that it was a joint high-confidence assessment, which is very unusual. From analysts from the - different agencies that the Russians had did this, their goals were to dirty up the American democracy, to hurt Hillary Clinton and to help elect Donald Trump. And we were going to brief it-- he explained that the next morning, to the gang of eight, the leaders of the House and Senate-- intelligence committees and the speaker and majority leader and minority leader on both sides. And then we were going to New York and brief the president-elect and his team.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You say high confidence. That means you're sure?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, that's the closest the intelligence community-- you never say you're sure in the intelligence business. The top level is high confidence. There's low confidence, medium confidence, high. This was the top of the chart. So, you never say you're sure in the intelligence business because you-- you never want to be over-confident. But this was-- their sense that given the variety of sources and methods we had, we had this nailed.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And in that meeting, that's what Russia did. **You also discussed with the president this information you had about the president-elect contained in the Steele dossier?**

JAMES COMEY: Right. Director Clapper explained to the president and vice president that there was additional material that had-- came from a reliable source and that we had included as an annex in the report, that it was sufficiently separate, that we didn't integrate it into the report, but it was sufficiently reliable that we thought it oughta be part of the entire report. And there was a portion of it that was particularly salacious that related to allegations around sexual conduct of-- before-- President Trump was a candidate. And the president asked-- **President Obama asked, "What's the plan for briefing that material?"** And he explained that we had decided that Director Comey would meet with the president-elect privately after we briefed the president-elect and his team on the general findings so that he could review it-- in a more private, more sensitive setting with the president-elect.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That was James Clapper. **How did President Obama respond to that?**

JAMES COMEY: He didn't say a word. President Obama has a great poker face. But he simply turned-- so if I'm **President Obama**, he turned slightly to his left, looked at me, and went like this-- and looked back at Director Clapper. So, kind of **gave me a-- Groucho Marx** is how I thought of it, **double eyebrow raise**. Didn't say a word, but communicated to me at least-- and I could be misreading it, 'cause I don't know President Obama's eyebrow raises, that sort of-- sympathy and concern. Like, "Good luck with that." And-- and that was it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Could it have been you again?

JAMES COMEY: It's possible. But-- you know, again, I could be misreading it. But I read it as, "You poor bastard." And almost like, "Whoa," and-- but, you know, he didn't explain it and so, like I said, I-- I might be misinterpreting it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Was there any choice there? Why-- if this was salacious and this particular part of the dossier-- unverified-- still unverified by the way?

JAMES COMEY: Yes. So far-- when I got fired, it was unverified.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why tell him?

JAMES COMEY: Because we, the intelligence community, including the F.B.I., knew this information about allegations around prostitutes in Russia. We had been told by the press that they were about to run with it. And then two specific reasons. The-- the way we work in the counterintelligence business is if a adversary has compromising information on someone that they might use, one of the ways we defeat the adversary is tell the person who might be blackmailed, "We-- the government, we already know about this. So, you're not going to be able to hide it so they don't have leverage on you." And then second, he's going to be president of the United States and the head of the entire executive branch. How could we, the leaders of the intelligence community, know something-- whether it's true or not about him personally, that's going to become public, that the Russians may have and not share it with him. And so, the logic of it-- was powerful that we should share it. And the logic, frankly, was powerful that I should do it alone, although I didn't love the idea. And so, we decided to do it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you all go up to New York the next day, January 6th, for the meeting in Trump Tower. You had-- one more warning-- from the secretary of Homeland Security.

JAMES COMEY: Right, as I explained in the book, Jeh Johnson, who's been a friend of mine since we were federal prosecutors in Manhattan in the late '80s, called me after the meeting in the oval office with President Obama. Jay had been in the meeting-- and just to tell me that he was worried about this plan for me to brief the president-elect alone about this material. And I said, "Me too." And he said, "Have you ever met Donald Trump?" And I said, "No." And he said, "Be careful, Jim, be very careful." And it's one of those things that you appreciate

a friend saying, it's not really helping me, except to make me feel even more nervous, the lump in my stomach bigger. But, yeah, Jay called me-- and I don't know whether he was calling at President Obama's request, but he seemed to be giving voice to the eyebrow raise.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, what does "be careful" mean in that context?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I don't know. That's why we-- thanks, bud. It's not really helping me. I-- I took it as, "Just choose your words carefully. Don't say more than you need to, less than you need to, try to get it just right, accomplish your goal, and then get outta there," is how I took it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, as you headed into Trump Tower that day, were you nervous?

JAMES COMEY: Yes.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What were you afraid of?

JAMES COMEY: Well, I'm about to meet with a person who doesn't know me, who's just been elected president of the United States. By all accounts, and from my watching him during the-- the campaign, could be volatile. And I'm about to talk to him about allegations that he was involved with prostitutes in Moscow and that the Russians taped it and have leverage over him. And I was worried that I'm about to have a situation emerge where the president-elect thinks the F.B.I.'s out to get him somehow. People, in my experience, tend to project onto you their worldview. And even though I did not intend to jam Donald Trump with this, my thinking was, given his approach to the world, he may think I'm pulling a J. Edgar Hoover and assume that I'm trying to dangle this over him to get leverage on him. And so, I worried-- I'm going to not only ruin any relationship I might have with the president, but more importantly, create a situation where the president and the-- and the F.B.I. are at war even before he becomes president.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you head up to the top of Trump Tower-- set the scene.

JAMES COMEY: We went in through the back entrance through-- an entrance of-- residences. So, we snuck around-- the press didn't see us going in. We went up and met in a conference room somewhere within the Trump Organization. It was a conference room with a glass wall and they'd hung a big thick curtain to block the wall from the hallway. And I walked in with the director of the C.I.A., the director of the N.S.A., and the director of National Intelligence. And we waited for the president-elect to come. A small conference room, looked kinda ordinary to me. And a few minutes later he walked in, President-elect Trump, along with the incoming vice president and their national security team. And a group of them sat at the table with us and a group sat at the wall behind me, against the curtain. And Director Clapper ran the meeting and did it exactly as he had done it with the gang of eight earlier that morning on Capitol Hill and with President Obama the day before.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: It was the first time you met Donald Trump. What was your impression?

JAMES COMEY: My impression was he looked exactly like he did on television, except he looked shorter to me than he did on television, but otherwise exactly the same. And the reason I say that is most people look slightly different in person. I don't know whether that's bad or good, but he looked the way I'd seen him look on television.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Which was?

JAMES COMEY: He had-- impressively coifed hair, it looks to be all his. I confess, I stared at it pretty closely and my reaction was, "It most take a heck of a lot of time in the morning, but it's impressively coifed." He looked-- his tie was too long, as it always is. He looked slightly orange up close with small white--half moons under his eyes, which I assume are from tanning goggles. And otherwise looked as I had expected him to look from television-- as I thought he looked on television.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You even clocked the size of his hands?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. I-- I say that in my book 'cause I'm trying to be honest, 'cause that's the truth there had been all this controversy and mocking about hand size, I can't remember the details. But as I shook his hand I made a note to check the size and it seemed like he had average-sized hands.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Then comes the briefing. What did you tell them, what was their reaction?

JAMES COMEY: Director Clapper laid out, as I said, exactly as he had for President Obama and the gang of eight. "Here's what the Russians tried to do. They tried to hurt our democracy, they tried to hurt Hillary Clinton, they tried to help elect you. We--" he-- was very specific about this, "We did no analysis, because the intelligence community doesn't, of American politics. We found no impact on the vote count but we didn't-- we don't have an opinion to offer on whether the Russian effort had an impact on the election." And he laid it all out and the-- the-- President Trump's first question-- President-elect Trump's first question was to confirm that it had no impact on the election. And-- and Director Clapper explained, as I think he already had, "No, we didn't do that analysis. We found no Russian manipulation of vote count. We didn't do an analysis of whether their work was effective in changing votes, changing the-- the sentiment of the electorate." And then the conversation, to my

surprise, moved into a PR conversation about how the Trump team would position this and what they could say about this. They actually started talking about drafting a press release with us still sitting there. And the reason that was so striking to me is that-- that's just not done. That the intelligence community does intelligence, the White House does PR and spin, and the searing lesson, as I explained in the book, of the Iraq war is you don't mix the two. That we give you facts and then we leave and then you figure out what you're going to tell people about them, if anything. But it moved right into this, "Let's figure out what to say about it," kinda deal.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You also said you were struck by what they didn't ask?

JAMES COMEY: Very much. No one, to my recollection, asked, "So what-- what's coming next from the Russians?" You're about to lead a country that has an adversary attacking it and I don't remember any questions about, "So what are they going to do next, how might we stop it? What's the future look like? Because we'll be custodians of the security of this country." There was none of that. It was all, "What can we say about what they did and how it affects the election that we just had."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You-- you said as this was happening, you had a flashback to your early days as a prosecutor?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Again, I-- put this in the book 'cause it's the truth. I had a flashback to my days investigating the Mafia, La Cosa Nostra. And-- and I couldn't figure out why when it first pushed into my head, so I pushed it away, saying, "That's crazy." And then it came back again. And I pushed it back and it came back again. And I think what it was the nature of La Cosa Nostra is an effort to make everyone part of the family. There's an expression in the Mafia-- there's a distinction between a friend of yours and a friend of ours. A friend of yours is someone on the outside of the family, a friend of ours, a "amica nostra" is the way they talked about it in Sicilian, is part of the Family, capital F. And I think the reason it was coming into my head was I felt this effort to make us all-- and maybe this wasn't their intention, but it's the way it felt to me, to make us all "amica nostra." We're all part of the messaging, we're all part of the effort. The boss is at the head of the table and we're going to figure out together how to do this. And I think that's why it brought that strange memory back into my head.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Do you think you shoulda said something then?

JAMES COMEY: Maybe. I mean, I-- I-- I think that's a reasonable question. I should've said, "Hey-- Mr. President-elect, the way it works is we in the intelligence community shouldn't be here for this." I-- I guess that's a reasonable question. I think the reason I didn't, I hope is obvious to folks, is that I was about to-- we had just delivered, "The Russians tried to help get you elected." And I was about to stay behind to talk about allegations of the president being involved with prostitutes in Moscow. And I thought, "That's gotta be my focus." And so, I didn't-- I didn't know where it entered my mind consciously. I didn't spend a lot of time thinking, "Should I be giving them a lesson about how to interact with the intelligence community."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Do you think that briefing convinced the president that the Russians did interfere in the election?

JAMES COMEY: I don't-- I don't know. I don't think so, given things he's said thereafter and some of the things he's said about the intelligence community after that. I think it convinced members of his staff, but as to him, I-- given what he said afterwards, I don't think so.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did he say anything else about the broader briefing?

JAMES COMEY: In that session? No. Not that I remember.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And then you went-- everybody else left the room--

JAMES COMEY: Yeah-- Director Clapper-- I call him General Clapper, 'cause he was a retired general. General Clapper said-- and-- "Mr. President-elect, there's some additional material that we think it makes sense of Director Comey to brief you on-- privately. And-- and we'll all excuse ourselves in a small group."

And the president-elect then said to me, "Okay, how small." And I said, "Well, I was thinking just the two of us, sir." And then his incoming chief of staff, Reince Priebus, said, "How about me, Reince Priebus, and the vice president?" And I said, turning to President-elect Trump, "It's up to you, sir. I wanted it to be a small group, but it's entirely up to you." And then he said-- I don't know whether he knew what I was going to talk about it, but he said-- "No, no, just the two of us, just the two of us, thanks everybody." And then the group filed out.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Just the two of you. What do you tell him?

JAMES COMEY: I didn't tell him anything. First, he began by telling me-- saying nice things to me about how he thought I'd conducted myself honorably during the Clinton e-mail investigation and that he knew that people at the F.B.I. thought very highly of me and he hoped very much that I was going to stay as F.B.I. director.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Unprompted?

JAMES COMEY: Un-- oh, unprompted. And I didn't say, "Thank you," because my view was I already have the job. Congress states a ten-year term in order to ensure continuity. And so, I appreciate the nice words, but I didn't want to make it seem like I was applying for a job that I already had and intended to have for another six years.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, to be clear, at that point, he was happy with how you had handled the Clinton e-mail investigation?

JAMES COMEY: Well, at that point, he said that. Now, whether-- whether that-- I came to conclude that a lot of times what he said was just kind of pleasantries to begin a conversation, so I don't know whether he really thought I had handled it well. But he said, in substance, "You handled it well, you conducted yourself honorably. And I know the people at the F.B.I. really like you. And I really hope you're going to stay as director." And that-- when that was finished, I then turned to the topic and said, "Sir, there's a portion of the material that we wanted to brief you privately to make sure you're aware of it because-- the-- we understand the media may be-- gonna publish it very soon." And then I started to tell him about the allegation was that he had been involved with prostitutes in a hotel in Moscow in 2013 during the visit for the Miss Universe pageant and that the Russians had-- filmed the episode. And he interrupted very defensively and started talking about it, you know, "Do I look like a guy who needs hookers?" And I assumed he was asking that rhetorically, I didn't answer that, and I just moved on and-- and explained, "Sir, I'm not saying that we credit this, I'm not saying we believe it. We just thought it very important that you know." And I explained, "One of the F.B.I.'s jobs is to protect presidency from coercion. And if there is any effort, one of the things we do is a defensive briefing to let the person who might be the target of that coercion know that this is out there, better equip us to defend ourselves against the adversary."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did you tell him you thought it wasn't true or you didn't know if it was true or not?

JAMES COMEY: I said, "We're not saying that-- I'm not saying that I believe the allegations, I'm not saying that I credit it." I never said, "I don't believe it," because I-- I couldn't say one way or another. But I said, "We are not-- I'm not saying we believe the allegations," or I might've used the word "credit the allegations."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: How graphic did you get?

JAMES COMEY: I think as graphic as I needed to be. I did not go into the business about-- people peeing on each other, I just thought it was a weird enough experience for me to be talking to the incoming president of the United States about prostitutes in a hotel in Moscow. And so, I left that part out. I thought I'd given enough to put him on notice as to what the essence of the material was.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What was the look on his face?

JAMES COMEY: He was very defensive and started to launch into-- for reasons that I don't understand, started going into the list of people who had accused him of touching them improperly, sexual assault and how he hadn't done this, he hadn't done that, he hadn't done that. And I worried the conversation was about to crash, because I was reading that he was reacting like, "We're investigating you and we're going to go figure out whether you were with prostitutes in Moscow." And-- and so I said something in substance about how we don't-- it-- "We're not investigating you, sir. This is not something that we're-- we care about, except that you know that this is out there."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did you believe his denial?

JAMES COMEY: I don't-- **I don't know.** I don't-- the nature of an investigator is you don't believe or disbelieve. You ask, "What's my evidence? What is the evidence that establishes me whether someone's telling me the truth or not. And ask this allegation--" I honestly never thought this words would come out of my mouth, **but I don't know whether the-- the-- current president of the United States was with prostitutes peeing on each other in Moscow in 2013. It's possible, but I don't know.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: How weird was that briefing?

JAMES COMEY: Really weird. I mean, I don't know whether it was weird for President-elect Trump, but I-- it was **almost an out-of-body experience for me. I was floating above myself, looking down,** saying, "You're sitting here, briefing the incoming president of the United States about prostitutes in Moscow." And of course, Jeh Johnson's voice is banging around in my head. **President Obama's eyebrow raise** is banging around in my head. I just wanted to get it done and get out of there.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Did you tell him that the Steele Dossier had been financed by his political opponents?**

JAMES COMEY: No. I didn't-- I didn't think I used the term "Steele Dossier," I just talked about additional material.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did he-- but **did he have a right to know that?**

JAMES COMEY: That it'd been financed by his political opponents? I don't know the answer to that. I-- it wasn't necessary for my goal, which was to alert him that we had this information. Again, I was clear on whether it's true or not, it's important that you know, both because of the counterintelligence reason and so you know that this maybe going to hit the media.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So how did it end?

JAMES COMEY: It ended not long after **I said--** it only took a few minutes after **I made clear to him, "We're not investigating you."** And-- I think he asked something like, "Is there anything else?" And I said, "No, sir." And then we shook hands and I walked out.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **You had been warned,** at least by some people on your staff, **not to tell him, "We're not investigating you."** Was that a mistake?

JAMES COMEY: It might have been-- a mistake. The general counsel of the F.B.I. had argued, "Look, it's literally true that we don't have a case open on President-elect Trump. We're looking at other people." And-- and-- but his argument was, "There's a problem with you saying that for two reasons. First, inevitably as we move along in the investigation as-- as to whether anyone was working with the Russians, the campaign's going to have to be a focus and the candidate's always the head of the campaign, so inevitably we're going to have to look at him. And second, you're going to create a duty to correct. But if you tell him he's under investigation and that changes, don't you have to go back and tell him--"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And you thought that was a reasonable prospect?

JAMES COMEY: I didn't know at that point in time whether that would change or not. But-- and I said to the general counsel, look, I get that, that makes sense to me. But **I'm very worried about beginning a new administration with the president thinking the F.B.I. is out to get him.** Now in hindsight, given the challenges I had with President Trump and his frustrations that I wouldn't publicly say he's not under investigation, I think the better argument is it was a mistake, I should've listened to the general counsel. But anyhow, that's how I think about it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **President Trump thought you were shaking him down?**

JAMES COMEY: I don't know that. But I-- it seems reasonable, given his view of the world. Remember, that was what **I worried about is that he would think I was pulling a J. Edgar Hoover,** to come in there and jam him by **raising the prospect of salacious, compromising material.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But you felt you had no choice?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I thought the logic was too strong that-- how could we have this information and conceal it from the incoming president of the United States? And look, if it's true-- again, we don't know whether it's true or not. But if it's true, and as odd as it sounds, it could possibly be true, we have to protect him. We have to protect the presidency. And so, part of our-- our role as the F.B.I. is let him know that they may come at you with this.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **If it's true, how can you protect him?**

JAMES COMEY: Well, if it's true-- if someone knows something bad about you that they're going to maybe use against you and you're in the government and-- and **I'm the F.B.I., if I come to you and tell you, "We know all about this,"** it'll make it harder for them to get you to do stuff based on this secret. **Because you know that we know. And so, it makes-- it reduces the leverage of the adversary.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Sure enough, a few days later, it does become public.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Buzzfeed-- publishes the entire-- Steele "dossier"-- as you all had feared** it would happen. And that's when you get your first phone call from President Trump.

JAMES COMEY: Yes, that's right. So, the following week, the-- as you said, the-- the media published the entire-- thing and President Trump called me at my office at the F.B.I. and he was very upset about the leak of this material and wanted to express his concern about it.

And I explained to him that it wasn't-- that it wasn't government material. That it had been prepared by private parties, the F.B.I. hadn't paid for it, the F.B.I. hadn't commissioned it, and it was all over Washington. "And as you'll remember, sir, as we told we, the media has this and is close to reporting it. So, **we shouldn't think of it as a leak** of-- of classified information. It wasn't classified and it-- that it wasn't government information." And then he launched into-- I didn't ask about the business with the prostitutes, but he launched into an explanation as to how I should know that wasn't true and that he remembered now, from talking to friends who had been with him, that he'd never stayed overnight at the hotel, he'd just changed clothes there and went to the Miss Universe pageant. **I don't know whether any of this true, but this is what he said.** And then went right back

without staying overnight. And then he said, "Another reason you know it's not true is I'm a germaphobe. There's no way I'd let people pee on each other around me." And that me caught me so much by surprise I actually let out an audible laugh and-- 'cause it was just one of those-- I was startled by it. And-- and I remember thinking, "Well, should I say that, 'As I understand the activity sir, it doesn't require an overnight stay. And given that it was allegedly the presidential suite at the Ritz Carlton, I would imagine you could be at a safe distance from the activity--'" all these things are bouncing around my head. But instead of saying it, it just led me to think, "The world's gone crazy. I'm the director of the F.B.I. and I'm standing at my window, looking out on the darkened Pennsylvania Avenue." And I remember this moment like it was yesterday. And I can see the lit-- Washington Monument that's rising from my vantage point of the F.B.I. just over the Trump-- new Trump hotel. And I just remember thinking, "Everything's gone mad." And then, having finished his explanation, which I hadn't asked for, he hung up. And I went to find my chief of staff to tell him that the world's gone crazy.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And in fact, he did stay overnight in Moscow.

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. But-- but again, I-- I-- I don't know those facts. But he told me he did not.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So-- so-- at-- at-- at this point, you've had-- two substantive conversations with the president. The bulk of it is about his alleged activities with prostitutes in Moscow.

JAMES COMEY: Yes.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And as you say, that seems a little crazy.

JAMES COMEY: It did to me. You could've asked me, when I became F.B.I. director, if I could imagine those conversations. Like, it's hard to imagine them even sitting here. But-- it is-- it is reality today.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: The president is inaugurated a week later. I want to try to get inside your head again at that moment, because now you've had these encounters with the president. He's taken the oath of office, you're thinking--

JAMES COMEY: I'm thinking I need to be very careful to protect the independence of the F.B.I. Because I now know-- I've had two one on one conversations with the president of the United States, which is a very unusual thing. Both of them touched on his conduct personally and implicated the F.B.I. I need to make sure to keep that distance to protect the F.B.I.'s independence, which had been built since Hoover. I mean, Hoover was always over having drinks with presidents and doing all kinds of stuff-- that was-- not appropriate. Gathering information, all that sort of thing on political figures. And the F.B.I., since Watergate, had created itself as an independent force in American life, so I need to be a guardian of that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And that affected you-- a couple of days later when you got invited to the White House. You'd been invited for a reception?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, the-- the-- the weekend of the inauguration, on Sunday, which was also the day of the National Football League Conference Championships. I remember that because of the time of the event. At 5:00, the president posted the law enforcement leaders of the agencies that had helped protect the inauguration, which is a really nice thing to do. And it was at 5:00 in the blue room at the White House.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You didn't want to go?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I didn't want to go for two reasons. First, I worried very much about that independence of the F.B.I. And, remember-- and I'm sure everyone listening remembers, there were a whole lot of people who thought that I had helped elect Donald Trump by what I had done at the end of October. And so why would I want to go to a public reception-- a potentially public reception with the president two days after he takes office? And then second, I wanted to watch football and the championship games were on and 5:00 was right in the middle-- I'd miss the end of one game and the beginning of another. My staff said, "No, you have to go. You're the director of the F.B.I. It would be an insult to the other agencies-- secret service, park police, if you don't go. And you can tape the football games and just don't talk to people about them."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And so, you--

JAMES COMEY: And so, I went.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --you do go and you walk in. You're there as the president walks in. What happens next?

JAMES COMEY: I walked into the blue room, which is a big blue oval room. And I quickly looked around, trying to figure out where-- which way the president would enter and I figured where the doors were. And so, I went to the far opposite end, right at the window, where you can look out and see the Washington monument. And I-- so I was now as far away as physically possible without going out the window from the president. And I resolved to stay there and--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Hard for you to hide?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, and I almost got away it here though. And-- the-- you would think that you would notice me, this giraffe standing at the end of the room. But I was standing next to the head of the secret service, who is a normal sized person, and the president and vice president come in and the-- the staff has set up these klieg lights, so I know the media is coming. And then the media group comes in and the president starts speaking on camera and his eyes start sweeping the room. And I remember the movement of his eyes 'cause I was-- obviously, thought I was going to be spotted. And he went past me with his eyes and settled on the man right next to me, the head of the secret service. And I was relieved and surprised. And he called the director of the secret service forward, made a big-- display, hugged him, and then had him stand with him in front of the cameras. And then he began talking. And, **I know this seems crazy to people, but I was sitting there thinking, "So how did he miss me?" I'm 6'8".** And then I-- **I look and right next to me is this blue curtain. And I'm wearing a blue suit the doesn't match perfectly, but close enough. So, I'm thinking, "How great is that? I got a little camouflage."** And so, **I start moving over and I pressed myself against the blue curtain, true story.** Thinking -- this is my save. This will save me from having this public embrace with the president. And so, then he starts speaking again and his eyes start going again. And **my camouflage worked until the very moment it didn't** and he sees me and says, "Jim, he's more famous than me," and then calls me forward. And I remember the walk, it seems like a thousand yards across the-- the-- the-- blue room-- the oval blue room. And my family's had a lot of fun watching my face as I walk across, 'cause they know that's my "oh no" face.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Well, that's not exactly what Patrice said, is it?

JAMES COMEY: **Well, I didn't want to say it on television. She said, "That's Jim's 'oh shit' face."** And so, I'm walking forward thinking that, thinking, **"How could he think this is a good idea?** That he's going to try to hug me, the guy that a whole lot of people think, although that's not true, but **think I tried to get him elected president and did.** Isn't he master of television, this is disastrous." And I'm thinking all this as I'm walking and I have this awkward look on my face. But I was determined there's not going to be a hug, 'cause I'm not a master of television but I knew that would be a real problem. And so, I extend my hand and he grabs my hand and he pulls in and back. So, he--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, he was going to hug you?

JAMES COMEY: He was going for the hug, going for the hug. And so, I'm not an unusually strong person but I work out and so I tighten my abs and my core and I'm thinking, this-- "Unless he's a lot stronger than he looks, he's not getting a hug." And so, he pulls and he doesn't get the hug. Our arms are tense and he gets just far enough that I get something worse than a hug. Because he's just able to lean up to put his face by my right ear-- unfortunately, the cameras were on the left side of my face. And so, the whole world saw him kiss me. And he didn't kiss me, he said, "I really look forward to working with you. But **the whole world, including my beloved family, saw the president of the United States kiss the man who helped get him elected.**"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So-- and I know this is speculative, but **what do you think is going through his mind?** You've briefed him twice, you've spoken with him twice. We know what the subject has been. You've been talking to him about Moscow. Has he forgotten that?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. 'Cause I don't-- I worked with him for five months, I have some insight into the mind of Donald Trump. And so, I'll give you my best guess as to it-- what I think it is. **I think it's about establishing dominance and making everyone part of the family.** And so, although there would be hits from embracing him, he would embrace me-- he's embracing me, making me his F.B.I. director. He had made the secret service director stay with him up there, almost on display. And after the alleged kiss, which wasn't a kiss, he tried to get me to stay as well, **almost to show, "These are my people."** And I backed off, like, "I'm not worthy, I'm not worthy," which **inside my head, I was thinking, "I'm not suicidal."** And so, then I backed, backed, backed up to the end. But if I had to guess-- and I could be wrong. But-- my guess is it's about establishing, "These are my people."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: He follows up with an invitation on January 27th?

JAMES COMEY: Yup. I'm at lunch. I almost never went to lunch as F.B.I. director. I would walk up to the cafeteria and get a sandwich and eat it at my desk. So, I'm at my desk, eating my lunch and working. And my assistant, Althea James, says, "There's a call-- coming from the White House." And they put it through and it's the president asking me if I want to come over for dinner that night. And I said-- I had a date with Patrice to get Thai food that night, but I didn't tell him that. I said, "Sure, sir." And he said--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why not say no?

JAMES COMEY: Well, it's the president of the United States calling to ask me to a dinner. And I was assuming it was a group dinner that-- 'cause it-- it actually didn't enter my mind that the president would meet alone, again, with the F.B.I. director. **(Comey makes such a big deal out of how unusual meeting alone with the president is,**

as I recall from testimony before the senate, he made it sound as though, the president insisted on the first meeting with him being alone, sending veep and Prebous out of the room, when in fact, he admitted that, he is the one, that insisted on the first meeting being private.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Yeah, but you had been pretty scrupulous. You wouldn't play basketball with President Obama, you only met with him on a non-policy issue once and that was before you were F.B.I. director. You really wanted to keep a wall--

JAMES COMEY: Yup.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --between the F.B.I. and the White House. Can't you just say no?

JAMES COMEY: Maybe? Although, part of the environment was I had-- I remember, I had this concern about having a war with the president and I'd done the brief on hookers thing privately. And so, I knew that there would be a worry about, "Where is the F.B.I.?"

Plus, I assumed it would be a group event. And I had been to group events with President Obama. He would have a annual dinner for the senior appointees in the administration. I was one, the director of National Intelligent is another. So, I had gone to those. And so, it actually didn't occur to me to say no. I was uncomfortable, but it didn't occur to me. And so, I just said to him, "Sir-- certainly, sir." And he said-- "6:00 or 6:30?" And I said, "It's up to you, sir." And he actually say, "And if you're-- if you're busy tonight, I can do it tomorrow. I'm here all weekend."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you knew then it wasn't a group dinner?

JAMES COMEY: Well no, 'cause I assumed he must be having leaders over to get to know them in groups. And the-- and so I said, "Sir, whatever you-- whatever you like." And he said, "Well, why don't we make it 6:30?" And I said, "Sure." And then I called Patrice, broke our date, and-- as luck had it, I had-- an encounter with Clapper, who had left the government but **we were giving him a recognition as honorary F.B.I. agent.** And I told him about this invitation and he told-- comforted me by saying, "Yeah, I've heard lots of other people are getting calls to come for dinner." And so then in my head I was-- "Okay, so it's a group thing. He must be having a group thing tonight, a group thing tomorrow night. That's fine." And so, I went over there expecting-- a crowd of people.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And what did you find?

JAMES COMEY: I stood in the entrance to the green room, which is next to the blue room, and chatted with two Navy stewards who were there.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: This is the residence?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, in the residence. And looked around the room and quickly saw that all the furniture had been moved in the-- in the center of the room. There was a small oval table and there were only two chairs and I could see two place cards. And I could see from where I was standing, one said, "Director Comey." I assume the other was the president. And so that's when I knew that it wasn't a group dinner to get to know the leaders of our different agencies, that it was just the two of us.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **What did you think was going on?**

JAMES COMEY: Something that made me uncomfortable and my best intuition at that point was **it's part of an effort to make me part of the team, to make me "amica nostra."** And that it made me deeply uncomfortable. And so, I just waited. There was no-- there was no saying no at this point. And the president showed up and had me sit down and it turned out just to be the two of us and that the purpose of the meeting, the dinner was for him to extract from him a promise of loyalty. That instinct was right, it was to make me a friend of ours.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: As you were witting with him, he-- he was just getting used to the trappings of--

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: --of the White House?

JAMES COMEY: I think he was. I think he was. He-- he was-- he took on-- on the plates was a card-- a calligraphy card, so-- very nice script. You always see these at the White House. And it listed the menu for the dinner we were about to have. And so, he-- I remember, he held his up and said, "They write these by hand." And I said, "A calligrapher?" And he kind of gave me this look and he said, "They write them by hand." And so, I-- I kinda let it go. And-- and then he talked about-- **one of the things he said was how luxurious the White House was,** the residence. And he said, "I-- and I know luxury." And-- which I credit. And-- he said, "It's-- it's really beautiful."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: How long did it take to get down to business?

JAMES COMEY: Not long. I think it was probably during the salad, before the shrimp scampi. He redirected the conversation-- **I think we started talking about how the beautiful the White House was.** He redirected the conversation by saying, "So what do you want to do?" And I kinda gave him this look and then he explained what he meant. And he said, "You know, a lot of people would want to be F.B.I. director and given all you've

gone through, I would understand if you want to walk away but it would look like you'd done something wrong if you did that. But I figured I should meet with you and-- and see what you want to do," which was really odd because I think, by that point, at least three times, he had said he hoped I was staying and looked forward to working with me. But there was no acknowledgment of that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Do you think he wanted you to walk away?

JAMES COMEY: No. No, I think he wanted me to say, "Sir, I'd very much like to continue to serve and be your F.B.I. director." **And then he would say**, "Okay, but I need loyalty, I expect loyalty," which is exactly what he did say, the-- the second part. So, I think it was about-- again, this is just a guess **but it's an educated guess**, that someone had told him or he had concluded that he gave the F.B.I. director job away for free by telling this guy you hope he's going to stay. You oughta get him in front of you and make sure he's a friend of ours. And-- and have him promise he's going to be loyal, 'cause **the F.B.I. is a dangerous organization**.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, he asks you what you want and says what he wants?

JAMES COMEY: Correct.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Which was?

JAMES COMEY: **He said, "I expect loyalty, I need loyalty."** And I did not reply. I just-- we're-- actually, the-- we were probably just about as close as you and I are now, probably exactly the same at this small table. **And I just stared at him and had this little narrative with myself inside, saying, "Don't you move, don't you dare move. Don't even blink."** Because I was so struck by-- caught by it, but I knew I couldn't say yes, I couldn't nod, and so I just froze and stared at him.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Why not say no?**

JAMES COMEY: That's a fair question. I think because I was caught totally by surprise. And again, I'm operating in an environment where I don't want-- I'm going to be director for another six years. This man's the new president of the United States, I do not need a war with him. I have to find a way to work with this administration and protect the values of the F.B.I. And so-- and part of it was just sheer surprise. **I couldn't think of a clever response**. And by the second time he came back to it, he didn't respond at all. We just stared at each other and then he went on eating. And then he came back to-- he didn't-- he noticed that I didn't answer. **He came back to it later in the dinner. And by then, I had my wits about me and had a better answer.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What was the second time?

JAMES COMEY: The second time was later in the conversation. He said, again, "I need loyalty." And **I said, "You will always get honesty from me."** And he paused and then he said, **"Honest loyalty,"** as if he was proposing some compromise or a deal. And I paused and said, **"You'll get that from me."** And, of course, in between those two-- the loyalty sandwich, in between those two, I had-- I had an opportunity to explain to him the F.B.I.'s role and how important it was for the F.B.I. to be independent and how I thought about it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But did you cross a line there-- **did you cross a line when you promised him honest loyalty?** Did-- would it be fair for him to think, "Wait, I have a deal here."

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I-- I don't think so. Given the context and the other things I'd said, I thought-- and look, it was a compromise on my part to try and avoid a really awkward conversation, get out of an awkward conversation.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Was it a mistake?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I don't know. But-- maybe, maybe. And maybe I should've said in the moment, "Sir, as I told you, the F.B.I. has to be--" and then give him the speech again, maybe. But-- and so maybe I should've been-- yeah, that's fair feedback. Maybe I should've been tougher or more direct, especially given what I know now. At the time, I obviously couldn't see the future. But given what I know now, maybe it would've been better to give a more explicit-- say, "Sir, I can't promise you loyalty. Given the nature of my role, I can promise you I always tell you the truth," which I had already told him. "That's my role. And that I'm not part of it." I should've given that whole speech then. But in the moment, frankly, it didn't occur to me. And I-- maybe I didn't have the guts to do it. I wanted to get out of this conversation without compromising myself. And I felt like, given all I've told him already, he has to understand what I mean by honest loyalty and **he's kidding himself if he thinks I just promised that I'm-- I'm "amica nostra."** But-- in hindsight, you're probably right. I probably should have done it differently.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **How strange is it for you to sit here and compare the president to a mob boss?**

JAMES COMEY: Very strange. And I don't do it lightly. I-- and I'm not trying to that, by the way, suggest that President Trump is out breaking legs and-- you know, shaking down shopkeepers. But instead, what I'm talking about is that leadership culture constantly comes back to me when I think about my experience with the Trump administration. The-- the loyalty oaths, the boss as the dominant center of everything, it's all about how do you

serve the boss, what's in the boss' interests. It's the family, the family, the family, the family. That's why it reminds me so much and not, "So what's the right thing for the country and what are the values of the institutions that we're dealing with?" It's all about here.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What was the rest of the able talk like?

JAMES COMEY: I think I described it in the book as, like-- watching a jigsaw puzzle contest with a shot clock, that the president would-- it wasn't a conversation in any meaningful sense, 'cause a conversation's what we're having where you do some talking, I do some talking. It was him talking almost the entire time, which I've discovered is something he frequently does. And so, it would be **monologue in this direction, monologue in that direction, monologue in a different direction**. And a constant series of assertions that-- about the inauguration crowd, about how great my inauguration speech was, about all the free media-- earned media, I think was his term, that I got during the campaign. **On and on and on and on**. Everyone agrees, everyone agrees, I did this, the-- I never assaulted these women, I never made fun of a reporter. And-- I'm sure you're wondering what question did I ask that would prompt those? None, zero. I didn't ask any questions that I recall.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **You call them baffling, unnecessary lies.**

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, that's the things that's-- especially to someone who's-- who's been involved in investigation in the justice system my whole life, is-- to give you an example, he-- at the beginning of the meeting, he tells us-- tells me Reince Priebus, his chief of staff, does not know we're meeting, which I thought was st-- I remember it because I thought, "How could the chief of staff not know the president's meeting with the F.B.I. director?" And then later in the same meal, near the end, he says, "Reince knows we're having dinner, so follow-up with Reince." Just-- so one of those things is not true. One of those things is a lie, but it reminded me of the inauguration crowd thing. Right, that it's-- his inauguration crowd was bigger than that Barack Obama's first inauguration. That's just not true. That's not a perspective, that's not a view, that's just a lie. And-- and yet he would say it and, "Everyone agrees, everyone says, everyone believes," and the-- the danger sort of occurred to me is-- 'cause you don't have a chance to speak. **That's washing over you, washing over you, washing over you**. Did you just agree to that? Did you just agree that he didn't make fun of a disabled reporter because you-- because you didn't speak? Well, you did have a chance to speak because there was no gap at all in the words. But I-- I have an encounter with him two weeks later where I learn from that and try to interrupt him to tell him I don't agree with him. But in this conversation, my first detail conversation, he's just rolling on, talking about all kinds of things.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you're listening. **Are you thinking, "President Trump's a liar?"**

JAMES COMEY: **Yes**, yeah. I-- and I-- and I had, obviously, concerns about that earlier, having watched him on the campaign that he is someone who is-- for whom the truth is not a high value. And-- and obviously, there were examples of that in the dinner. The Priebus thing is-- is an example of it. The-- the inauguration thing is an example of it. I'm sure there are others in the conversation. But yes, that he is-- that sometimes he's lying in ways that are obvious, sometimes he's saying things that we may not know are true or false and then there's a spectrum in between.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **And then unprompted, he brings up the golden shower again.**

JAMES COMEY: Correct, yeah. He brings it up and says he may want me to investigate it to prove that it didn't happen. And then he says-- something that distracted me. 'Cause he said, you know, "If there's even a 1 percent chance my wife thinks that's true, that's terrible." And I-- and I remember thinking, "How could your wife think there's a 1 percent chance you were with prostitutes peeing on each other in Moscow?" I'm a flawed human being, but there is literally zero chance that my wife would think that was true. So what kind of marriage to what kind of man does your wife think there's only a 99 percent chance you didn't do that? And the reason I'm recounting this is I remember-- I wasn't listening to him, 'cause I'm running this through my head, like, how could that possibly be true? And I said to him, "Sir--" when he started talking about it, "I may order you to investigate that," I said, "Sir, that's up to you. But you'd want to be careful about that, because it might create a narrative that we're investigating you personally. And second, it's very difficult to prove something didn't happen."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And did he accept that?

JAMES COMEY: He said he would think about it. And he said, "I hope you'll think about it too."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You notice something else-- during that dinner. You say the president didn't laugh.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, not at all. And I was struck by it. So, struck by it, it stayed with me, that I've never seen him laugh. Not in public, not in private. And at a dinner with someone-- I mean, I'm not a comedian but I occasionally say something that's funny that people chuckle with each other. But I never saw anything that

resembled a laugh. And I could over interpret that, I could be-- also we're missing something that-- that maybe he's-- he's breaking up in stitches with other people other than the F.B.I. director, but I also tried-- after I got fired, I thought-- that stayed with me. And so, I went and tried to find examples of videos where he's laughing and I could only find that really wasn't a genuine laugh.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **The dinner ends, you immediately write it up. Why?**

JAMES COMEY: Because I knew, given the nature of the conversation and the nature of the person I was talking to, that to protect the F.B.I. and to protect myself, I would need to remember very accurately what we talked about it. And as the F.B.I. director, you have thousands of conversations. And-- and so the detail can get lost over time. I knew that, given that I worried he might not tell the truth about our encounter and given that it touched on him personally, that I thought, "You know, I need to have a written record of this." And so. I went home, on my personal computer, and created a memo and kept a copy of it in my personal safe at home and left another copy of it at the F.B.I. Because it was about both protecting the F.B.I. and protecting me.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Do you think President Trump got what we wanted out of that dinner?

JAMES COMEY: No. And I think he knew that because it was a later point when he was frustrated with me that I wouldn't get out-- as he said, get out that I'm not under investigation, where he tried to recall the loyalty pledge, I think, from the context. Where he said, "You know, I've been very loyal to you, 'cause we had that thing." And I-- I think what he was doing was trying to recall our encounter at that dinner and it coming up in his memory as, "Actually, the guy didn't promise to be loyal to me. He promised me honest loyalty and-- and that's actually what he's giving me now by telling me, 'You oughta have your lawyer call the Department of Justice.'"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: About 10 days later you're back in the White House. You're-- meeting with Reince-- previously the chief of staff-- when he suggested you go meet with the president again.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. This was a follow-up meeting to the dinner from the 27th. And it's us talking about a variety of topics, some of which were classified, but one of which was, so how should it work? How does the F.B.I. appropriately interact with the White House. And I was explaining it has to be through the Justice Department, it's important that there be a regular channel, except for national security emergencies or national security policy issues. And at the end of that conversation, which was designed to explain-- and Priebus, to his credit, seemed to want to get it right. But at the end, he asked me whether I wanted to see the president. And I said, "No, that's okay. I'm sure he's got plenty to do." And he said, "I'm sure he'd love to see you." And I said, "No, n-- that's fine." He said, "Sit. Sit." And then he left and-- went down the hall, apparently to the Oval Office, and came back and said, "He's in the Oval. He'd love to see you." And I said, without expression, "Great." And then he takes me down to the Oval Office and the president was just finishing a conversation with the then-s-- Press Secretary Sean Spicer. And I came in and sat down.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Let me stop you there. You've been in the Oval Office several times in your career. You served several presidents. How is it different?

JAMES COMEY: It was different-- well I noticed right away the curtains were different. He had hung bright, gold curtains, which I found out later were actually Bill Clinton's Oval Office curtains, excuse me, since changed. And-- **but most striking was that he was sitting behind the resolute desk, the big-- the president's desk, which I had actually never seen Presidents Bush or Obama do during a meeting.** They would be there sometimes for phone calls, I gather, but when I was there they always sat in the open sitting area, which made sense to me as someone who tries to get people as a leader to tell you the truth. It's much easier in an informal setting. But I noticed he was behind the desk with-- both arms on the table top, on the desktop. And so, I sat-- so **there's a gigantic block of wood between us, I sat in a little wooden chair right up against the desk.** And the conversation started and-- and Reince was trying to steer it, in part, towards the Steele dossier, and the president wasn't interested in that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why did Reince want to talk about that?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know for sure. I don't-- I don't know. He seemed to want to bring the topic up. I-- I don't-- I don't know exactly. I--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You know, you mentioned something about-- **since you brought up the Steele dossier again,** you mentioned that the parts about-- the prostitutes was-- unverified. You don't know whether they're true or not. What about the rest of the Steele dossier? Has it checked out? **Is it a credible document?**

JAMES COMEY: The answer is, I don't know. When I left the F.B.I. when I was fired in early May of last year, an effort was underway by the F.B.I. to try to verify as much as pos-- rule in or rule out what-- and that work was still ongoing. So, I don't know what the answer is. **It came from a credible source.** And as I said, **its central premise was corroborated, that there was an effort by the Russians to influence the election** and that there had

been some connections between people associated with the Trump campaign and the Russian effort, in particular the Papadopoulos information that started the F.B.I.'s investigation.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, connections between the Trump campaign and Russia had been corroborated by the time you left the F.B.I.?

JAMES COMEY: I think all I can say is that-- the-- the work was still underway, the investigation began because of inf-- reliable information that George Papadopoulos was having conversations about obtaining information from the Russians. That's probably as far as I can go at this point.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So where did the conversation go?

JAMES COMEY: The president was talking about something that had happened during an airing of a interview he did with Bill O'Reilly on Fox--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Oh, the Super Bowl interview --

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. The Super Bowl pre-game show where-- and I hadn't asked any questions about this, but the president was just talking about it, he had given an answer to Bill O'Reilly that had been much criticized across the political spectrum when he had said, in response to a question, that he respected Vladimir Putin and said, "That doesn't mean I'm going to get along with him." And then O'Reilly responded, "But he's a killer." And **the president responded, in substance, "But we're killers, too. You think our country's so innocent."** I forget the exact words, but that's the gist of it. And that moral equivalence, between the people of our government and Putin's thugs, had generated a lot of controversy. And so, the president was, as I said when I described the dinner, just in a monologue talking about how that was a great answer, what was he supposed to do, it was a hard question, he gave his best answer. And just going on and on and on. Basically, we're all agreeing with this if we don't speak. And having seen it happen during the dinner I thought, "I can't let that happen," 'cause I don't think it was a hard question. I think the second part of his answer is terrible. And so, he gave me an opening at some point by saying like, "Yeah, you agree it was a good answer--"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, the president wants you to say this was a good answer.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. In fact, he was telling me it was a good answer and then said-- gave me an opening by saying, "You think it was a great answer. You think it was a good answer." And then he was starting to move on. And I jumped in and I said, "Mr. President, the first part of the answer was fine, not the second part. **We're not the kind of killers that Putin is.**" And when I said that, the weather changed in the room. And like a shadow crossed his face and his eyes got this strange, kinda hard look. And I thought in that moment, "I've just done something unusual maybe." And then (SNAP) it passed, and the meeting was over. And, "Thanks for coming in," and-- and Priebus walked me out. It was like--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **You had another mob flashback.**

JAMES COMEY: **Yeah**, I did. Although in that moment **I was thinking, "I just succeeded,"** although I hadn't intended to, **in ending any personal relationship between me and the president** by th-- by interrupting him and also criticizing him to his face. And I went back and told my staff that it happened, and then I thought-- and told them, **"That's not a bad thing, because it will help us keep a distance that we need to keep from him."**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You-- you saw it right there, and we talked about this earlier-- **why is President Trump so reluctant to call out Vladimir Putin?**

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. I'm struck by it and I'm struck by it both in public and in private. Because I can understand the arguments why the president of the United States might not want to criticize the leader of another country because there's always good reasons to try and build better relationships, I suppose, even when that other leader is someone who is killing his own citizens and engaging in-- in attacks against our country. But you would think that in private-- talking to the F.B.I. director, whose job it is to thwart Russian attacks, you might acknowledge that this enemy of ours is an enemy of ours. But I never saw. And so, I don't know the reason. I really don't.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Do you think the Russians have something on Donald Trump?**

JAMES COMEY: I think it's possible. I don't know. These are more words I never thought I'd utter about a president of the United States, but it's possible.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That's stunning. You can't say for certain that the president of the United States is not compromised by the Russians?

JAMES COMEY: It is stunning, and I wish I wasn't saying it, but it's just-- it's the truth. I cannot say that. It always struck me and still strikes me as unlikely, and **I woulda been able to say with high confidence about any other president I dealt with, but I can't. It's possible.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: February 14th, you're back in the Oval Office?

JAMES COMEY: Back again. Valentine's Day. For--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why?

JAMES COMEY: We were there for a briefing, which was a very good idea, to give the new president an understanding of the terrorism threat in the United States, which is the F.B.I.'s primary responsibility. And so, I was there was the vice president and leaders of the counter terrorism agencies in a horseshoe of chairs ar-- again, he's behind the desk, in a horseshoe of chairs around the desk to tell him, "Look, here's what we're worried about in the United States." And-- so I did most of the talking during that briefing and gave some, I thought, some pretty eye-opening insight into some threats that we don't talk about a lot, but the president was kind of quiet, which is unusual, and unengaged. And-- and then ended the meeting by thanking everybody and s-- and pointing at me saying, "I just want to talk to Jim." And excused everyone, including the vice president.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: They didn't want to leave.

JAMES COMEY: Well I know the attorney general didn't want to leave because-- he ac-- he was-- I'm sitting here, he was sitting off to my right and the door by the grandfather clock was off to my left. President was sitting where you are. And the attorney general came around and stood right by my chair and lingered. Clearly, his body language leads-- to my mind said he didn't want to leave. And then the president said, "Thanks, Jeff. I just want to talk to Jim. Thank you." And then he walked off. And then staff had been sitting on the couches and chairs behind us, and one of the people back there, been-- Jared Kushner, the president's son in law, and he came to my left elbow and stood after the attorney general left and started chatting with me about the e-mail investigation, just pleasantries about how hard that must have been, and lingering as well. And then the president said, "Thanks, Jared. Thank you. Just want to talk to Jim." And so-- he was excused.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You're alone in the Oval Office?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What happens next?

JAMES COMEY: I didn't know what was going to happen next, but I knew that whatever it was, it was really, really important that I remember everything that was said, and as best I could the exact words that were said. Because why would you kick out the attorney general, who's my boss, and the vice president of the United States to speak to me? Something was going to happen that was going to be important to remember--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: He knows he's going to say something that others shouldn't hear.

JAMES COMEY: That was my read, that it's-- it's so unusual that-- first of all, it's unusual for the attorney general-- excuse me, for the F.B.I. director and the president to be alone at all. But to kick out the vice president of the United States and the attorney general, who I work for, so you could talk to me alone, something was up that was really important. And that it might well be that he knew what everybody was going to talk about was something that he shouldn't be talking about with the others. And so, my antennae were up and I just-- listened.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And what he wanted to talk about was Mike Flynn.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. That's how he began it. "I want to talk about Mike Flynn." And he started explaining to me-- that Flynn was a good guy and that he had to be let go 'cause he was-- had lied to the vice president and he-- said he had other concerns about him, which he didn't in that meeting spell out. And then he-- got a little bit distracted, the conversation moved off to leaks a little bit. And he talked about how bad leaks were of classified information. And I agreed. And we talked about that for a bit. And while that conversation was going on, Reince Priebus opened the door to my left, by the grandfather clock, and I turned, and I can see standing waiting was a big group of people, including the vice president. And the president-- waved him away and had him close the door. And then after the interruption came back to Flynn.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So that-- that prompted him to get back to business.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Get back to the point. He-- he had wandered off on an important topic of leaks and-- and urging me to talk to the attorney general about being more aggressive in pursuing leaks of classified information, all of which is fine. And then the interruption got him back to Mike Flynn, and that's when he asked me-- said he hopes I can let it go.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And when he said that, you thought?

JAMES COMEY: He's asking me to drop the criminal investigation of his, now former, national security advisor.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Direction?

JAMES COMEY: I took it as a direction. He's-- his words were, though, "I hope you can let it go." But the context where I've been-- where everyone's been kicked out, and it was just the two of us, the president of the United States, I took the expression of hope as, "This is what I want you to do." This--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: The president says he didn't say that.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Well what am I going to do? He did. That's why I was-- when he tweeted that there might be tapes, I was-- I meant what I said when I said, "Lordy, I hope there are tapes because I know what happened

in that-- in that meeting." And I testified about it under oath thinking there might be tapes. And so, **I'd be a crazy person to make it up.** And I wrote it down immediately after that meeting.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: He-- he-- he later said there weren't tapes in a tweet several weeks later after it hung out there for a long, long time. Which statement do you believe?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. I-- I mean, I would assume one of the reasons, although it was a delayed revelation, that I wanted to get out into public in-- that he had-- that we had had this encounter, he'd asked me to let it go, is that if there were tapes only a special prosecutor was going to go get 'em. And so, I don't know. I have no insight into whether Former Director Mueller and his team subpoenaed the White House for tapes. I have no idea.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, he says, "I hope you can let it go." What do you say?

JAMES COMEY: He had said, **"He's a good guy, I hope you can let it go,"** I think those are the exact words. But he said-- and I just said, "I agree he's a good guy," or I said, "he's a good guy." And so then full-stop. And there was a brief pause. And then the meeting was over.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Should you have said more there? Should you have said, "Mr. President, I can't discuss this with you. You're doing something improper?"

JAMES COMEY: Maybe. I mean, that-- that's also a fair criticism. Maybe I should have. Although, as I've thought about it since, if he didn't know he was doing something improper, why did he kick out the attorney general and the vice president of the United States and the leaders of the intelligence community? I mean, why am I alone if he's-- doesn't know the nature of the request? But it's possible that in the moment I shoulda-- you know, another person would have said, "Sir, you can't ask me that. That's a criminal investigation. That could be obstruction of justice." Again, it's one of these deals where I'm so-- even though I knew something important was going to happen, it didn't occur to me he was going to ask me to drop a criminal investigation. And so, a little bit of it is the shock of it, and part of it is just from the environment **I think I had a good gut sense that he knows what he's doing.** (Comey knew that he was throwing the election to Trump when he reopened the Clinton investigation too, acting like his memos are as reliable as tapes, Trump is a liar and comparing him to a mob boss is his continued effort to take Trump down and accomplish his goal of making "Hitler" president.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **With that direction, was President Trump obstructing justice?**

JAMES COMEY: Possibly. I mean, it's certainly some evidence of obstruction of justice. It would depend and-- and I'm just a witness in this case, not the investigator or prosecutor, it would depend upon other things that reflected on his intent.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: I wonder if you even should have agreed at that point that Flynn is a good guy. By February 14th, **did you know that Mike Flynn had lied to the F.B.I.?**

JAMES COMEY: Yes. Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, was it a mistake to even agree with the president on that point?

JAMES COMEY: Maybe. I mean, I-- I actually-- **good people do lie,** and **my sense of Flynn was he was a good guy,** that I sat with him and chatted with him when he was head of the Defense Intelligence Agency. And so, **the fact that someone lies doesn't necessarily make them a bad person.** But I think mostly it was me trying to get outta the conversation, give him a piece of what he said that's harmless so that I cannot give him the rest. (And yet, you have to be sure by now that lying to the FBI is, at least, one of the worst things a person can do! Just ask Martha Stewart how bad it is to lie, when it's the FBI your lying to. And that's the only charge they had on Flynn.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **But you knew at this point that Mike Flynn was in some jeopardy.**

JAMES COMEY: Yes.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Serious jeopardy.**

JAMES COMEY: **Yes.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Did the president know that?**

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. That is obviously an area that a special prosecutor would want to investigate. I **don't know the answer to that.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **There's been some reporting that-- at-- at-- at one point you told the Congress that the agency who interviewed Mike Flynn didn't believe that he had lied.**

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I saw that. And that-- I don't know where that's coming from. That-- unless I'm-- I-- I-- said something that people misunderstood, **I don't remember even intending to say that.** So, my recollection is I never said that to anybody.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So at this point-- the president is now, given what you thought was a direction-- you didn't step in and say, **"Listen, you shouldn't do that, Mr. President,"** (This is the Comey gave for not

prosecuting Clinton! Nobody told her it was wrong!) at some point in your mind, as you're writing these notes, have you shifted to collecting evidence of a possible crime?

JAMES COMEY: Well, yes, in a sense. I mean, I am recording it bec-- for the s-- same reason I recorded the earlier one, but it's even more important that I record this one because the conversation will likely come back some day and he may well lie about it. (This "nut-job" even tries to refer to attempts at accurate memory as if they are recordings, and he has shown over and over that his memory is far from didactic, and why should anybody believe the director of the FBI?) And so, I need to remember exactly what was said there. It could be evidence of a crime. It was really important that it be well documented. I shared it with-- my colleagues at the F.B.I. But something else was true, it was important that we did not intend to abide his direction, we were not going to let it go, no matter what he said. And so, it was really important that we not let the investigators yet know this had happened, because we worried it might chill them in some way if you hear the president wants your case to go away.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you're holding this evidence. You share it with your deputy, your general counsel.

JAMES COMEY: Uh-huh (AFFIRM).

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You don't share it with the attorney general.

JAMES COMEY: No.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why not?

JAMES COMEY: We thought-- rightly, he was about to recuse himself on anything related to Russia and so that didn't make sense. The harder question was, should we tell the person who is acting in the role as deputy attorney general, which was a U.S. attorney who was there temporarily? And decided that didn't make any sense either, that we would wait until we got a new-- there's nothing to be done, since there was no way to corroborate it, (At least he pays lip service to a need of corroborating his notes, not something that is necessary for FBI agents, WHY? Because they have Congress so compromised by salacious tapes they won't even bark when the clean-up crew called on by Mueller to destroy the evidence in the 911 crime, arrived on 9/10!) the idea of tapes didn't occur to us, that we would be getting new leadership at that deputy attorney general level. And then the department would figure out how they were going to supervise all the Russia stuff.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, at this point it's almost as if there's an investigation within the investigation.

JAMES COMEY: Well there's a box within the investigation where we're holding a piece of information so that we can figure out what to do about it later. So, it's-- we are walling it off, since we couldn't think-- the leaders of the F.B.I. couldn't think of what logical investigations you would do now, that you needed to do right now, so there would be no harm in holding it and then figuring out what to do with it as the investigation went on.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So i-- i-- i-- if the president hadn't fired you, would that information still be boxed up?

JAMES COMEY: Oh no. No. 'Cause we'd have-- we'd have gotten guidance at some point as to how they were going to lead the Russia investigation and then have to figure out what investigation we could do to try to corroborate that. What would we do with that? But firing me certainly accelerated it, in a way it wouldn't have been accelerated before. (Pence's pick for AG, Sessions taps Rod and Rosenstein really does double duty, writing a scathing review of Comey that clearly indicated that Trump should fire Comey, Sessions is the one saying here's Roensteins evaluation and pushing Trump to fire Comey. Then Rod tosses in the disclaimer after the fact, that he wasn't recommending that Trump fire Comey, to make it appear that Trump was obstructing. And then Rod appoints Comey's good friend, mentor and previous director of the FBI to cover Comey's tracks, and finish the job Comey started, and take down the president. If you read what Rosenstein had to say about Comey you realize this has a lot in common with the way comey talked about Clinton and then said they wouldn't prosecute her.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What were you thinking as you left the Oval Office that day?

JAMES COMEY: That something really important just happened and that I was a little-- another one of those outta-body experiences, like, "Really? The president just kicked out the attorney general to ask me to drop a criminal investigation." Wow, the world s-- continues to go crazy. (The more this slime-ball runs his head, the more the president is right, nut-job!)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Calls you been-- calls you back a couple weeks later. The next phone call was-- and that was just kind of a check-in. Right?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Said the world had gone crazy. I was about to get on a helicopter and the president called me just to, he didn't say this, but I heard it in my own head as just, "Hey, what's up?" And it was to find out, "So how are you doing?" I said, "Great, sir. How are you doing?" And it was just a check-in.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And that was March 1st. Did you ever look back-- at-- at the day and-- and-- get any sense of what might have prompted that phone call?

JAMES COMEY: No, I never did.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: He then called you again-- it was actually a few weeks later-- March 30th. He's more agitated now--

JAMES COMEY: Yes.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why?

JAMES COMEY: I think two reasons. M-- most prominently that there had been a hearing where, at the Department of Justice direction, I had confirmed for the first time that we had open-- counter intelligence investigation to understand whether any Americans associated with the Trump campaign were working with the Russians. And-- and so that obviously caught his attention. And then I think there continued to be a lotta stuff in the news about the Russia investigation. So, he was calling me to tell me how frustrating he found that, and it was getting in the way of his ability to make deals for the country. And he wanted to lift the cloud, **he called it a cloud**. And so, wanted me to get out that he wasn't under investigation. (Comey makes an issue out of the president calling the Russia investigation a cloud after he has repeatedly referred to himself having an out-of-body experience, hovering over the room, looking down at his dead body! What can I say?)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, **if he's not under investigation, you've told him, why not tell the country?**

JAMES COMEY: Well for-- for the reasons that the F.B.I. general counsel was concerned about me in the first instance telling then President-elect Trump he wasn't under investigation, it-- it was-- potentially misleading and also would create a duty to correct that. (Well, I'll just say it is a big-plus to have, had an FBI Director that feels he has a duty to try to explain things to da-da people in a way we can "get that" he's "lordy" just an honest man that believes deeply in "free speech" and speaks his mind. It just makes me feel the world is a safer place!) And there was a challenge also with, so what's the limiting principle? If they ask, **"Is the vice president under investigation," do you answer that?** And then if they say, "Is the attorney general under investigation," do you answer that? **And-- where do you stop?** (Don't stop, please go on. There, there, you're doing just fine, you haven't said anything wrong, well, if you have said or done anything wrong, nobody told you, so, don't worry, nobody is investigating you, certainly not the FBI, you're not lying to the FBI so, you feel free to lie all you want.) And so, the Department of Justice was thinking about it and had decided, in connection with my testimony, that they would only authorize me to say there was an investigation but not to comment on who was under investigation. But they did one other thing, they had me tell the leaders of the intelligence committees exactly who we were investigating, the-- which is unusual, the identities of the Americans which did not include the president.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What part of you is thinking also, "I am collecting evidence on the president"?

JAMES COMEY: Well part of me is thinking that because of the obstruc-- potential obstruction issue, but also, I continued to believe that there was force to the F.B.I. general counsel's argument that we're going to have to look at the president. I-- even if you-- even if you took the-- the f-- my conversation with him about Flynn as a potential obstruction, you put it off to the side and said, "Well that's different than the Russia investigation," even on the Russia investigation there was continuing s-- and stronger force to the argument that you're inevitably going to look at his conduct, 'cause he's the head of the campaign.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And for at least a period of time they're trying to build a tower in Moscow.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: April 11th. Final phone call.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. This was a follow-up where he's-- I think it's the only phone call or contact that I had with him that involved no preamble talking about how awesome I am and how great it is-- or he just began by expressing his frustration-- no. His voice was frustrated, his-- he began by asking, "So what did you do with my request to get out that I'm not under investigation, to lift the cloud?" And I explained to him that I had referred it to the acting deputy attorney general and I hadn't heard back. And that-- that was frustrating to him. And then I explained to him how it should work. He should have the White House counsel contact the Justice Department if he wants to find out-- he has a request to make. And that was the last time I spoke to him.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But isn't that where he said, "We had that thing"?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. He said, "'Cause I've been very good to you. I've been loyal to you," words like that. "We had that thing. You know?" And then he pulled up short, because the-- there was no pledge of loyalty. (All of this is Comeys unsubstantiated claims that would never be acceptable out of anyone except the infallible FBI.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: In his mind when he says, "We had that thing," does he think he made you F.B.I. director, kept you F.B.I. director, that's why you owe him?

JAMES COMEY: I-- I-- I could be wrong about this, but I'll tell you what my reaction was, he's reaching for the-- the goal of that loyalty dinner, that he's remembering that he had a dinner with me and he's starting to say, "I've been very loyal to you and you promised to be loyal to me." And then he pulls up short because if he's replaying the dinner in his head, he remembers the awkward stare and then he remembers that weird formulation about always be honest and then honest loyalty. And again, I could be wrong about that, but my gut told me that's what he's reaching for and he's pulling up short because, "We both know I never promised to be loyal to you, in the way you understand it."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And then on Friday, May 9th, your tenure as F.B.I. director-- excuse me-- then on May 9th your tenure as F.B.I. director ends.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. When I'm in Los Angeles at the-- F.B.I. field office in Los Angeles, about to go to a diversity recruiting event.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And what happened?

JAMES COMEY: I was doing what I did many, many times visiting F.B.I. offices, I was walking around thanking everybody personally. And there was a group of employees who didn't have desks that I could visit, they were the custodial employees (When it comes to, being a genuinely nice guy Comey just wants to let da-da people know that he goes above and beyond the call of duty! But, he said "he could visit" the custodians and thank them and let them know they are a part of the mission, he didn't say he actually did it.) and then the communications room employee. And so, they were all s-- in a group in a big, central room and I was standing talking to them. And the room had televisions on the wall at the very back. And I was in the middle of thanking them for being part of the F.B.I. and its mission and explaining everybody owns the mission, they are no support employees. And I saw, "Comey resigns," on the back screens. And one of the many great— (This suggests that Trump has a unique source of intel, a reassuring lack of fear and a real flair! It could have been, just a coincidence, too.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Resigns?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, it said, "Resigns." And **one of the many great things about the F.B.I. is we have some hilarious pranksters in that organization**, and so I thought it was a scam by someone on my staff. So, I turn to the-- them and I said, "Someone put a lotta work into that." And then I continued talking. And then the-- that changed on the screens, which showed the different networks, changed to, "Comey fired." And the-- now I'm staring it and the-- **the audience could see my face change**, so they start turning around looking at the back. And I said, "Look, I don't know whether that's true or not. I'm going to go find out." "But what I want to say to you won't change whether or not-- that's true." And then I finished talking (to myself) about the mission of the F.B.I., how everybody has to be part of it. And I thanked them for their work, I shook all their hands, (except the custodians with all of those scary little microscopic thingys crawling all over their hands.) then I went into a room (to bang my head against the wall and the next thing I knew I was hovering over the room looking down on myself, and it looked like I was break-dancing, anyone that doesn't know me very well would think I was throwing a tantrum but the wife and kids know that that was just a little tizzy fit, I get like that when I can't find the remote, seriously it was no big deal. Um-um, straitens his gold tie and asks, did I say too much? There, there, you're doing just fine, take these Prozac and Ritalin pills and we'll have some Thora zine and some warm milk for you when it's beddy-bye-time. Well, I just remember thinking, the worlds gone mad, the worlds gone mad I tell you, MAAAAAADDDDD! Do you think I would be a better president than Trump?) to find out have I been fired, because I did not expect to be fired.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And who told you?

JAMES COMEY: Eventually my assistant, Althea James-- there was an actual person down on Pennsylvania Avenue knocking on the front door of the F.B.I. with a letter from the president. And she somehow got the F.B.I. police to go down and get it, scanned it, e-mailed it to me. And this took probably a half hour or so. Said, "Yeah," I've been fired. "President of the United States, there's a letter from him saying I'm fired effective immediately."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you're looking at that letter, **what's your first thought?**

JAMES COMEY: **That's crazy**. How could that be? But they also, I think, s-- attached to it a letter from the attorney general and a letter from the-- the deputy attorney general, purporting to lay out the reasons I was fired. And so, I think it at-- I think I saw those actually the same time, and my reaction was, **"That makes no sense at all."** And-- and then I took a call from Patrice who called saying the kids and she had seen it, "What's going on?" I said, **"I don't know. We're trying to find out."** (He doesn't know! All he knows now is that he has a really bad headache and needs some fresh air.) My friend Pat Fitzgerald called from Chicago, I said the same thing. And then John Kelly, who was then the secretary of Homeland Security, called me.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Now White House chief of staff.

JAMES COMEY: Now White House chief of staff.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What did he say?

JAMES COMEY: He was very upset. He was very emotional and said he had seen the news and that he intended to resign because he wouldn't work for people who would treat someone like me in such a dishonorable way and that he was going to quit.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What did you tell him?

JAMES COMEY: Please don't do that. Please don't do that, John. And I knew him well and still-- knew-- thought highly of him then, still think highly of him, and I said, "Please don't do that. This president needs people of character and principle around him, especially this president. Please don't do that." And I said, "We need you to stay and serve for the country."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: If he called you today saying he intended to quit, what would you tell him?

JAMES COMEY: I understand. I-- I think you've-- you've sacrificed as much as you really can of yourself for the country. And-- no one would begrudge you leaving. You've done your absolute best. It's-- it's come at a cost to you, but-- that no one can blame you.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: I want to get back to the story -- but one more question. I think it's to an important point that-- **when you're talking about being an ethical leader**, at what point do people serve in order to protect the institution, to protect the country, and **at what point does it cross over into enabling bad behavior?**

JAMES COMEY: That is the question that people have to ask themselves. And-- and there's no easy way to define it in the abstract, that you-- the challenge of this president is that he will stain everyone around him. And the question is, **how much stain is too much stain** and how much stain eventually makes you unable to accomplish your goal of protecting the country and serving the country? So, I don't know. And it-- it-- it would be hard for anybody to answer that. But everyone's gotta answer that individually.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Could you imagine if you hadn't been fired on May 9th-- **if you hadn't been fired on May 9th, would you still be working for President Trump?**

JAMES COMEY: Yes. I-- I would-- **yes, I would.** I-- **as I told President Obama, I was dreading it and I-- I would be im-- an unhappy F.B.I. director, but in a way proud of the organization and in my role in trying to protect it.** And the current F.B.I. director is a friend of mine, is an honorable person. I'm so glad that he's serving, 'cause I know he cares about the institutional values the way I do. It's hard, **you gotta constantly worry about efforts to compromise you and compromise your institution.** (Well! Imagine that! Isn't that ironic! Isn't that ironic! Isn't that ironic!) But, in the end, to answer your question, that's-- that is question and that's one that everybody has to answer individually.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You say you were surprised as you read the letter. Weren't you angry?

JAMES COMEY: **Yeah, I don't remember being angry.** (I couldn't remember anything for a couple of days, all I could think about was my head, it feels like somebody ran over my head with a lawnmower!) I remember just thinking, "This is a lie." The stuff about, you know, being fired because of the Hillary Clinton e-mail investigation, that makes no sense at all. And then, of course, I quickly saw on the news that, you know, the White House saying that the F.B.I. was in tatters and the workforce-- it was relieved that I was fired. More and more lies. And so, I was worried about the organization, worried about the people-- who I'm supposed to meet with right after that and confused. I don't remember being angry in that moment.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Also had to find a way to get home.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. It-- 'cause **I'm no longer F.B.I. director, so how do I get home?** I-- **I actually gave thought to renting a convertible and driving almost 3,000 miles,** (See, what did I say about fresh air? Oh! I did say he needed some fresh air, I guess he needs a whole lot of it.) something I've never done. I've had friends drive across country, but **I'm not single or crazy so I didn't do it.** (I didn't make up that story about prostitutes peeing on each other and leak it to Christopher Steele, I didn't do it.) And I left it to the-- who-- my deputy, who immediately had become the acting director of the F.B.I., to figure that out. And the-- **the head of my security detail, who's an amazing person, said, "Sir, we're going to figure this out. But if I have to put you in handcuffs, we're taking you back on the F.B.I. plane."** And I said, **"Well look, I want to do whatever is appropriate under the law and the regulations, so you all figure that out."** And they figured out that they had an obligation to protect me and so they would bring me back on the plane.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, you're in that private jet basically alone.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What did you do?

JAMES COMEY: I broke F.B.I. rules. I was no longer an employee, so I wasn't breaking the rules. So, I took a bottle of red wine out of my suitcase that I was bringing back from California, a California pinot noir, and I drank red wine from a paper coffee cup and just looked out at the lights of the country I love so much as we flew home. And then I-- as-- we got close to the airport in Washington, I asked the pilots could I sit up with them, 'cause I'd never done it. Been all over the world with these pilots and sat in the passenger's seat. Hundreds of flights, I'd never sat up there and watched them do their work. So, they put the headphones on me and I sat on a jump seat between the two pilots and watched them land along the Potomac. And-- and then we shook hands with tears in our eyes and then I left and get driven home.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: That's it. The pinnacle of your professional career, it's over--

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Yeah. Over in a flash. Yeah. Makes no sense at all. But--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Did you-- realize then, or could you realize then, the consequences of you being fired?

JAMES COMEY: No. I was a bit numb at the time. And I thought, "It's crazy to fire me." I'm leading the investigation of Russian influence and particularly whether the-- anyone in the Trump orbit had coordinated and conspired with the Russians. That makes no sense at all. And the reasons they've given make no sense at all, are clearly a pretense. But I was numb enough that I just thought, "Well that's the president's legal right to fire me and so I gotta figure out what I'm going to do with the rest of my life." And so, I was trying to put it out of my mind and just sleep and exercise and hang out with my wife and kids. And it wasn't until the president tweeted at me that Friday morning after I was fired that, "James Comey better hope there aren't tapes of our conversations," that I sorta snapped back to the present. In fact, it wasn't even then. I snapped back three days later in the middle of the night. I woke up in the middle of the night and the thought hit me like a lightning bolt, like, "Wait a minute. If there are tapes, he will be heard on that tape in the Oval Office asking me to let it go. There is corroboration or could be corroboration for the thing we thought we'll never be able to corroborate."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Of a possible crime.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. Of possible obstruction of justice. Somebody's gotta go get those tapes. I trust the F.B.I., right, 'cause they'll see what I see. But I don't trust the leadership of the Department of Justice to do it. And so--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why not?

JAMES COMEY: Well the attorney general was recused and the deputy attorney general, in my view, had acted dishonorably by putting out this pretext about why I was fired. So, I thought, "Well he's 'amica nostra.' Right? He's part of the family now. I can't trust him." And so, what can I do? I can do something now. I'm a private citizen and I have in my safe downstairs an unclassified memo about that conversation. And I'm a private citizen, I can tell people about conversations with the president that are unclassified. And so, I'm going to do it. And so, I asked a friend of mine to get it out to a reporter. And my goal was to prompt the Department of Justice to appoint a special prosecutor, go get the tapes. That's all I was thinking about was the tapes. Go get the tapes. Go get the tapes--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You-- you documented every encounter you had with President Trump going back to the time he was president-elect from the Trump Tower meeting.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. I think there's a written record of-- we-- and I've left it out, we-- he and I had one conversation on the phone, it was about a classified topic that was totally appropriate and-- and so I don't know whether I did a memo on that. But nearly every encounter I documented, either with a memo-- and some of them were classified-- memos and so I obviously created them at the F.B.I. and left them at the F.B.I. But for the unclassified encounters, I wrote them up on my personal computer, printed them on my printer, with my paper, and kept a copy here. But because I also want to protect the bureau, I left a copy at the F.B.I. But thank goodness I kept a copy here, because I was banned from the property. One of the orders that was issued is I was never to be allowed back on F.B.I. property, like I had killed somebody. So, my staff had to box my stuff up and send it home. But I had the memo in my safe, my unclassified memo. And I thought, "If I get that out, that'll put tremendous pressure on the Department of Justice to have somebody go get the tapes before President Trump could destroy them--"

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And those tapes, in your mind, would be evidence of a possible crime.

JAMES COMEY: Yes. And I would be heard on those tapes in that conversation with the president, and he would be heard saying, "I hope you can let it go." And I would be heard saying, "I agree he's a good guy."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: President's tweeted innumerable times calling you a leaker-- because of that. First of all, what's your response to President Trump?

JAMES COMEY: Look, **it's true**, I mean, I'm the one who testified about it, that's how people know about it, that I gave that unclassified-- this is a whole nother conversation about whether you can leak unclassified information, I don't want to get involved in that. **I gave that unclassified memo to my mind**, who was also acting as my lawyer, but this wasn't a lawyer task, and asked him to give it to a reporter. That is entirely appropriate.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why not do it yourself? Why not do it openly, transparently?

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. For one very practical reason. At the end of my driveway was a horde of media and my thought was, "If I do it myself, it'll be like feeding seagulls at the beach." That if I give it to one reporter then what's my answer to all the others about why I won't answer their questions? How do I fence it off--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But-- but how do you-- how do you weight that inconvenience against the ethics of being more open?

JAMES COMEY: I-- well I-- I guess that's fair criticism, but my reaction was, "I'm going to get the information out." I know the information is true and if I'm ever asked about it, **of course I'll tell the truth** about it. Which is-- the first time I was asked about it I did.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: President also-- several different tweets calls you a liar.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And?

JAMES COMEY: What am I going to do? Yeah. People have to make their own judgments about other people. I would ask people-- when I-- whenever we would evaluate a witness you'd always say, "So what's their body of work? So, what are they like? What's their pattern and practice? Is their story internally consistent? Did they document it?" All of those questions. But I'm not going to make that argument for myself.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **The day after you were fired-- president** is meeting in the Oval Office with the Russian foreign minister. **Calls you a nut job**. Says the pressure's been relieved now, the pressure on him has been relieved. What did you think when you saw that?

JAMES COMEY: Wow, was my reaction. First of all, what are the Russians doing in the Oval Office? One, as a counter intelligence person **I'm thinking, "That's crazy--"** without any Americans being present, one. And, two, it-- the pretense is melting away, the bit about, "You were fired because of how you handled the e-mail investigation," is melting away. You were fired because of the Russia investigation. That's the substance of what I heard those words as.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And then that Lester Holt interview.

JAMES COMEY: Right. Same thing. The pretense has now melted.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: So, if there is evidence of a crime, you want it out there, you want there to be an investigation, you wanted a special counsel.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I did.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Why exactly?

JAMES COMEY: Because I wanted someone without political conflict, someone who is not "amica nostra," to find the facts. And I don't know what they'll find. I don't know whether Bob Mueller s-- and his people will conclude that President Trump committed a crime or not. I don't really care, so long as it's done in the right way, confidently, honestly and independently. And I know the F.B.I. would be that way, and now I know the prosecutors will be that way. And whatever they find, the American people can rely on because they will find the truth. Again, I don't sit here saying, "I hope the trust is that," or, "I hope the truth is this." I just want them to find the truth. And I'm confident that they will, unless he's interfered with in some way.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You've been interviewed by Robert Mueller?

JAMES COMEY: I'm not going to talk about my contact with the special counsel.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You're free to do to that. Correct?

JAMES COMEY: Yes, but I also want to make sure that I-- don't-- I don't do anything that might get in the way of their ability to be effective.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Do you think there's any chance that-- that writing this book will get in the way?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know. I hope not. I mean, because I've tried to be consistent. What you worry about with interviews or with-- with-- with a witness writing a book is, **does their story change? And again, that's the virtue of the memos, is that I've tried to be true to the memos and not create inconsistent statements.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And you also had to testify to Congress about all that-- a few weeks later. That was a dramatic moment-- for the country, it appeared to be a powerful, personal moment for you. What were you trying to do there?

JAMES COMEY: I was trying to speak at the beginning of that to the people of the F.B.I., because one of the things that happened with me being banned by the president from the property is I never got to say, "Goodbye," to

those people. And when I said the stuff was lies about the F.B.I. being in tatters and being glad to get rid of me, I meant it. I was very, very close to that workforce and they were very close to me. And I know this 'cause of the boxes and boxes of letters and cards they've sent me. But I never got a chance to say, "Thank you," and to frame it and say, "keep up with your mission," those kinds of things. And so, I thought, "This is the chance." And I wrote the substantive information that the Senate committee wanted in advance so that I could talk in my opening to the people of the F.B.I. And I wanted to do it from heart, and so I didn't use any notes. A s-- decision I was regretting standing there with butterflies in my stomach before walking out. And it was emotional for me because I love that organization, I love the mission, I love those people. And-- and so saying, "Goodbye," to them was an emotional thing for me. And I almost didn't get through it. I started to choke up talking about them. But I knew it would mean a lot to them, and I knew it would offer me a measure of closure. And it just really wasn't what the Senate committee wanted to hear, but I thought, "I have an opportunity now," and so I took it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **It is so clear how much you love the F.B.I. Are you convinced you didn't hurt it?**

JAMES COMEY: **No.** I'm convinced-- well I guess it's easy to convince yourself, but I'm convinced that it was hurt as little as possible by virtue of what I did and that it would have been hurt more in other ways. But no, I-- I think making the decisions I had to make hurt the organization. **The F.B.I.--** you know, and the presidency of Donald Trump hurts the organization. The organization's not politicized, that stuff is all nonsense. It's an apolitical organization, but **it's subject now to extraordinary attack.** And I trace that all the way back to the beginning of the e-mail investigation.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **And can it survive the attacks?**

JAMES COMEY: **Yes,** it can survive the attacks. It'll take a while to recover, and damage will be done to the country, because the essence of the F.B.I. is a special agent knocking on a door and talking to a crime victim and convincing them to come forward or standing up in a courtroom and telling a jury, "I found this in the left-hand drawer of this fraudster's desk," and being believed at the door and in the courtroom. And the constant attacks, constant attacks, risks undermining that. And that's why-- my concern about the attacks on the F.B.I. is not a political thing, we all need that organization as a country. Everyone should want the F.B.I. to be that other in American life. And right now, it's the Republicans who are attacking it. Democrats are doing a whole lot of attacking last year because the teams are on different sides. We have to recognize, we want an organization that is not on anyone's side. That's in the national interest. And I hope people can rise above, come back to the title of the book, have a higher loyalty above your tribe to the things that matter for the country.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Before we broke, you mentioned that they didn't trust the Justice Department.

What do you make of the attorney general?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know what to make of him. I mean, I only worked with him very briefly before I was fired. My sense of him, maybe it's unfair to him, was that he was over matched for the job. And-- that **the job was f-- much, much bigger than he was.** And that he was going to struggle in it. That's my sense.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And you also said that the deputy attorney general, who's now running the Russia investigation, you said what he put out in support of your firing was just a pretext, and the pretense then fell away. So, can the American people have confidence in the man who's supervising the Russia investigation?

JAMES COMEY: Yes, in this sense. First of all, the American people can have complete confidence in **Robert Mueller.** As I said-- earlier, he **and I are not close friends,** but I've known him and watched his work--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **You've had dinner, played golf?**

JAMES COMEY: Yeah. I think we played golf once in our 25 years. And-- sorry, and-- and I've had dinner with him maybe once or twice. So, I know him, and I can s-- and I-- we're friendly. But I know his work most of all. And I've watched it closely. He's not on anybody's side. He does not care about anything except the truth. And so, they can have great confidence if Bob Mueller is let-- left in place to do his job, he will find the truth. And again, I don't know what that will be. He may conclude that there is nothing that touches President Trump or any of his senior people. And that's fine, so long as he's able to find that truth. And so that's the most important thing. And I also think the deputy attorney general-- I don't know this, but has likely learned a painful lesson from the way he handled my firing. And so, it gives him all the more reason to act honorably in overseeing Director Mueller.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: What will-- **what will it mean if President Trump is tries to fire Robert Mueller?**

JAMES COMEY: It would, I hope, set off alarm bells that this is his most serious attack yet on the rule of law. And it would be something that our entire country-- again, Democrats and Republicans, that is higher than all the normal fights about policy. That is about the values of this country and the rule of law. And it would be to the everlasting shame of partisans if they were unable to see that higher level and to protect it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **Do you think the deputy attorney general'll carry out that order?**

JAMES COMEY: **No.** I don't. I think, given his experience with me, that-- that he has an opportunity in overseeing Bob Mueller to restore some of his professional reputation. And **I'm m-- highly confident that he would refuse to abide that order.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: **And if Robert Mueller decides to bring a case, would you be a witness for the prosecution?**

JAMES COMEY: **Sure,** if he asked me to be. **I'm a fact witness.** That relates to-- I'm sure, **to an obstruction investigation.** Where that's going to go, I don't know. But potentially, I'd be-- I'd be a witness.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Are there things you don't know that you haven't said that could damage President Trump?

JAMES COMEY: Things that I don't know that I haven't said?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Thing-- I'm sorry. Are there-- are there things that you know but haven't said that could damage President Trump?

JAMES COMEY: That's a good question. I don't think so. I don't think I'm holding back on you. I'm not talking about the details of investigations. But I left a long time ago. And there's been a lotta work done since the day I was fired. And so, I don't-- I have no idea what Bob Mueller has.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But you read the papers. You follow the investigation. Do you think people tied to President Trump colluded with the Russians?

JAMES COMEY: I don't know is the honest answer. That-- that was th-- what we were trying to investigate at the time. Was anyone aiding the Russians, conspiring with the Russians? There's no doubt there was smoke around that. Whether there's fire, I-- I didn't stay long enough to know.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You write that President Trump is unethical, untethered to the truth. **Is Donald Trump unfit to be president?**

JAMES COMEY: **Yes.** But not in the way m-- I often hear people talk about it. I don't buy this stuff about him being mentally incompetent or early stages of dementia. He strikes me as a person of above average intelligence who's tracking conversations and knows what's going on. I don't think he's medically unfit to be president. **I think he's morally unfit to be president.** A person who sees moral equivalence in Charlottesville, who talks about and treats women like they're pieces of meat, who lies constantly about matters big and small and insists the American people believe it, that person's not fit to be president of the United States, on moral grounds. And that's not a policy statement. Again, I don't care what your views are on guns or immigration or taxes. There's something more important than that that should unite all of us, and that is our president must embody respect and adhere to the values that are at the core of this country. The most important being truth. This president is not able to do that. **He is morally unfit to be president.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You're the former director of the F.B.I. You've served in senior positions in the Department of Justice for Republican and Democratic presidents. And you think Donald Trump is unfit-- s-- the bottom line standard, unfit to be president?

JAMES COMEY: I do. I do. And I-- I-- I hope one of the things that comes outta the Trump administration his first term is a recognition that, as much as we fight about those policy issues in this country, what's at the core of this nation, we are just a collection of ideas. And at the core of those ideas is that there is a thing called truth. There is the rule of law. There is integrity. Those things matter before any fights about policies. And people who tell themselves, "Well, yes, Donald Trump is unethical but I'm getting the right Supreme Court justice or the right regulatory rollback," are kidding themselves because if we lose that tether to the truth, if that stops being the norm at the heart of our public life, what are we? Where are we as a country? So, I worry sometimes people think I'm talking about politics. Not in the way we normally talk about in this country. But I hope in the most important way. **Values matter. This president does not reflect the values of this country.**

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: If you are right, what is the remedy? **Should Donald Trump be impeached?**

JAMES COMEY: Impeachment is-- is a question of law and fact and politics. And so that'll be determined by people gather--

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You're a citizen. You have a judgment.

JAMES COMEY: Yeah, I'll tell you, I'll give you a strange answer. I hope not because I think impeaching and removing Donald Trump from office would let the American people off the hook and have something happen indirectly that I believe they're duty bound to do directly. People in this country need to stand up and go to the voting booth and vote their values. We'll fight about guns. We'll fight about taxes. We'll fight about all those other things down the road. But you cannot have, as president of the United States, someone who does not reflect the values that I believe Republicans treasure and Democrats treasure and Independents treasure. That is the core of this country. That's our foundation. And so, impeachment, in a way, would short circuit that.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: But-- but if Robert Mueller finds evidence of obstruction of justice, what is the remedy?

JAMES COMEY: Well, sure. Tha-- I-- I didn't mean to say that I want them to stop doing their investigation or whatever flows from that. But in a way, as a citizen, I think we owe it to each other to get off the couch and think about what unites us. I think about the people who supported Trump and continue to support Trump. A lotta them come from families with a proud history of military service. And that's a wonderful thing. What did their fathers and grandfathers fight and die for? Not for immigration policy. Not for a tax policy. Not for Supreme Court justice. They fought and died for a set of ideas. The rule of law. Freedom of speech. Freedom of religion. The truth. That's what they fought and died for. And at some point, we have to focus on that and make sure that whoever's leading us embodies those and we judge that leader by their tether to those values. Then we'll go back to fighting like cats and dogs about all the things we normally fight about.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: I've talked to a lotta people who've watched you for a long time-- worked with you, admire you. And some of them come out with-- with this storyline on **James Comey**. "Here was a guy who **loved being F.B.I. director**. He wanted to keep that job more than anything else in the world. That's why he didn't speak up on several different occasions when he should've spoken up-- about President Trump. And that's why he's speaking out now. He got fired. He's angry."

JAMES COMEY: I get that. I mean, I get why people would think that. That's just not right though. I mean, if all I cared about was getting the job and going along, getting along, it's hard to explain some of the things I did during 2016. My goal with President Trump was to try and find a way to work with a new administration and protect the integrity of the F.B.I. That was my goal. I'm sure I did it imperfectly. You've pointed out w-- I think reasonably ways in which I could've done it better or differently. That was my goal.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: At any point did you think, "I should resign"?

JAMES COMEY: No. In fact, at any point I thought, "I have to stay to protect this institution."

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Are you braced for a s-- tweet storm from President Trump?

JAMES COMEY: Sure. I don't follow him on Twitter, but I'm sure it's going to come. And that's okay. I mean, that's okay.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: You close the book with a very vivid image describing the Trump presidency. What is that?

JAMES COMEY: I think of it as a forest fire. That forest fires do tremendous damage. **His presidency is doing**, and will do, **tremendous damage** to our norms and our values, especially the truth. And so that's bad. And terrible things happen in forest fires. But I'm an optimistic person. And so, I choose to see the opportunity in a forest fire 'cause what forest fires do is allow things to grow that never could've grown. Were crowded out, didn't have the light or the water to grow. And so, I see already things growing and flourishing that didn't before this fire. I see the kids marching in the streets, including my own kids, about guns. I see all kinds of civil society getting engaged. I see parents talking to their kids about truth telling and prejudice and bias and respect. That was not happening three or four years ago. And so, there's a lot of good growing. And I also see the Courts and Congress getting involved in ways they hadn't before. So, I choose to see opportunity. I think this forest fire will leave us better and stronger, as did the last forest fire. Watergate was a forest fire. It re-balanced power among the branches of government. I think we're going to see that. And I think we're going to be better for it.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Couple years back, you gave a speech I think to the F.B.I. personnel saying, "If we fall in love with our own virtue, we can go sideways." At any point over the last two years, did you fall prey to that? **Did you fall in love with your own virtue?**

JAMES COMEY: I don't think so. But I worried about it constantly. And-- and the guardrail for that, because that's a big worry I have about myself, was to surround myself with people who will hit that. Hit at the certainty. Hit at the pride to make sure I've thought about things well. I hope people read the book for a number of reasons. It's about leadership and shows the importance of surrounding yourself with people who will poke at you, who will insist that you see the truth about other stuff. But most of all, about yourself 'cause I have a lotta strengths, I have a lotta weaknesses. And I want to make sure the people around me know that and help me guardrail against those weaknesses.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: How does this end?

JAMES COMEY: How does-- you mean m-- how does my involvement end?

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Let's say two th-- f-- first of all, **for the country, how does this end?**

JAMES COMEY: I think most likely, in a very important presidential election-- the next presidential election, where I do hope people of all political stripes will realize what unites us is actually more important than what

divides us. And that **we have to choose a leader**-- I don't care what party a leader's from. **We have to choose a leader who will embody** the s-- values-- **the values of this country**. That's how I hope it ends.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: And for James Comey?

JAMES COMEY: I'm going to teach. I'm going to travel around and speak about leadership. I want to be useful, especially to young people. It's really fun to engage with young people. Talk about people who will poke and prod you. But I want to offer them a vision of here's what it should look like. I've never quite gotten there, but here's what it should look like. Don't withdraw. Get into the public square. Be part of the life of this country 'cause we need you so badly. And when you do it, think about what matters most of all. And that is the values involved in your institutions. (I'd be surprised if Comey doesn't run for president. This was an impressive come back at the end of this interview. I have to admit, he got himself out of the hole he was digging.)

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS: Thanks very much.

COMEY DEFENDS FBI USE OF INFORMANTS BY CRISTIANO LIMA 05/23/2018

Former FBI Director James Comey on Wednesday pushed back against allegations by President Donald Trump and his allies that the bureau may have been "spying" on his campaign through an informant during the 2016 elections, warning that attacks on the U.S. law enforcement agency "will do lasting damage to our country." "Facts matter. The FBI's use of Confidential Human Sources (the actual term) is tightly regulated and essential to protecting the country," the former bureau chief wrote on Twitter. **"Attacks on the FBI and lying about its work will do lasting damage to our country."** (This is a threat, pure and simple, when the truth comes out we will find that this dangerous time is the result of the FBI using school children to attack their classmates. These children's lawyers need to be getting to the bottom of who is responsible for these children's actions. Children who say they are sorry for what they have done, as if it doing it was not what they wanted but had no control over. This is the result of being programmed, and the FBI is behind it.)

He later added: "Dangerous time when our country is led by those who will lie about anything, backed by those who will believe anything, based on information from media sources that will say anything. Americans must break out of that bubble and seek truth." (Comey has no problem calling the president a liar. Do what Comey suggests; "Americans must break out of that bubble and seek truth.")

The remarks followed an array of online missives by the president criticizing the "Criminal Deep State" over reports an FBI informant made contact with the Trump campaign in 2016 as part of the federal investigation into Russian election meddling and ties to his team. Trump took to Twitter to dub the matter "SPYGATE," arguing that if his allegations proved true, it would be "one of the biggest political scandals in history!" The president and his allies in recent days have seized on the revelation to question whether an informant was implanted in the campaign for political purposes, seemingly as part of an effort to undermine the ongoing Russia probe run by special counsel Robert Mueller. Over the weekend Trump demanded that the Justice Department and FBI "look into whether or not the FBI/DOJ infiltrated or surveilled the Trump Campaign for Political Purposes" under former President Barack Obama. In response, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein referred the question to the DOJ's inspector general.

The White House has also invited a group of Republican legislators to a briefing on Thursday where they will be given access to classified information relating to the FBI probe into Russian election interference in 2016. Democratic lawmakers were not invited to the gathering, which was coordinated by White House chief of staff John Kelly. "How will Republicans explain this to their grandchildren?" Comey added on Wednesday. (Comey trying to paint himself as the ultimate example of honesty. Get to truth people, Comey wants the truth to come out and when it does, he will be scurrying around trying to find a rock to hide under.)

Trump took direct aim at the former FBI director over the remarks later on Wednesday. **"If you look at what he's said, all of the lies, all of the fiction, I think he's got a lot of problems,"** Trump told reporters outside the White House. Trump added that he "did a great service to this country by firing James Comey." Comey was fired by Trump in May 2017 and has become a

frequent target of criticism for the president. Trump told NBC News in the days following the ouster that the Russia probe was on his mind when he was mulling the decision to dismiss Comey, an assertion from which he has since backed off.

THE MYTH OF AN ENDING: WHY EVEN REMOVING TRUMP FROM OFFICE WON'T SAVE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY: IT FEELS LIKE THIS MOMENT IN HISTORY DESERVES A DEFINITIVE ENDING. IT WON'T GET ONE. BY DYLAN MATTHEWS APR 23, 2018

When the president's lawyer is getting his office raided by the FBI, and his former national security adviser has pleaded guilty to felonies, and his former campaign chair faces up to 305 years in prison, and both a federal special counsel and a state attorney general are conducting ever-widening criminal probes into the president's business partners, and rumors abound that the vice president and the ambassador to the United Nations are planning to run together in the next presidential race — it's reasonable for opponents and critics of the current regime to get their hopes up. In the New Yorker, Adam Davidson compares the present moment to the beginning of the Iraq occupation in 2003 and the start of the subprime mortgage crisis in 2007 — both times that marked the beginning of a calamitous disaster, which one could see coming if one knew where to look. "This is the week we know, with increasing certainty, that we are entering the last phase of the Trump Presidency," he writes. "This doesn't feel like a prophecy; it feels like a simple statement of the apparent truth."

I don't want to argue with Davidson's prediction of a dramatic demise for the Trump presidency; Jim Newell and Jeet Heer have thoughtful responses noting that the path is trickier than Davidson suggests. I don't know who's right, and I don't want to make an overly confident prediction only to be proven wrong in a couple months or years. What I want to argue with, instead, is the broader intellectual tendency — a yearning, really — of which Davidson's piece is a part. This yearning is for something, anything, to end the death loop that American democracy appears to be trapped in, for a big, dramatic blowup to fix the system's ills. In the liberal imagination, that blowup typically takes the form of Trump's removal from office, an event that sets us back to a path of normalcy and sane politics. This yearning is understandable — but it is both dangerous and misplaced. Ending the Trump presidency will not fix, or even substantially ameliorate, most of the problems plaguing the American political system. They were mounting for years before he took office — indeed, they made him possible — and they will continue to plague us for years after he leaves.

What's more, the desire for a dramatic explosion of the Trump presidency at times seems to blend into a desire for the dramatic blowup of the American political system altogether, a sense that we need some apocalyptic event that will wipe the slate clean and revitalize our democracy in one big revolutionary motion. It's no accident that the rise of Trump has coincided with fearful but titillated worries about coups d'état, collapses into tyranny, and even a second American civil war or secession. These concerns are partially specific to Trump. But they reflect worries that transcend him too.

The reality is that Trump's removal or resignation from office, while desirable, would not do much to change the trajectory of America's political institutions. And the mounting desire for something cataclysmic that could change their trajectory strikes me as dangerous. The best we can do, I fear, is to muddle along and try our best to keep things from getting worse. And the less we accept that, and the more we escape into fantasies of collapse and redemption, the harder making those modest incremental improvements will be.

END THE PRESIDENCY, SAVE THE WORLD

Most observers acknowledge that American democracy is in a pretty bad way. The sheer number of hurdles that reform legislation must pass through, from filibusters to holds to committee votes, have turned the federal government into a vetocracy that stands paralyzed and incapable of adapting in the face of new challenges. Gerrymandering, nonproportional representation in Congress, and the Electoral College lead to a representative government that isn't very representative at all.

Polarization — particularly negative polarization rooted more in hatred of the other party's members than loyalty to one's own party — makes compromise and bipartisanship harder to achieve with each passing year. Until 2015, these problems were mounting but largely faceless. Donald Trump gave them a human form. He illustrates the US's susceptibility to demagoguery and to the influence of billionaires seeking to deregulate their own businesses and cut their own taxes. He won with the assistance of one of America's most broken and anti-majoritarian institutions (the Electoral College) with a congressional majority bolstered by gerrymandering and the underrepresentation of left-leaning urban areas.

He shows how America's thermostatic electorate, constantly responding to one party's electoral success with a dramatic swing to the other side, can undermine democratic responsiveness by catapulting a party with a deeply unpopular agenda into office. And he shows how dangerous the presidency's extraordinary war powers can be in the wrong hands. So it's no wonder that his presidency has proven a breeding ground for fantasies of his regime's demise that range from the responsible — see my colleague Ezra Klein's case that Trump should be impeached for being ridiculously bad at his job — to the conspiratorial and preposterous (see Louise Mensch's claims that Trump's impeachment and arrest are imminent and that the "Marshal of the Supreme Court" had informed the president his impeachment was coming; or Jamie Kirchick, who even before Trump's presidency was musings about a military coup unseating him). Those are the optimistic scenarios in which Trump's presidency and the forces it represents are turned back. But dystopian thought has been on the rise too. We've seen a surge of concern and scenario building premised around Trump's erosion of American political institutions.

It's fair to worry about the threat Trump poses to the rule of law and certain democratic norms, but unhinged and wacky dystopias have arisen as well, where the concern is less a gradual erosion of important norms and more a palpable fear that Trump is preparing an Alberto Fujimori-style auto-coup where he seizes full-on dictatorial powers. (Yale historian Timothy Snyder, whose book *On Tyranny* was one of the first big best-sellers of the Trump era, has declared it "pretty much inevitable" that Trump will attempt a dictatorial seizure of power.) Concerns about presidential authoritarianism are nothing new, just as desires for a presidency to reach an early end are nothing new. But they've taken on new potency in the Trump era. That's partially because Trump is historically awful. But it's also because we have a sense that things just can't go on like this, that the intense dysfunction and corruption of the American system of government has to come to an end eventually, in a big and dramatic and permanent fashion.

Humans, as the late literary critic Frank Kermode argued in his book *The Sense of an Ending*, crave narrative structure. "We are surrounded by [chaos] and equipped for coexistence with it only by our fictive powers," he writes. We can't see the world as a sequence of events, one right after another, with no end or resolution in sight. "To see everything as out of mere succession," he observes, "is to behave like a man drugged or insane." We can't see what's happening to American politics as just a succession of events that, in themselves, mean nothing. They have to be leading up to a climactic *Götterdämmerung* in which our slate is wiped clean. This is the yearning behind bold predictions of the Trump administration's collapse, or of a dramatic descent into tyranny at Trump's hand.

We fantasize about an early, dramatic end to the Trump years in part because that signals a return to normalcy and a rejection of all the dysfunctions he symbolizes. For more sophisticated observers who know that the forces that produced Trump will continue after he's gone, you see either a wallowing into dystopia — musing about an American descent into outright tyranny, of the kind occurring in the formerly democratic Hungary and Poland right now. Or you see fantasies of utopia, as in Bernie Sanders's characterization of the anti-Trump resistance as a broader "political revolution, something long overdue" that will sweep into power "an agenda that works for the working families of our country and not just the billionaire class."

Spend less time fantasizing about the system blowing up and more time thinking about how best to muddle through

For the past few months, I've been making my way through Mike Duncan's excellent podcast season on the French Revolution, which begins with a brief explication of the many dysfunctions of the Ancien Régime. Power was somehow both too concentrated in the king — creating problems when someone as ill-suited to the role as Louis XVI ascended to the position — and too diffusely distributed across the nobility, clergy, and judiciary. The French people ultimately decided to fix their problems by taking to the streets to force, first a constitutional monarchy, and then a revolutionary republic. But a quarter-century and millions of dead strewn across Europe later, the Bourbon dynasty returned, and status quo ante prevailed. As the clichéd, apocryphal Zhou Enlai quote goes, it's too early to know if the French Revolution was a good idea or not, but it clearly failed at achieving its near- or medium-term goals: achieving a durable, stable political system that was more responsive than the Bourbons and that would stand the test of time.

Now, few people outright argue for revolutionary overthrow of the American system of government. The closest we get to calls for revolution or overthrow are celebrations of the Chinese model of dictatorship from both Chinese and Western admirers who see a nation that, unlike a vetocratic America, can just do things, with the implicit idea being that America could use a turn toward autocracy. But other than that discourse, revolutionary or extraconstitutional thought is basically absent. Even the newly vibrant American socialist movement is composed almost exclusively of reformist social democrats rather than revolutionary socialists. In a way, I think there should be more talk of revolution, if only to expand the bounds of debate.

The political system is badly defective, and revolution is honestly one of the few proposals to fix it that's equal to the scale of the problem. **It deserves a fair hearing, even if I think it would be a terrible mistake** — after all, most revolutions tend to fail, we've learned over the past few centuries.

So where does this leave us? Absent a revolutionary shock to create a radically new political order, the best we can do is **just muddle along**. What does that look like? An unsatisfying litany of heavy political lifts, most of which will fail, and each of which on its own would only mildly improve matters if adopted. We should abolish the filibuster and Electoral College and **eliminate midterm elections** by having the House, Senate, and president serve concurrent four-year terms. We should adopt the **Fair Representation Act** to end gerrymandering and move toward proportional representation. We need a **robust right to vote in the Constitution**, public financing for elections, and more transparency for corporate and nonprofit political spending. These seem like ambitious reforms, and in all likelihood most of them will fail, leaving us in a perhaps mildly better version of the morass we're in now. Even in the extraordinarily unlikely event we make them all happen, a number of core problems in our politics will remain. You can't legislate negative partisanship away, and you can't entirely prevent corporations and the wealthy from exerting some degree of oligarchic power without trampling on freedom of speech. And if those changes are not enough, then getting Trump frog-marched out of the White House certainly won't be. **Ejecting him cannot and will not suddenly cure our political dysfunction**. The problems in our democracy don't suddenly disappear when he's no longer in the White House, any more than they would've disappeared had he narrowly lost in 2016 rather than narrowly won.

I understand the yearning not to muddle, for a big, climactic finish to both the Trump presidency and the American national nightmare. But if muddling through is to lead anywhere, we ought to be prepared for it, and prepared to make the most of it, rather than thinking a deus ex machina like a civil war or revolution or impeachment will blow the whole thing up in a stroke. That kind of conviction can breed complacency or disdain for good incrementalist ideas. And it can breed fatalism about what's possible in the current system by setting the standard for success impossibly high. This is not a romantic vision. It doesn't fill one with hope the way that declarations that the end of the Trump presidency is imminent do. This feels like a big moment, one that deserves a big conclusion, with big stakes. The truth is the Trump years will likely end with a whimper rather than a bang — just as the conclusion of Watergate did not lead to a cleansed and more ethical politics, and just as the financial crisis did not usher in a new era of ethical banking. Part of the pain of those crises came from Americans as a people expecting too much out of them, expecting a greater transformation than was actually on offer. If, as Davidson says, the Trump presidency's collapse is one such moment, we should enter it with a clearer sense of the problems that gave rise to Trump, and the discipline, the vision, and, most importantly, the patience to tackle them.

There you have it folks. **The answer is, the best we can do is just muddle along**. Which is just another way to say, **don't take any chances, go with the flow, stick with the status quo**. **Go down with the ship**. Me, I'm going back to building my house, which is just the same as saying I'll be rearranging furniture on a ship that's going down. My big fear is that the results of the final article is that the Republicans will get away with their role in getting Mike Pence in the picture and controlling every move Trump has made with the raft of players Pence brought on board with him.

The double standards of the Mueller investigation Victor Hanson CT, 4/30/2018

The country is about to witness an investigatory train wreck. In one direction, special counsel **Robert Mueller's** investigation train is looking for any conceivable thing that President **Donald Trump's** presidential campaign team might have done wrong in 2016. The oncoming train is slower but also larger. It involves congressional investigations, Department of Justice referrals and inspector general's reports — mostly focused on improper or illegal **FBI** and **DOJ** behavior during the 2016 election.

Why are the two now about to collide?

By charging former National Security Adviser **Michael Flynn** for lying to the FBI, Mueller emphasized that even the appearance of false testimony is felonious behavior. If that is so, then the DOJ will likely have to charge former Deputy FBI Director Andrew McCabe with perjury or related offenses. A

report from the Office of the Inspector General indicates that McCabe lied at least four times to federal investigators.

Former FBI Director [James Comey](#) may also have lied to Congress when he testified that he had not written his report on the [Hillary Clinton](#) email scandal before interviewing Clinton. Former Director of National Intelligence [James Clapper](#) and former CIA Director [John Brennan](#) lied under oath to Congress on matters related to surveillance. Clinton aides Cheryl Mills and [Huma Abedin](#) likely lied when they told FBI investigators they had no idea that their then-boss, Hillary Clinton, was using an illegal private email server. Both had communicated with Clinton about it.

Mueller is said to be investigating whether Trump obstructed justice by requesting that Comey go easy on Flynn. If so, then the DOJ will have to look at Comey himself and DOJ officials who obstructed a federal court. On at least four occasions, they were not honest about the deeply flawed Christopher Steele dossier being the source of information used in applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. Comey also has said that he predicated the nature of the Clinton email investigation on his assumptions about her chances of winning the presidency — another investigatory abuse.

The Mueller team is reportedly still looking into the possibility of election-cycle collusion with Russia by Trump officials. That track will require Mueller's DOJ counterparts to look carefully at the Clinton campaign, which paid opposition researcher Steele, a British subject, for dirt on Trump that was produced through collusion with Russian sources.

Mueller is also said to be investigating whether Trump or his advisers, broke laws concerning the release of confidential government information. If so, the DOJ may have to indict Comey. He confessed to passing along confidential FBI memos to a friend for the expressed purpose of leaking their contents to the press. High-ranking Obama administration officials may also be subject to indictments, given that they may have requested the “unmasking” of American citizens whose communications were intercepted during the surveillance of foreign parties and then leaked the names of those citizens to the press.

Mueller's team apparently has assumed that Michael Cohen's status as Trump's personal attorney offers no protections under normal attorney-client privilege protocols. If that is true, the DOJ will have to investigate why the FBI allowed Clinton aide Mills to pose as Clinton's attorney and thereby be shielded from providing testimony on what she knew about the email scandal involving her “client.” Investigators have swarmed Cohen's offices and residence, supposedly in fear that he might destroy pertinent records.

The FBI should probably then reopen the investigation into the Clinton email scandal, given that Clinton destroyed more than 30,000 emails, as well as computer hard drives that were requested by federal investigators.

What is going on?

Mueller has searched far and wide for wrongdoing but so far has found little. Meanwhile, there is plenty of other wrongdoing already found, but no one seems to be looking at it. [Flynn](#), [Cohen](#) and other Trump aides are considered small enough fry to go after. [Clinton](#), [Comey](#), [McCabe](#) and others seem big enough fry to leave alone.

No one thought Hillary Clinton would blow the election. Top Obama officials at the FBI, DOJ, intelligence agencies and National Security Council believed in 2015-16 that they could ignore laws with impunity since a protective Clinton administration would soon be in power.

Politics have infected these investigations.

Trump was seen as a threat to the status quo, and FBI and DOJ lawbreakers were seen as custodians of it. The more Mueller searches for hypothetical lawbreaking, the more he is inadvertently underscoring that actual lawbreakers must be subject to the same standard of justice. Ironically, Mueller's investigation has reminded America that it is past time to call Comey, McCabe, and a host of Obama-era DOJ and FBI officials to account.

For over a year, we have had two standards of legality when there can only be one.

A reckoning is near.

Tribune Content Agency [Victor Davis Hanson](#) is a classicist and historian at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University.

Parody of quotes from Louis L'Amour books and short stories. “Bendigo Shafter”, “How the West was Won”, “Guns of the Timberland” and the book of short stories “West of Dodge”

“Two kinds of men here, them that come to build and them that come to get rich and get out.” I’m proud to be a simple man, with simple observations. President Donald Trump is one kind of man, and Vice President Mike Pence is the other. “What’s the use of a dream coming true unless another dream can be built on top of it. Never doubt your dream. No matter how hard it gets, hold on to your dream, and your self-respect. Folks will judge you as you judge yourself. When your dream becomes so much a part of you that it shines out of your eyes, you’d best give it rein. A man is as big as his dreams are. There are always those who scoff and bicker and cower ... but if you want to make big tracks on the land, you’ve got to step out and start walking. To run is to invite disaster, for there is no place to run.”

“Situations like this have always appealed to me. I’ve always been curious about what people do when the chips are down, well, the chips are down now. I wouldn’t want to play poker with him. It took a lot of cold nerve to step over in front of a man ready to kill. That day I treasured, for it was the last of one world and the beginning of another. Out west you didn’t question a man’s word. We in the west asked no questions of a man. He was taken by the name he gave you, if he chose to give one, and judged by his actions. A man’s affairs were his own. It was on that trip that I first saw Webb shoot. It gave me pleasure, for I admired good shooting, and such might be the saving of us all. Webb is a mean and cantankerous man, but when it comes fighting time, he’ll be there. I don’t believe in it, and I think we’ll pay for it, but ‘I’ll walk out there with you.’ While those in front held our attention, others were closing in behind. Webb swore and turned sharply around, “stand where you are! Go ahead, if you feel lucky, God damn you, try it.” With Webb’s rifle muzzle down, I guess the man thought he could take him. He, like all of us, had a lot to learn about Webb, trouble was that man’s time had just run out. He made his move, and Webb flipped a six-shooter from beneath his shirt with his left hand and fired. The man lay dead, a bullet through his skull. Only I, who knew what was happening out there with a kind of instinct, new that what Webb had done, had saved us all. His sudden action had destroyed their timing. They had planned to begin it, and his move had caught them short. Already the wilderness was beginning to weave its pattern around us, and the ancient instincts, so long dead, were coming back again. The instinct for darkness, to remain concealed until an enemy revealed himself. “See, I am a man, by these signs you shall know me, that I can make a fire, that I cook my food.” When others panic, decrying the changing times. There are those who simply go on, taking them in stride, living their lives with quiet persistence,” and missing nothing.

“He was normally a silent man, speaking rarely and to the point. He was not a man given to talking, speaking only when his mind was made up, not as many do who shape their thoughts as they speak. He studied the joining of the planks and the way the corners fitted and said, ‘I’ve never seen it done better.’ There is a pleasure in working with the hands and muscles, a pleasure in the use of good tools. For most of our work we preferred careful fitting and wooden pins, which lasted longer and did not rust and rot the wood around them. In all our building, we built to last. It is the work a man does that matters. Yet, there is a longing in me for reading, writing and learning, the sounds of words are a rolling music to my ears, and I long for command of them so that I might speak and write with wisdom. There is determination, there is the will to survive, the will to endure. We have that, and no matter what trials we must endure, we will be here to greet it. Many men who have made mistakes in their own lives have created grandly, beautifully. It is this by which we measure a man, by what he does in his life, by what he creates to leave behind. Happiness for a man usually means doing something he wants to do very much,

something that gives him a sense of achievement. We must beware not to stray too far from the hands of the craftsmen, the hands that weave, the hands that sew, the hands that weld and mold, for whatever man makes must carry pride or we have lost much, too much.”

“A native American respects strength but mighty little else. (To speak of a native American man as gay before the FBI and Hollywood is beyond the scope of stupid.) Most of them take pride in their victories and would rather count coups on a live, dangerous enemy than a dead one. Tell them we are friends and thank them for saving the young ones from the snow. Tell them when they come in the spring we will have gifts for them. All right, how did you know they were Cheyennes? Moccasins, every tribes’ moccasins are different. Night made all things black, and it was like a great tunnel filled with roaring wind, a long wind that bent the trees down and skittered the dry leaves along the hard ground. Along the pinon slopes and into the aspen we rode, down grassy bottoms where the wind moaned and into the dark pines, and through canyons among the rocks, and stopping at lonely creeks for a drink. We stood there a long moment looking upon it. The wind had gone down in the hours before the dawn and the cabins lay white in the mornings still cold, slow smoke rising from the chimneys like beaconing fingers that promised warmth and security. I felt that our women would have compared well with those wives of Bavaria of whom Montaigne tells. When besieged and defeated by the Emperor Conrad III, the gentlewomen were permitted to depart, taking with them only what they valued most. Those same gentlewomen took upon their backs their husbands and their children, and the Emperor, who had pledged to kill all of the men, let them depart out of respect for their courage.”

“Plan carefully, then go ahead and let nothing stand in your way.” Yet, he was worried now. “It’s war unless I miss my guess.” “Will it be a shooting war?” No, no shooting or violence will come from our side if we can prevent it. Any violence that is perceived as coming from our side will be a victory for them. “It will be a war of strategy,” our main objective must be to prevent violence when possible, and if we fail to prevent it, we must stop it as quickly as we can. **These are quotes from “Guns of the Timberland”, together with words of my own to stress that preventing violence is of the utmost importance for success.** Those of us who stand together to demand change, must be committed to keeping the peace. Both sides that may show up armed for violence, the White Supremacists of the neo-Nazi, Alt-Right and the anti-Fascist of the Communist, Hard Core Left, are only a hammer in the hands of the directors. Their members are few when compared with those who seek peaceful, meaningful change. The best way to prevent confrontations by gatherings of these two groups is by avoiding mass gatherings in Washington D.C. or your state capitals. Invite county residents only, to meet in a county park, town square or courthouse plaza, stressing in your permit for gathering that non-residents of the county will be asked not to attend. This should make a difference in deciding who is at fault if outsiders do cause trouble. By voicing unity on the issues that are dealt with in this document at events across the country we can force the changes necessary to move ahead. It will take longer this way, but it will be safer because it will be easier to prevent violence. And preventing violence is the key to success. Those that would be used as hammers are used to end a meaningful movement. Though it will require greater patience and persistence to keep it local, it will provide a more certain path to success.

If there are any doubts that our current FBI is still collecting and using compromising information to influence Congress, the above article by Victor Hanson, “The double standards of

the Mueller investigation” should lay those doubts to rest. You must understand how being compromised would prevent Congress from calling for an official investigation into the crimes of 9/11/2001. George W. Bush was president at the time, Donald J. Trump is president now. Trump wants to be a success at being president, when he is thinking for himself, he is a success, but he has not had that opportunity for any significant length of time since becoming president. We must offer him that opportunity and we can. I've laid it out for you just how this can be done. We have got to say to Donald Trump, “Mr. President, we've got your back!” Most of the worst things people point to, to find fault with this man are things he has been coerced or programmed to do or say. Everyone should have enough experiences with waking up in the morning in total disbelief at something you did that was totally out of character for you to understand this. What you probably haven't given enough thought to is:

Who is programming you? And; What are they programming you to do?

You can bet, whatever it is, it isn't good for you!

The real issue is: Is it more dangerous to the country to have an agency that keeps secrets from our elected officers? That question has been answered numerous times throughout the history of these agencies and the answer has always been the same. YES! It is more dangerous having them, but the unbelievable solution has always been to create another secret intelligence agency to oversee the others because Congress has been compromised, this hideous cycle has got to be stopped while there is any breath of a chance at success. It is those of us, middle age and over that have witnessed the victimizing of the younger generations that must shoulder this responsibility. Autism was literally one in a million in the 70's and the talk then was that psychologists were targeting newlyweds with exceptional parenting skills with the intention of weaponizing those skills to the detriment of their children. By making the parents overprotective and getting them to force their children to get used to sleeping flat on their backs, which slows the heart rate, slowing development and creating the symptoms to be diagnosed as autism. Then as treatment of autism they force the children to concentrate on Pacman for four to six hours at a time. Low and behold, autism has skyrocketed from one in a million to one in sixty-five children born in this country today. See how easy it is to go from one hideous problem to another! The reason is there are so many problems. The point is the younger generations will have absolutely no chance of turning this juggernaut around. I believe we can turn it around, but it is up to us, the older US citizens between 35 and 75 to step outside the box, organize and meet in your local courthouse square to seek the demands laid out in this document. Deprogram yourselves first, before jumping to the defense of a single issue, if I am wrong, then the deprogramming process of exposing those that have too much control over you, and stopping it, will reveal the truth in the end, and I will be the first to acknowledge that I have been proven wrong. Once we have forced these changes then the extraordinary mess that has been made will be able to be approached at the county level, gaining consensus, and using the long-established methods of making changes on the state and federal level. There are ridiculously expensive techniques being used in medicine such as caesarian section births that are unnecessary, but Congress seems incapable of handling them, that is just one of the issues that has raised the cost of medical care in this country. This mess can be cleaned up, but the roots of the problem are our centralized government and the existence of secret agencies. These agencies have already declared war on the children in schools and they are using the children in the schools to fight this war. We can stop this by untying Congresses hands, they have the power to stop this, but they are compromised by the FBI and CIA files. The evidence shows that a relatively small number of high level officials, Bush family members and Dick Cheney and others orchestrated the “High Treason” crimes of 9/11/2001. They do not have total control YET! When we kick the door down there will be literally thousands of workers that installed explosives in the world trade center buildings, and those that witnessed the removal of explosives at Los Alamos and those that have firsthand knowledge of the training of the “terrorists” at the airports and the list goes on and on of the people who will be willing to come forward and testify. But this cannot be left to the young victims to fix because they will not be able to fix it when we are gone. The world is in crisis and now that a career CIA Alt-Right ex-director of the CIA has been named secretary of state the clock is ticking, and time is running out. Donald Trump can make a quick recovery from his programming if we remove his programmers. Vice President Mike Pence cannot. He is capable of taking us down hard without further guidance from a handler, possibly for years because he has been groomed for it for so long. They intend to keep Trump as long as they can control him. They could have taken him down right after the election, but they quickly got him on a short leash. It's the one waiting in the wings that must be forced out along with his cabinet picks and department heads. I continue to back General Mattis because of his history

of being a student of the military situation he is facing and a teacher to his troops even though Pence bragged in his speech to CPAC that he brought Mattis to Trump. When we can get body-cams on all elected officials, separate them from their handlers and install directors of the intelligence agencies that will order the agents to return stateside, begin documenting their careers to deliver their reports to Congress while Congress is reviewing the files and declassifying everything that can be declassified which should be everything except the most advanced technology, then we will be able to begin decentralizing state and federal government in a way that enables counties to evaluate the issues of more than a million federal laws. This document is just the beginning, a starting point that fully arms the people with the full intentions and full vision of the Founding Fathers decentralized ideals. I'm telling you, the monsters guiding secret intelligence agencies are vulnerable right now. But we must act, we really have nothing left to lose when the FBI is already lashing out at the children in schools, you all should know from the old adage "History Repeats Itself!" that if we wait until they burn the constitution, they will kill everyone over the age of about 14 because no one who has grown up in this country will be deemed thoroughly programmed enough to live. There are enough of the members of Congress that understand that this truth pertains to them as well, that they have pushed back against the pressure to cast aside the rule of law for so long. You better believe there has been pressure using a variety of methods by those that believe "The Ends Justify the Means" for a very long time. History tells us that the ends that are achieved at any cost are horrible nightmares.

Selling out to China is not the answer to continuing any notion of freedom in WV, the US, or anywhere else in the world.

XI JINPING, PRESIDENT OF CHINA (ELECTED ON NOV 15, 2012)

Nov 15, 2012 | Tags: [President](#) | Category: [All](#), [Asia Leaders](#), [Dictators](#)

Xi Jinping (pinyin: Xī Jīnpíng; pronounced [ɕʰi tɕɪnpʰɨŋ], born 1 June 1953) is the current "paramount leader" of the People's Republic of China. He currently serves as the General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, Chairman of the Central Military Commission, the country's Vice President, the President of the Central Party School and the 1st ranked member of the CPC Politburo Standing Committee, China's de facto top power organ. He served as the top-ranked member of the Central Secretariat of the Communist Party of China, the Vice-Chairman of the Central Military Commission. Son of communist veteran Xi Zhongxun (1913–2002), Xi Jinping served mostly in Fujian province in his early career. He was later appointed party chief of the neighboring Zhejiang province, and then was appointed as Shanghai's party chief following the dismissal of Chen Liangyu. Known for his tough stance on corruption and a frank openness about political and market economy reforms, Xi's combination of positions makes him the presumptive heir to former General Secretary Hu Jintao and the "paramount leader" of the Communist Party of China's fifth generation of leadership. China's new leader Xi Jinping will lead the economy of the People's Republic of China along with 6 other top official members. Some new members in leadership include Li Keqiang and Wang Qishan. The seven membership group is dubbed as the "Politburo Standing Committee" and some predict that China's new leadership will be less progressive.

This is just a conglomerate of rearranged
Songs most will recognize, and some will
Be able to identify the liberty
I've taken, just to lighten up!
Like the other one's I have sprung on you.
This is intended to be all one song.

I was once out strolling one very hot
summer's day, in a big field of tall grass

Here come old flat-top
He come groovin' up slowly
He one holy roller
He got hair down to his knees
Got to be good-looking
'Cause he's so hard to see

He say, one and one and one is three
Try it, it ain't new math trigonometry
He got feet down below his knees
Got to be a joker he just, do what he please

There's a port on a western bay
And it serves a hundred ships a day
Lonely sailors pass the time away
And talk about their homes

Brandy wears a braided chain
Made of finest silver from the North of Spain
A locket that bears the name
Of the man that Brandy loved

He came on a summer's day
Bearing gifts from far away
But he made it clear he couldn't stay
No harbor was his home

Brandy used to watch his eyes
When he told his sailor stories
She could see the ocean fall and rise
She felt his rage and glory
But he had always told the truth,
Lord, he was an honest man
And Brandy does her best to understand

At night when the bars close down
Brandy walks through a silent town
And loves a man who's not around
She still can hear him say,
She hears him say "Brandy, you're a fine girl"
(you're a fine girl) "What a good wife
You would be" (such a fine girl)
"But my life, my lover, my lady is the sea"

Yeah. The last love of my life is the sea!
Can you hear me? Can you hear me?
Or am I all alone?

Everybody listen to me
And return me my ship
I've been lost now for days uncounted
And its months since I've seen home
Can you hear me? Can you hear me?
Or am I all alone?

Out of the middle, came a lady
She whispered, something crazy.
She said. Spill wine, take that pearl
Spill wine, take that pearl

If you return me to my home port
I will kiss you Mother Earth
Take me back now
Take me back now
To the port of my birth

Spill wine, take that pearl
Spill wine, take that pearl
Heaven help me
Heaven help me

And return me my ship
I'm getting closer to my home
I could feel hot flames of fire
Roaring at my back
I'm getting closer to my home
As she disappeared, she said
Spill wine, take that pearl
Spill wine, take that pearl

But soon she was back
I'm getting closer to my home
In her hand was a bottle of wine,
In the other a glass.
I'm getting closer to my home
She poured some of the wine
From the bottle into the glass
I'm getting closer to my home
And raised it to her lips,
But just before she drank it, she said
Spill wine, take that pearl
Spill wine, take that pearl
Can you hear me? Can you hear me?
Or am I all alone? The beating of my heart
Is the only sound.

IMPRIMIS MARCH 2018, COLUMNIST, ASIA TIMES

HOW TO MEET THE STRATEGIC CHALLENGE POSED BY CHINA DAVID P. GOLDMAN

David P. Goldman is a columnist for *Asia Times*. He also writes regularly for PJ Media and the *Claremont Review of Books* and is the classical music critic for *Tablet* magazine. He has directed research at investment banks and served as a consultant for the National Security Council and the Department of Defense. A senior fellow of the London Institute for Policy Studies, he is the author of *How Civilizations Die (And Why Islam Is Dying Too)*. In 2017, he was a Pulliam Distinguished Visiting Fellow in Journalism at Hillsdale College.

The following is adapted from a speech delivered on February 21, 2018, in Bonita Springs, Florida, at a Hillsdale College National Leadership Seminar.

China poses a formidable strategic challenge to America, but we should keep in mind that it is in large part motivated by insecurity and fear. America has inherent strengths that China does not. And the greatest danger to America is not a lack of strength, but complacency. China is a phenomenon unlike anything in economic history. The average Chinese consumes 17 times more today than in 1987. This is like the difference between driving a car and riding a bicycle or between indoor plumbing and an outhouse. In an incredibly short period of time, this formerly backward country has lifted itself into the very first rank of world economies.

Over the same period, China has moved approximately 600 million people from the countryside to the cities—the equivalent of moving the entire population of Europe from the Ural Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean. To accommodate those people, it built the equivalent of a new London, plus a new Berlin, Rome, Glasgow, Helsinki, Naples, and Lyons. And of course, moving people whose ancestors spent millennia in the monotony of traditional village life and bringing them into the industrial world led to an explosion of productivity.

Where does America stand in respect to China? By a measure economists call purchasing power parity, you can buy a lot more with \$100 in China than you can in the United States. Adjusted for that measure, the Chinese economy is already bigger than ours. In terms of dollars, our economy is still bigger. But the Chinese are gaining on us, and in the next eight to ten years their economy—unlike the economies of our previous competitors—will catch up.

China, on the other hand, is an empire based on the coercion of unwilling people. Whereas the United States became a great nation populated by people who chose to be part of it, China conquered peoples of different ethnicities and with different languages and has kept them together by force. Whereas our principle is *E Pluribus Unum*, the Chinese reality is *E Pluribus Pluribus* with a dictator at the top. ("E pluribus unum—Latin for "Out of many, one" — is a 13-letter traditional motto of the United States, ... and adopted by an Act of Congress in 1782. *Annuo coeptis* is one of two mottos on the reverse side of the Great Seal of the United States. Taken from the Latin words *annuo*, "to nod" or "to approve", and *coeptum*, "commencement, undertaking", it is literally translated, "[he] favors our undertakings" or has favored our undertakings". The phrase *Novus ordo seclorum* (Latin for "New order of the ages"; ... The phrase *Novus ordo seclorum* is sometimes mistranslated as "New World Order" by people who believe in a conspiracy behind the design.")

China once covered a relatively small geographic area. It took about 1,500 years for it to reach its current borders in the ninth century. These borders are natural frontiers. China can't expand over the Himalayas to India, while to its extreme west is desert and to its east is the ocean. So, China is not an inherently expansionist power. Nor is China unified. It has a written system of several thousand characters that takes seven years of elementary education to learn, working four hours a day with an ink brush, ink pot, and paper. Learning these characters well enough to read a school textbook or a newspaper is how the Chinese are socialized. The current generation is the first where the majority of Chinese understand the common language, due to the centralization of the state and the mass media. But the Chinese still speak very different languages. Cantonese and Mandarin are as different as Finnish and French. In Hong Kong, you'll see two Chinese screaming at each other in broken English because one speaks Mandarin and the other speaks Cantonese and they don't have a word in common.

China is inherently unstable because all that holds it together is an imperial culture and the tax collector in Beijing. It is like a collection of very powerful, oppositely charged magnets held together by super glue—it looks stable, but it isn't. Within the living memory of older Chinese, China underwent an era of national division, warlordism, civil war, starvation, and degradation. The Century of Humiliation, as the Chinese call it—which began with the opium wars in 1848 and ended with the success of the Communist Revolution in 1949—was a century in which civil war claimed untold millions of lives, and the terror of a return to those conditions is a specter that haunts the Chinese leadership.

China, like Russia, responds to its past humiliation by challenging American power. It would be naive to expect the Chinese or the Russians to be our friends; the best we can hope for is peaceful

competition and occasional cooperation in matters of mutual concern. But it is also important to recognize that American policy errors exacerbate their suspicion and distrust. For example, our decision to impose majority rule in Iraq created a Shi'ite sectarian state now allied to Iran, and it left Iraq's Sunni minority without a state to protect them. This drove the Sunnis into the hands of non-state actors and unintentionally helped al-Qaeda and ISIS. Sunni jihad is a serious security threat to Russia and China, and Russia's intervention in Syria is, in part, a response to our mistakes.

The Chinese live a double life. If you walk down the street in Beijing, you see people who dress very drably, who show little emotion and do their best not to draw attention to themselves. But if you go to a Chinese wedding or a restaurant where families gather, the same people are loud and bumptious. Their real existence is a family existence. During the Lunar New Year, the Chinese have the largest migration in history—three billion long-distance journeys are undertaken—because all Chinese will travel long distances to be with their family.


Here in the West, we have a concept of rights and privileges that traces back to the Roman Republic—we serve in the army, we pay taxes, and the state has certain obligations in return. There is no such concept in China. Beijing rules by whim. The Chinese do whatever the emperor—or today, the Communist Party—asks, hoping they will be rewarded. But there is no sense of anything deserved. The idea of the state held together by a common interest as in Cicero, or by a common love as in St. Augustine, is unknown in China. The imperial power is looked on as a necessary evil. The Chinese had an emperor for 3,000 years, and when they didn't have an emperor they killed one another. It's all very well to lecture the Chinese about the benefits of Western democracy, but most Chinese believe they need the equivalent of an emperor to prevent a reprise of the Century of Humiliation.

From the standpoint of most Chinese, the Communist Party dynasty that took charge in 1949 has brought about a golden age. It's the first time in Chinese history when no one is afraid of starving to death or of a warlord coming through and raping the women and burning the crops. So, for the time being, the regime has a great deal of support, even though **it is more comprehensively totalitarian than Hitler or Stalin could have imagined.** As deplorable as the regime looks to us, the prospects for transforming China's way of governance are for now negligible. **China's Communist Party government is a merciless meritocracy,** which is one reason the Chinese have difficulty understanding American politics. **If you're in the Chinese leadership, you made it there by scoring high on a long series of exams, starting at age twelve**—which means you haven't met a stupid person since you were in junior high school. The fact that democracies can frequently advance stupid people—we are entitled to do that if we wish—doesn't make sense to the Chinese. **The one thing President Xi Jinping cannot do is get his child into Peking University unless that child scores high on his exams. Here in America, you can buy your way into Harvard.** You can't do that in China. So, **while the Chinese Communist Party is not a particularly efficient organization, and is certainly not a moral one, it has a lot of incredibly smart people in it.**


Along with ensuring internal stability at all costs, China's leaders are determined to make China impregnable from the outside. **We hardly hear the term South China Sea these days, because that sea has become a Chinese lake.** It has become a Chinese lake because the Chinese have made it clear they will go to war over it. There's a Chinese proverb: "Kill the chicken for the instruction of the monkey." China has an even greater concern over Taiwan. The Chinese Communist Party is terrified that a rebel province like Taiwan can set in motion centrifugal forces that the Party will be unable to control. So, the adhesion of Taiwan to the Chinese state—the imperial center—is for the Chinese government an existential matter. They will go to war over it. By demonstrating their willingness to fight over the South China Sea, they are demonstrating that they will fight all the more viciously over Taiwan.

Turning back to our two economies, consider the three graphs above. China does something that Japan, Korea, and other Asian nations do—it massively subsidizes capital investment in heavy industry. From the Chinese standpoint, a steel mill or a semiconductor fabrication plant are public goods—the Chinese look at these things the way we look at highways and airports. And as a result of Chinese subsidies for heavy industry, America has been pushed out of any major capital-intensive manufacturing. Thirty years ago the Japanese were doing this, which is why the Reagan administration took steps to force the Japanese to build car plants in the U.S. But Japan’s economy was very small compared to ours. Because China’s economy is roughly the same size as ours, the impact of Chinese subsidies is huge.

The first graph shows the capital intensity of the companies in the major Chinese stock index (MSCI) versus their return on equity. The more capital-intensive, the higher the return. In the United States, on the other hand, if you look at the S&P 500 on the second graph, the slope is in the other direction. More capital-intensive industries are less profitable. This distortion of global investment by Chinese subsidies for heavy industry has led to a stripping out of capital from American heavy industry. It’s not that Americans prefer financial assets to real assets—it’s that the Chinese have pushed us out. That’s why we’ve lost so much ground in terms of industry.



Source: Bloomberg



Source: World Bank

As the third graph shows, China’s share of high tech exports has risen from about five percent in 1999 to about 25 percent at present, while America’s has plummeted from about 20 percent to about seven percent. That’s not a sustainable situation. What it means in practical terms is that America can’t build a military aircraft without Chinese chips. That’s a national security issue. China’s “One Belt, One Road” policy, announced by President Xi in 2013, is a plan to dominate industry throughout Eurasia—both by land (belt) and by sea (road). As a rule, so-called developing economies *don’t* develop, because 40 percent of the people are outside of the formal economy—they’re in

the “underground” economy, mostly in small villages, and they live relatively unproductive lives. What the Chinese have done is to rip out the social structure of village life.

China’s economy is nothing like Japan’s, because Japan wanted to maintain its social structure. The Japanese protected agriculture, small retail, and small business. So, in Japan we see a few great companies with global capacity sitting on top of a protected, inefficient economy. In China, which moved the mass of people from the villages to the cities, their equivalent of Amazon—**Alibaba—will manage labor back in the villages.** The Chinese have broadband everywhere, so as entrepreneurs figure out what villages can make, the villages will work for them. The Chinese intentionally dismantled their social structure to avoid Japan’s constraints. **And what they propose to do with “One Belt, One Road” is repeat that experiment throughout all of Asia—to Sinofy every country from Turkey to Southeast Asia.**

A couple years ago, I visited the headquarters of **Huawei**, China’s telecommunications company—the **biggest in the world**—which hardly existed a dozen years ago. It has a campus that makes Stanford look like a swamp. **Today it has 70 percent of the world market** in telecommunications. How did Huawei do that? It cut prices and got massive subsidies from the government. After a three-hour tour, the Chinese sat the Latin Americans I was with down in a little amphitheater and said, **“If you turn your economy over to us, we will make you like China.** We’ll put in telecommunications. We’ll put

in broadband. We'll bring in e-commerce. We'll bring in e-finance. You'll be advanced like we are." The Latin Americans didn't take the deal, but the Turks have taken it. Turkey plans to be a cash-free society in five years. Chinese telecommunications companies are rebuilding the Turkish broadband network. Turkey has given up on the West and is becoming the western economic province of China.

The impact of what China is doing is felt all over the world. **Former allies of the U.S., including former NATO members, are orienting towards China.** Russia—which has become totally dependent on China—has quadrupled its energy exports to China, providing China with land-based energy imports in case the U.S. tries interfering with seaborne energy traffic.

China has an extensive high-speed rail network, with trains going 200 miles an hour. This has had huge productivity effects, and the Chinese are proposing to build these trains all over Southeast Asia. Thailand, an agricultural country, sees that with high-speed trains built by China, it can become the source of fresh fruits and vegetables for China. So, Thailand—which used to be an American ally—is being absorbed into the Chinese economy. And so on.

One of the most dangerous misconceptions Americans have about the Chinese is that they can't innovate. Who do you think invented gunpowder, the magnetic compass, the clock, and movable type? Yes, China's culture is much more conformist than ours. And on average, **Chinese are less likely than Americans to be innovators.** But there are 1.38 billion Chinese, and their research and development (R&D) spending is quickly catching up with ours. They're producing four times as many science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) bachelor's degrees and twice as many STEM Ph.D.s as the United States. Granted, some of them are of low quality—but many are excellent.

The single most troublesome deficiency we have in the United States is not the industrial base, which is relatively easy to deal with. **It is the lack of scientific and engineering education.** Six or seven percent of U.S. college students major in engineering. In China that number is 30-40 percent. **That's our biggest problem.** Second to that is the fact, already mentioned, that there is a massive distortion of the global economic system caused by Chinese industrial policy. **The Chinese play very dirty.** One of the issues raised in the Trump administration's recent National Security Strategy is forced technology transfer. That is, **if Intel wants to get access to the Chinese market—the biggest chip market in the world—China requires Intel to divulge everything it knows.** From the standpoint of Intel stock price over the next five to ten years, that's a pretty good deal. But it is bad from the standpoint of America's national interest. If the U.S. government prohibits the transfer of technology to China, the Intels and the Texas Instruments of the world will scream, because it will hurt their stock prices. **I'm a free trader, but national security sometimes supersedes the free market.** This would be such a case.

Virtually all of American investment in R&D today goes to software. This means that **we've conceded to Asia, and especially China,** the actual manufacturing, to the point that—this bears repeating—**we can't put a warplane in the air without Chinese chips.** So, what do we do about China? The answer is not to adopt an industrial policy. As Americans, we believe in individual liberty. We are not good at being collectivists. China and Germany have industrial policies. Culturally they can deal with it. We cannot. **If we're going to compete with China, we've got to do it the American way. And what we are best at is innovation.**

In the 1970s, all the smart people thought Russia was going to win the Cold War. Economists at the CIA and in the universities believed that Russia had a great economy. But by 1989, we realized that the Russian economy was a piece of junk. It actually had a negative worth, because the cost of environmental cleanup exceeded the value of whatever Russia was producing. What happened in the interim was the greatest wave of industrial innovation in American history. **We invented fast, light, small, inexpensive microchips. We invented sensors that didn't exist before. We invented the semiconductor laser. And we did virtually all of this through the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and NASA, in cooperation with the great corporate laboratories.** The U.S. turned the Russian economy into junk by creating an economy that hadn't existed before. That was the Reagan economy. During this creation, the Fortune 500 lost employment. The monopolies were all ruined. New companies no one ever heard of sprang up to commercialize the new technologies, and corruption declined because we had challengers taking market share away from the entrenched interests.

In 1983, I wrote a memo for the National Security Council arguing that the Strategic Defense Initiative would pay for itself—that the impact of the new technologies we were researching, once they were commercialized, would generate more tax revenue than we'd spent on R&D. When you do R&D, you don't know the outcome. Manufacturing using CMOS, (**Complementary metal-oxide-semiconductor** is a technology for constructing integrated circuits. It is used in microprocessors, microcontrollers, static RAM, and other digital logic circuits. It is also used for several analog circuits such as image sensors (CMOS sensor), data converters, and highly integrated transceivers for many types of communication. In 1963, while working for Fairchild Semiconductor, Frank Wanlass patented CMOS.) chip technology came about because the Pentagon thought it would be great for fighter pilots to have a weather forecasting module in the cockpit. The semiconductor laser came about because the Pentagon wanted to light up the battlefield during nighttime warfare. These technologies produced unforeseen consequences that rippled in unimaginable ways through our economy. We have failed to continue this innovation in recent decades. Starting with the Clinton administration, we came to believe we were so powerful that we didn't have to invest in national defense and new technologies. Investment went into the Internet bubble of the 1990s, as if downloading movies was going to be the economy of the future.

I'm a free marketer. But the one thing markets cannot do is divorce themselves from culture. It is when we have a national security requirement, forcing us to the frontier of physics to develop weapons that are better than those of our rivals, that we get the best kind of innovation. So, the government has a role—a critical role—in meeting the Chinese challenge. If the Chinese are spending tens of billions of dollars to build chip fabrication plants and we come up with a better way of doing it, suddenly they'll have a hundred billion dollars' worth of worthless chip manufacturing plants on their hands. But you can't predict the outcome in advance. You have to make the commitment and take a leap of faith in American ingenuity and science. We can meet the strategic challenge of China, but we have to meet it as Americans in the American way.

WEST VIRGINIA ANNOUNCES \$83.7 BILLION GAS DEVELOPMENT DEAL WITH CHINA ENERGY

BY METRONEWS STAFF IN NEWS | NOVEMBER 09, 2017

CHARLESTON, W.Va. — The state Department of Commerce announced overnight an agreement with **China Energy** to invest **\$83.7 billion** in shale gas development and chemical manufacturing projects in West Virginia. Gov. Jim Justice touted it as the largest **private** investment in West Virginia's history. West Virginia's gross domestic product last year was \$73.4 billion. "I realize it's close to the unbelievable range, but we really have, I think, landed something that's going to significantly impact and dramatically change the face of the petrochemical industry within West Virginia," state Commerce Secretary Woody Thrasher said in an interview today with MetroNews' Hopy Kercheval.

The agreement was the biggest among several deals signed during President Donald Trump's state visit to Beijing. The total value of the deals done during Trump's trip could be as much as \$250 billion, **Reuters reported**. Thrasher signed a Memorandum of Understanding with China Energy President Ling Wen Thursday as President Trump looked on.



Courtesy of the West Virginia Press Association: West Virginia Commerce Secretary participates in a signing ceremony with China Energy as President Donald Trump observes.

Some national energy analysts **cautioned** that agreements such as a memorandum of understanding would represent a less firm commitment than a contract and the actual amount being invested could wind up being less than originally described. The state Department of Commerce sent out a news release about the announcement just after midnight. China Energy officials had made several trips to West Virginia and the memorandum represents the first of several expected commitments by the company, the Commerce Department said. Planning for the projects is underway and will proceed in phases over the course of 20 years, according to the release from the Commerce Department.

The projects will focus on power generation, chemical manufacturing and underground storage of natural gas liquids and derivatives. “The plans clearly demonstrate a total value change approach, integrated from raw materials through the production of useful chemical intermediates locally,” according to the release. The signing occurred during President Trump’s recent tour of Asia and the U.S.-China Business Exchange trade mission to enhance relations between the two countries. Thrasher, Governor Justice and members of the state’s congressional delegation all praised the agreement. “This is a great day for the state of West Virginia,” Justice stated. “I’ve been saying for the last couple months that the tides are turning in West Virginia and this is proof. Today is another sign as we joined with my good friend President Trump to announce the largest investment in our state’s history.”

Thrasher called the announcement the latest sign of strong partnerships with overseas companies. “West Virginia has actively sought direct foreign investment to strengthen and diversify our economy,” Thrasher stated. “Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Hino Motors, Gestamp, Sogefi and other solid corporate citizens with international parent companies create jobs, generate incomes and support communities in West Virginia. In that same spirit, we welcome China Energy and the mutual benefits our energy collaboration will bring.”

China Energy is the recent creation of a merger between China’s state-owned coal mining company Shenhua Group and energy producer Guodian Group. The merger positions China Energy as the world’s largest power company with more than 200,000 employees. West Virginia enjoys a strong relationship with China Energy, including ongoing research initiatives with West Virginia University. WVU and then-Shenhua Group began their relationship in 2002 with joint research on direct coal liquefaction technology.

China Energy selected West Virginia for this project because of the State’s position as a key energy-producing state and home to one of the world’s largest shale gas reserves, underpinned by a longstanding relationship between the two entities. **“The massive size of this energy**

undertaking and level of collaboration between our two countries is unprecedented,” Thrasher stated. “It required cooperation between state and federal level officials.

Senator Shelley Moore Capito has worked hand in hand with the West Virginia Development Office for months to ensure this unparalleled economic development opportunity was realized for the state of West Virginia.” Capito, in her own release, said the investment announced today is a direct result of a series of meetings and calls her office had with Energy Secretary Rick Perry and Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross. Expanding Appalachia’s energy infrastructure, including developing a regional storage hub and market for natural gas liquids, will have a transformative effect on our economy, our security, and our future,” stated Capito, R-W.Va. “From driving growth and creating jobs to maximizing America’s energy potential, the benefits for West Virginia and the country from this new investment will be significant and long-lasting.”

Sen. Joe Manchin also provided a statement expressing support for the investment. “I am thrilled Secretary Thrasher and China Energy have signed the Memorandum of Understanding today in Beijing. I have always said that West Virginians are the hardest working people in the world. I’m glad China Energy recognizes this and is working with us to create jobs and economic growth in our state,” Manchin stated.

Congressman David McKinley also stated his enthusiasm. “This investment in shale gas resources located here in West Virginia will spur tremendous economic growth in our communities,” stated McKinley, R-W.Va. “Secretary Thrasher has been in constant contact with my office as his team has worked out the details for this project. We commend him for his dedication to bringing new jobs to the Mountain State, and we look forward to the opportunities created by this new partnership.”

Congressman Evan Jenkins described the agreement as testimony to what West Virginia can do with its resources. “West Virginia’s energy resources are second to none, and this announcement is wonderful news for our state. I’ve always said that an energy economy is a jobs economy, and we now have a president who is embracing West Virginia’s energy and jobs potential,” Jenkins stated.

As Reuters reported, many of the deals announced on the China trip were packaged as “non-binding” agreements, gave scant details or rolled over existing tie-ups. “I am somewhat skeptical of such a large number,” Alex Wolf, senior emerging markets economist at Aberdeen Standard Investments, **told the Reuters Global Markets Forum**, adding that the overall tone of the visit so far had been “positive”. “

TRUMP/CHINA \$83 BILLION DEAL FOR WV - AND THE MEDIA IS

SILENT . POSTED ON 11/20/17

Looks like he is doing work for the West Virginia and PA folks that voted for him. Wonder if it'll ever get any news? The West Virginia Department of Commerce today announced China Energy Investment Corporation Limited's plan to invest \$83.7 billion in shale gas development and chemical manufacturing projects in West Virginia. President Donald J. Trump and Chinese President Xi Jinping witnessed West Virginia Secretary of Commerce H. Wood Thrasher and China Energy President Ling Wen sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between China Energy and the state of West Virginia as part of the US-China Business Exchange trade mission to enhance relations between the two countries. The China Energy announcement in West Virginia was the largest investment in a series of projects in US corporations and other states totaling a reported \$250 billion of investment in the United States. The company has made several trips to West Virginia, and the MOU marks the first step in a series of commitments China Energy plans to make in the Mountain State. Planning for the projects is underway and will proceed in phases over the course of 20 years. The projects will focus on power generation, chemical manufacturing, and underground storage of natural gas liquids and derivatives. The plans clearly demonstrate a total value chain approach, integrated from raw materials

through the production of useful chemical intermediates locally. "This is a great day for the state of West Virginia," said West Virginia Gov. Jim Justice. "I've been saying for the last couple months that the tides are turning in West Virginia and this is proof. Today is another sign as we joined with my good friend President Trump to announce the largest investment in our state's history."

"West Virginia has actively sought direct foreign investment to strengthen and diversify our economy," said WV Commerce Secretary Thrasher. "Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Hino Motors, Gestamp, Sogefi and other solid corporate citizens with international parent companies create jobs, generate incomes and support communities in West Virginia. In that same spirit, we welcome China Energy and the mutual benefits our energy collaboration will bring." China Energy selected West Virginia for this project because of the State's position as a key energy-producing state and home to one of the world's largest shale gas reserves, underpinned by a longstanding relationship between the two entities. West Virginia enjoys a strong relationship with China Energy, including ongoing research initiatives with West Virginia University. WVU and then-Shenhua Group began their relationship in 2002 with joint research on direct coal liquefaction technology. "The massive size of this energy undertaking and level of collaboration between our two countries is unprecedented," said Secretary Thrasher.

"It required cooperation between state and federal level officials. Senator Shelley Moore Capito has worked hand in hand with the West Virginia Development Office for months to ensure this unparalleled economic development opportunity was realized for the state of West Virginia." "Expanding Appalachia's energy infrastructure, including developing a regional storage hub and market for natural gas liquids, will have a transformative effect on our economy, our security, and our future. From driving growth and creating jobs to maximizing America's energy potential, the benefits for West Virginia and the country from this new investment will be significant and long-lasting," said Senator Shelley Moore Capito. "That's why I worked diligently to expand West Virginia's energy infrastructure and bring this investment to our state, advocating for it with President Trump, Vice President Pence and Secretaries Perry and Ross. I'm excited to continue working with the administration, and state, local and private-sector leaders to keep this effort moving forward."

"I am thrilled Secretary Thrasher and China Energy have signed the Memorandum of Understanding today in Beijing. I have always said that West Virginians are the hardest working people in the world. I'm glad China Energy recognizes this and is working with us to create jobs and economic growth in our state," said Senator Joe Manchin. "This investment in shale gas resources located here in West Virginia will spur tremendous economic growth in our communities," said Congressman David McKinley. "Secretary Thrasher has been in constant contact with my office as his team has worked out the details for this project. We commend him for his dedication to bringing new jobs to the Mountain State, and we look forward to the opportunities created by this new partnership." China Energy is the recent creation of a merger between China's state-owned coal mining company Shenhua Group and energy producer Guodian Group. The merger positions China Energy as the world's largest power company with more than 200,000 employees. SOURCE West Virginia Department of Commerce[quote]

TRUMP'S BRUTAL POLICIES TARGET THE MOST VULNERABLE AMERICANS

THE ADMINISTRATION IS USING THE PRETENSE OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY TO SLASH PROGRAMS FOR THE POOR AND PEOPLE OF COLOR. BY [KATRINA VANDEN HEUVEL](#) TWITTER MAY 15, 2018

We tend to associate the word "brutality" with physical violence, especially violence at the hands of the state. It calls to mind police shootings, torture, and war. But there is another form of brutality that is less apparent to the naked eye—the brutality of policy. In recent weeks, the Trump administration has announced policy proposals that appear to serve little purpose other than cruelty. For example, the Labor Department is apparently planning to roll back child-labor protections that limit the hours that teenagers can spend performing dangerous jobs, such as operating chain saws

and trash compactors. The agency risibly described its proposal as an effort to “launch more family-sustaining careers by removing current regulatory restrictions” in a summary of the draft regulation obtained by Bloomberg Law. Worker and child-labor advocates, however, credit the rules with significant reductions in the number of teenagers who are injured or killed.

After blowing up the deficit with tax cuts for corporations and the rich, the White House is now using the pretense of fiscal responsibility to ask Congress to cut \$15 billion in approved spending, including some \$7 billion from the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP). The program, which provides health coverage for 9 million low-income kids and pregnant mothers, was extended for a decade earlier this year after Republicans allowed funding to expire last fall amid their attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act. In defense of its request, the Trump administration has claimed that cuts would come from funds that are unlikely to be spent. If that’s the case, however, then “there are no savings,” as Georgetown Law professor David Super has noted. This means that Trump’s plan, should Congress approve it, will either accomplish nothing or will deprive children and families in need of care.

In another act of cruelty, Department of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Ben Carson **put forward** a proposal last month that would triple the minimum rent paid by the poorest Americans living in federally subsidized housing. In addition to raising the minimum rent from \$50 to \$150 a month, Carson’s plan would allow housing authorities to impose work requirements and eliminate deductions for expenses such as child and medical care. Insisting that “the current system isn’t working very well” and “doing nothing is not an option,” Carson seems set on making life harder for the poorest residents of public housing. His plan would affect **an estimated 460,000 single mothers** and could result in **nearly 1 million children becoming homeless**, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Meanwhile, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) continues its aggressive and inhumane purge of immigrants that is tearing apart families across the country. CNN recently **highlighted the story** of one couple who lived in the United States for 30 years and reported to regular ICE check-ins for the past 10 until they were deported in December, leaving behind three American-born children and a mortgage. Their 22-year-old daughter was forced to stop attending college classes to help pay the bills and support her 15-year-old brother. And last week, the administration announced that it intends to inflict further pain on immigrant families with a new policy that would separate parents and children who are detained attempting to cross the border. **In an interview with NPR, White House Chief of Staff John F. Kelly dismissed concerns about the impact that this heartless policy would have on young children, saying, “The children will be taken care of — put into foster care or whatever.”**

This is only a partial reflection of the extent of the Trump administration’s brutal policies toward poor Americans and people of color (not to mention the rise in **civilian casualties** resulting from Trump’s increasing use of military force in the Middle East). And of course, House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) and congressional Republicans have waged their own years-long crusade to eviscerate the safety net for the poor, including **the ongoing push to slash food-stamp benefits**.

These are just some of the conditions being protested by the new Poor People’s Campaign, which launched 40 days of coordinated action at a recent rally in Washington. The Rev. William J. Barber II, one of the PPC’s leaders, **says** that Trump’s cruel policies have given the campaign momentum, but he has also made it clear that the movement is bigger than politics; it’s about addressing the **“deeper moral malady”** that has infected America. As Barber **declared** in an impassioned sermon at the campaign’s launch, “When you have policies that take away the human rights of the poor and make women and children prey, then you have a nation that can’t survive.”

RAY MCGOVERN ON GINA HASPEL, TORTURE, AND HIS RECENT ARREST

THE ARMY AND CIA VETERAN WANTS TO ASK: "WTF?" BY JAMES CARDEN 5/17/2018

On Wednesday, the Senate Intelligence Committee approved Gina Haspel's nomination to become director of the Central Intelligence Agency in a ten-to-five vote; and on Thursday, the full Senate voted to confirm, 54 to 45, with the help of six Democratic senators. Last week, during Haspel's confirmation hearing, former CIA official Ray McGovern, 78, was brutalized by Capitol Hill police officers and held overnight in jail after he interrupted the public proceedings. This week, I spoke with McGovern, whose duties included chairing National Intelligence Estimates and preparing the President's Daily Brief for President Ronald Reagan, to get his views on the Haspel nomination. This interview has been edited for length and clarity.

JAMES CARDEN: Ray, you were a CIA intelligence officer for 27 years. Do you think Haspel is some kind of aberration or a reflection of the agency post-9/11?

RAY MCGOVERN: The sea change began in earnest with Bill Casey and Bobby Gates [Casey was CIA director from 1981–87, Gates served deputy director from 1986–89, then later as director from 1991–93]. People in analysis as well as operations got ahead according to how quickly they would salute and follow the bidding of their masters. And that accounts for the worst NIE [National Intelligence Estimate] in history, Oct 1, 2002 on the non-existent Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq. By then, George Tenet [CIA director 1996–2004] had only cooperative sycophants sitting around the table; it takes roughly a generation to corrupt an institution like the agency. Most distressing, in a way, was my personal experience, watching old colleagues, good, hardworking, until-now trusted colleagues, people like Charlie Allen [assistant director of central intelligence for collection, 1998–2005], for example—who now supports a torturer for director.

How do I explain what happened to Charlie, and so many others of my former analyst colleagues—not to mention folks I knew and, some of them I trusted, from the operations side? After the trauma of 9/11, something happened to Charlie, and others. He was conscientious in the extreme; it was partly his fault, I'm sure he felt, and he was/is correct. And it was Charlie, if memory serves, who warned, after the fact, that the light was "blinking red." In other words, he was in charge of coordinating collection community-wide and failed miserably. I know Charlie; worked with him on the PDB [President's Daily Brief] among other things. **I believe he was traumatized into going along with the "enhanced interrogation techniques" even though he was smart enough to realize that "no good intelligence"—in the words of Lt. Gen. John Kimmons, a former commanding general of the Army's Intelligence and Security Command, "is going to come from abusive techniques."** In other words, Allen seems to have fallen in with very bad companions, condoned the worst, and now, out of a misplaced sense of loyalty, seems conscience-bound to support torturers like Haspel.

JC: You recently charged that Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Richard Burr (R-NC) is helping Haspel "cover up" her involvement in the CIA torture program. Can you elaborate?

RM: Richard Burr was on HPSCI [House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence] for the two crucial EIT [enhanced interrogation techniques] torture years, 2003–2004, and then on SSCI [Senate Select Committee on Intelligence] for the next 12 years. He's been chair since January 2015. The very first thing Burr did on assuming the chairmanship was recall all copies of the four-year SSCI investigation of CIA torture, based on original CIA documents, that, ironically, was the result of a bipartisan decision by the committee in the immediate aftermath of Haspel and her CIA superior, Jose Rodriguez, destroying the tapes of waterboarding. **You'll recall the redacted but still heinous-detail-filled, 500-page account in the Executive Summary that Diane Feinstein managed to get published in December 2014 just days before Burr took the chair.** Burr is a tool of the CIA.

JC: Not all former CIA officers agree with your criticism of Haspel. For instance, John Sipher, a former CIA Moscow station chief, wrote an op-ed in *The New York Times* titled "Why Gina Haspel is the Best Choice for CIA Director," which described Haspel as a mere bureaucrat, an "executive responsible for a large work force. Another former CIA officer, Doug Wise, has also praised Haspel. "For many of us during our careers," wrote Wise, "Ms. Haspel represented a role model who possessed the rare ability to make the right decision—every time."

RM: All of this, of course, is BS. Meantime, the mainstream media has avoided mentioning the two formal letters issued by Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity [which McGovern co-founded in January 2003] on Haspel and torture like the plague. Even worse: The opposition to Haspel from over a hundred retired general officers was largely suppressed. That speaks volumes.

And besides, any of the folks that Haspel's PR outfit directed the media to were themselves involved in one way or another with the torture program.

JC: What about the role of popular culture in all of this?

RM: I cannot overstate the influence of Hollywood, TV, and the media in making all this possible. Most Americans are still in a vengeful mood after 9/11 and believe torture "works." *O tempora o mores!*

JC: Last week you were dragged out of the Haspel confirmation hearing by Capitol Hill police officers. What exactly were you charged with? Have you been given an explanation for the seemingly out-of-control overreaction by the Capitol Hill police? [Editor's Note: A Capitol Hill police spokeswoman has not answered questions from *The Nation* regarding the incident at the time of this writing.]

RM: I have acquired a handwritten copy of one of the Capitol police officers' notes, which says I was "taken through door and taken to ground." One of the videos shows me taken out and immediately on the floor outside. Some have been asking me, "Did you fall down?" Now we have the notes showing I was "taken to ground." There was a female voice heard on the videotape saying, "You are hurting him." The captain supervisor decided, rather than seize her and her camera, to order the others to cease and desist. One has to be thankful for small favors; my chronically separated/dislocated left shoulder did not, in the end, go out. Later I was shackled, along with 97 others, for a couple of hours before we went into the courtroom to see the judge. I was the last one arraigned. I am charged with disruption of Congress and resisting arrest. I go to court in a week.

JC: Haspel's confirmation by the full Senate looks increasingly likely now that three Democrats, including Intelligence-committee ranking member Mark Warner, Indiana's Joe Donnelly, and West Virginia's Joe Manchin, have said that they will vote to confirm. If you had the opportunity to address these gentlemen directly, what would you say?

RM: I'd say, "WTF?!"

THE HISTORY OF LYNCHING AND THE PRESENT OF POLICING: A NEW DOCUMENTARY ON MICHAEL BROWN COMES JUST IN TIME. By [KHALIL GIBRAN MUHAMMAD](#) 5/17/2018

The recent spate of racially charged police incidents, including the killing of unarmed black men from Sacramento to New York City, speaks to the urgency of a number of new projects seeking truth and reconciliation between the past and present. The newly opened National Memorial of Peace and Justice and its accompanying Legacy Museum in Montgomery, Alabama, confront the long and dark history of lynching in the United States. *Stranger Fruit*, Jason Pollock's documentary about the police shooting of Michael Brown four summers ago, was released nationally on April 3 and will premiere on Starz next month. The film's investigation of Brown's killing invites us to grapple with a difficult legacy, and in so doing, challenges us to pursue a more just future. *Stranger Fruit* opens with scenes of Ferguson, Missouri, protests set to Billie Holiday's haunting 1939 song. It reconsiders how Brown's lifeless body came to rest on smoldering blacktop for over four hours in the Missouri heat, pointing to glaring contradictions in the official story. And it raises the possibility that local law enforcement obstructed justice by lying to federal investigators after the grand jury non-indictment. The official story in question goes like this: Darren Wilson suspected Brown of robbing a convenience store before stopping him and Dorian Johnson in the street. An angry and aggressive Brown initiated a struggle over the officer's gun. To protect himself, Wilson discharged his weapon twice, wounding Brown in his hand. Brown took off running as Wilson gave chase. After a distance of 180 feet, Brown turned back toward Wilson, charged at him "like a demon," and was then shot six or seven more times as Wilson emptied his clip.

The Department of Justice stated that federal agents canvassed 300 residences; interviewed dozens of witnesses, including local officials; and collected physical evidence, autopsy reports, cell-phone records, and e-mails. "In so doing, we assessed the witnesses' demeanor, tone, bias, and ability to accurately perceive or recall the events of August 9, 2014." Numerous witnesses said Michael Brown did not attack Darren Wilson and attempted to surrender. But federal officials stated that none of these witnesses, most of whom were Brown's black neighbors, were "credible." Their statements were deemed inconsistent or "contradicted by the physical and forensic evidence."

You might assume that federal officials applied the same standards to local law enforcement too. They did not. The film shows three instances in which police gave official statements to the press or the grand jury that are incompatible with the final version. The highest-ranking officer, St. Louis County Police Chief Jon Belmar, gave the first press statement, hours after Brown's death. He described "the entire scene" of the shooting as occurring within "about 35 feet" and involving a "couple" of shots. "It was more than a couple, but I don't think it was ah, ah many more than that," he said. "We've done a very comprehensive canvas." According to the physical evidence and ballistics, all 12 shell casings were documented and recovered. And the crime scene stretched 180 feet, not 35. Six days into the investigation, Ferguson Police Chief T. Jackson released the convenience-store video but told the media that Darren Wilson did not know about the robbery. A confused reporter tried to connect the dots, pushing Jackson to clarify. "Let's stay with this, this is critical. What are you saying chief?" he asked incredulously. "Did he know [Brown] was a suspect in a case or did he not know?" The camera zooms in for Jackson's response: "He didn't. It had nothing to do with the stop." When the grand jury interviewed the first responding officer on the scene, he told them that Wilson "did not know anything about the stealing call." The sergeant, who can be seen in the film from cell-phone video, insisted the stop was "only about the sidewalk, nothing to do with cigarillos."

Police made these statements when memories were still raw and truth within reach. But federal investigators did not use them in their report to challenge or discredit local officials, leaving Wilson's final version of events intact. Patrick Green, mayor of the neighboring town of Normandy, calls the Brown case a "cover-up" in his interview with Pollock. "The cover-up is to me that one white officer is more important than all these African Americans put together."

For nearly three quarters of a century, thousands of black people, including over 100 black women, were lynched in the presence of or with the complicity of law enforcement. Not only could blacks not testify in prosecutions against whites, local officials often refused to indict, lying in the official record that the victim died "at the hands of parties unknown." Lynching postcards sold as souvenirs told a different story. *Stranger Fruit* starts with an affirmation of Michael Brown's humanity and builds on a history of racial terror. The Ferguson police department's well-documented occupation of the black community is the crucial context for assessing inconsistent police statements and the physical evidence. As Holiday sings:

*Here is fruit for the crows to pluck
For the rain to gather, for the wind to suck
For the sun to rot, for the trees to drop
Here is a strange and bitter crop*

In 1955, Mamie Till allowed the nation to see the mutilated remains of her lynched teenage son, Emmett Till. No one was convicted. Fifty years later, Keith Beauchamp's documentary, *The Untold Story of Emmett Louis Till*, uncovered evidence that Till's accuser Carolyn Bryant had lied. Although too much time had elapsed for Bryant to face prosecution, that film led to the passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act. It is not too late with Pollock's film.

The documentary starts with an affirmation of Michael Brown's humanity and builds on a history of racial terror.

The arc of history that connects lynching's past to policing's present runs through the bodies of black unarmed men, women, and children—Eric Garner, Sandra Bland, Tamir Rice—whose names might one day be added to the weathered steel columns of the new National Memorial. Michael Brown is already there: A 10-foot sculpture of a bullet-ridden, disfigured body, titled *BAM (For Michael)* by the artist Sanford Biggers, stands at the exit of the Legacy Museum. Lezley McSpadden, Brown's mother, plans to run for Ferguson's City Council this fall. She insists—as the work of Biggers and Pollock does—that this moment is not just about Americans' desperate need to reckon with the past. It is also about pursuing justice now and in the future. [KHALIL GIBRAN MUHAMMAD](#) is a professor of history, race and public policy at the Harvard Kennedy School, Suzanne Young Murray professor at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, and author of *The Condemnation of Blackness: Race, Crime and the Making of Modern Urban America*.

1 Baton Rouge officer fired, 1 suspended in deadly shooting

MICHAEL KUNZELMAN and ANTHONY IZAGUIRRE,

BATON ROUGE, La. (AP) — A Louisiana police chief on Friday fired the white officer who fatally shot a black man during a struggle outside a convenience store nearly two years ago, a killing that set off widespread protests. Baton Rouge Police Chief Murphy Paul announced officer Blane Salamoni's firing less than a week after Louisiana's attorney general ruled out criminal charges in Alton Sterling's July 2016 shooting death. Paul also suspended officer Howie Lake II, the other officer involved in the deadly confrontation, for three days. Lake helped wrestle Sterling to the ground but did not fire his weapon that night. Paul said he fired Salamoni for violating department policies on use of force and "command of temper." He suspended Lake for violating only the latter policy. "My decision was not based on politics," Paul said during a news conference. "It was not based on emotions. It was based on the facts of the case." Both officers had remained on paid administrative leave since the shooting.

Police also released body camera footage and other videos of the officers' deadly encounter with Sterling. Two cellphone videos of the incident quickly spread on social media after the shooting, but the new videos show the clearest and most complete picture of what happened that night. In the body camera footage, an officer can be heard repeatedly using profanity as he shouts at Sterling and at one point threatens to shoot him in the head as Sterling asks what he did. Authorities have said Salamoni made that threat as he pointed a gun at Sterling. When Sterling complains that the officers are hurting him, one of the officers says to use a Taser on him and an electric buzzing can be heard. The officer believed to be Salamoni then runs at Sterling, tackling him as the camera footage blurs with motion. Someone yells "he's got a gun," then gunshots ring out. Salamoni told an internal affairs investigator in September 2016 that he cursed at Sterling to send a message that the officers weren't "playing," according to a report released Friday. Salamoni also said he saw Sterling reach for and hold a gun in his pants pocket right before he shot him during their struggle on the ground. Trying to explain why he swore at Sterling after the shooting, Salamoni said "he was so mad at Sterling for making him kill him and for trying to kill us," the report says.

L. Chris Stewart, a lawyer representing two of Sterling's five children, said the newly released videos show officer Salamoni attacked Sterling without provocation "like a wild dog." "The most obvious thing that stands out is Alton wasn't fighting back at all," Stewart said. "He's trying to defuse it the whole time." Salamoni shot Sterling six times during the struggle outside the Triple S Food Mart, where the 37-year-old black man was selling homemade CDs. After the shooting — as Sterling lies on the ground — an officer can be heard using profanity to say Sterling was stupid.

Salamoni's attorney, John McLindon, said he will appeal the officer's firing to a civil service board. Salamoni knows he probably can't return to the Baton Rouge police force but wants to prove he did nothing wrong, his lawyer said. "He did what he was trained to do," McLindon added. The officers recovered a loaded revolver from Sterling's pocket. As a convicted felon, Sterling could not legally carry a gun. Louisiana Attorney General Jeff Landry announced Tuesday that his office isn't charging either officer with state crimes. The Justice Department ruled out federal criminal charges last May.

Less than an hour after the chief's announcement Friday evening, Travis Hicks, 33, was selling CDs in the parking lot outside the store where Sterling was killed. He said the videos released Friday confirmed what most people in the neighborhood already knew. Hicks said he didn't think Lake deserved to be fired but thought the fact that Salamoni was not criminally charged shows a double standard. "If it was one of us," he said, gesturing at two African-American men browsing his table of CDs, "it would have never took that long. They would have sent us right to Angola," Hicks said, referring to Louisiana's state prison.

In June 2017, Baton Rouge Mayor Sharon Weston Broome called on Paul's predecessor, Carl Dabadie Jr., to fire Salamoni. Dabadie refused, saying it would be

improper and premature because the shooting remained under investigation. Salamoni, 30, had served as a Baton Rouge police officer for four years before the shooting. Lake was a three-year veteran of the force. Lake had a separate hearing Thursday before Paul and three of his deputies before the chief announced his disciplinary decision. Lake's attorney, Kyle Kershaw, said his client wants to return to his patrol job in Baton Rouge after his brief suspension. "Every measure that he employed was exactly what he was taught at the academy," Kershaw said.

For nearly two years, Sterling's family and many other Baton Rouge residents have called on authorities to release all of the video footage of the shooting. The shock of finally seeing and hearing it overwhelmed Andrika Williams, the mother of three of Sterling's children. Williams told her attorney, Michael Adams, that she had an anxiety attack and collapsed when she saw one of the newly released videos in a friend's social media post as she walking in her neighborhood Friday evening. "Every time they see this footage, they relive this. It's horrible to watch," Adams said.

PUTIN 'THANKS' RUSSIANS AT INAUGURATION WHILE HIS POLICE BEATS THEM UP ACROSS THE COUNTRY WP BY VLADIMIR KARA-MURZA MAY 9, 2018

There are only two countries in Europe whose leaders have been continuously in power for about two decades, and both are dictatorships. In Belarus, Alexander Lukashenko came to power through the ballot box, but quickly entrenched his rule by banishing independent media, dissolving parliament and imprisoning opponents. For a while, Belarus was known as "Europe's last dictatorship" – until Vladimir Putin came to power in Russia and transformed the flawed democracy built by his predecessor into the autocracy it is today. Independent television networks were taken over or shut down. **Parliament became a rubber stamp** ("not a place for discussion," in the unforgettable [words](#) of its speaker). And **elections have been transformed into meaningless rituals**. The two regimes have something else in common: **Their most prominent political rivals are dead**. Lukashenko's opponents – including the former interior minister and the former deputy speaker of parliament – "[disappeared](#)" in 1999 and are still officially listed as missing persons. Putin's most formidable challenger, Russia's former deputy prime minister [Boris Nemtsov](#), was gunned down on a bridge near the Kremlin in 2015. (The US Congress has become a rubber stamp for the intelligence community, and our elections have become meaningless rituals because of the way our multi-party system is rigged to be only a two-party system.)

On Monday, Putin was formally sworn in for his fourth term as president of Russia. In reality, it is his fifth: He went around the constitutional limit of two consecutive terms by installing a puppet "president" (Dmitry Medvedev) while remaining fully in charge as prime minister between 2008 and 2012. Putin has now been in power for 18 years; there is an entire generation of Russians who have never known any other political reality. They have also never seen a competitive election. For a leader who claims to be so popular among his citizens, Putin is [remarkably afraid](#) of allowing his opponents on the ballot. The [March "election"](#) that extended his tenure in the Kremlin was no exception. With Nemtsov dead and another prominent opponent, **Alexei Navalny, disqualified from running**, the incumbent cruised to a preordained "victory" over handpicked shadow-boxers. **Monday's inauguration** was a subdued affair, without the customary motorcade ride through the streets of Moscow that paralyzed the city in the past. **Some 6,000 guests** attended the **ceremony in the Kremlin's St. Andrew's Hall, once used to crown Russian czars**. Foreign dignitaries were scarce, a sign of the growing international isolation in which Putin's regime has plunged Russia; the most prominent foreigners were the American actor Steven Seagal and former German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, now employed by Putin as chairman of Rosneft, a state oil company that grew out of [the pillaging of Yukos](#). **With his right hand placed on the Constitution, Putin swore an oath "to respect and safeguard the rights and**

freedoms” of Russian citizens. In short remarks afterward, he [thanked](#) Russians for the “sincere support you ... have shown me in the presidential election.”

Two days before Putin spoke in the ornate surroundings of the Kremlin, his riot police and National Guard were beating and arresting the very Russians he swore to “respect” as [protests against his continued rule broke out across the country](#). In more than 60 cities, thousands braved the threats and the police batons to go into the streets and voice their opposition to the nearly two-decade rule by one man – something they were unable to do in the choreographed vote seven weeks earlier. As in [previous opposition rallies](#) over the past year, most of the protesters were young people. Some [1,600 arrests](#) were made on a single day; more than 150 of those arrested were minors. “Aren’t you afraid?” a journalist [asked](#) a young girl who came to the rally on Moscow’s Tverskaya Street. “I am,” she replied. “But [I am more afraid for my future](#).” Even the people accustomed to Russian police brutality were shocked by the [force](#) used against youths who participated in the rallies. Regular police regiments were reinforced by private paramilitary groups dressed in czarist-era Cossack uniforms and brandishing whips. They have been [contracted and paid](#) by the Russian authorities for various projects, including policing the upcoming FIFA World Cup. Amnesty International has [called](#) the violence unleashed on peaceful protesters “outrageous.” [The usually guarded U.S. State Department noted](#) that “[leaders who are secure in their own legitimacy don’t arrest their peaceful opponents for protesting](#).”

“It was a blessing ... to be among people who are not only intelligent and honest, but also courageous,” [Navalny wrote](#) after he was released from his own arrest at the rally in Moscow, adding to Putin: “[You will not scare us](#).” “The authorities have once again raised the stakes — they are now actually beating people up,” [said](#) Mikhail Khodorkovsky, founder of the Open Russia movement, which is providing legal help to many of those arrested. Intensifying the crackdown, he added, can only lead toward deeper confrontation: “There are only two steps left to be made: from the [government] side, mass repressions and shooting; from the [opposition] side, blocking roads and building barricades.... There is no good outcome from this. For Putin, the coming years will be the most difficult in his life. But he chose this himself.”

Putin isn’t as all-powerful as he looks By [Jackson Diehl](#) Washington Post May 13, 2018

Vladimir Putin’s grim, businesslike [inauguration](#) to a fourth term as Russian president last week was accompanied by equally grim commentaries about his grip on the country. [He may have stolen the election](#), it was said, [but the vast majority of Russians support him and his regime](#). He may have eliminated all serious opposition, through prohibitions, imprisonment and the occasional murder, but [his country is unsuited for democracy anyway](#). There’s a tiresome illogic to such stuff: If 80 percent of voters support you, [why not](#) let your main opponent compete, and prove it? If Russians are really content with political serfdom, why did tens of thousands of them [take to the streets of more than 60 cities](#) two days before the inauguration, [carrying signs](#) saying things such as “[Putin is not our Tsar](#)”?

How refreshing, then, to meet the group of Russians who [appeared in Washington](#) last week, shortly after Putin’s swearing-in: opposition activists who are not just protesting but also organizing grass-roots movements in and around Moscow — and who delivered a small but startling rebuff to the Kremlin a few months ago. Theirs is a more realistic, grounded view of Putin’s Russia, which is a place where discontent is growing, the desire for civil rights is tangible and the prospect of democratic change is, in the longer term, real. “Yes, we believe in [Putin’s] polls, but things can change very fast if there is a real opposition,” said Natalia Shavshukova, a former municipal council member who now trains local politicians. Her proof? In the municipal elections in the Moscow region [in September](#), [independent candidates won 260 of about 1,500 seats, compared with 30 in the previous election](#). One of the districts lost by the government was the Moscow area including the Kremlin.

Wait, you say: [a real democratic election? In Putin’s Russia?](#) It turns out [they can still happen on the local level](#), largely because [the regime lacks the resources to suppress independent](#)

candidates or steal votes in every municipal council. In that space, grass-roots movements have sprung up: People angry about toxic garbage dumps, a destructive urban renewal plan or local corruption are banding together, finding candidates and getting them elected, using the mostly empty shells of legally tolerated political parties as their vehicles. “We have already proved that opposition candidates are able to win at the local level. That’s because the authorities didn’t think we were dangerous,” said Vladislav Naganov, a 30-something lawyer who was elected to the Khimki district council outside Moscow. Added Julia Galiamina, of the Timiryazevsky district council: “Our behavior changed the system. When we work on the ground and lead a good team, we win.”

If opposition leaders do start to look dangerous, of course, bad things happen to them. Yevgeny Urlashov, a charismatic opposition leader who in 2012 won election as mayor of Yaroslavl, a city of 600,000, is now serving a 12-year prison sentence on trumped-up charges. Boris Nemtsov, a national opposition leader, was murdered on a bridge outside the Kremlin in 2015. Alexei Navalny, who succeeded him as Putin’s chief nemesis, has been banned from elections and subjected to constant harassment since receiving 27 percent of the vote in a 2013 contest for mayor of Moscow.

What the emerging local movements show, though, is that if Putin is seeking to create a model of 21st-century authoritarian government in Russia, he’s not succeeding. His regime consists of a centralized, mafia-like clique that controls the military, security services, state television and a number of big companies but — **unlike in the Soviet era — not everything.** Wherever it retreats — and under mounting economic pressure, the regime is retreating — an independent civil society springs up. That’s especially true among younger people, who make up a large share of the opposition candidates in local elections. Though they don’t get much attention, popular protests are slowly growing around Russia. They are triggered by the abuses and disasters of a failing government — such as the shopping-mall fire that killed 64 people in the Siberian city of Kemerovo in March, or the landfill emitting toxic fumes in the Moscow suburb of Volokolamsk last month. Shavshukova said that for many of those turning out for demonstrations, “it’s not a political project. But was the Boston Tea Party a political project? Nobody knows when it starts to turn into politics.” It may take a long time. But what seems clear in talking to these Russian organizers is that Putin, the putative all-powerful ruler, will not control the timing. “For many people, Putin is simply a symbol of great Russia,” said Galiamina. **“Our goal is to show people the connection between local problems, their lives and federal policies.** But it’s a very long-term goal. For now, we have to show them that politics exists.”

Code Name Crossfire Hurricane: The Secret Origins of the Trump Investigation By Matt Apuzzo, Adam Goldman and Nicholas Fandos May 16, 2018

WASHINGTON — Within hours of opening an investigation into the Trump campaign’s ties to Russia in the summer of 2016, the F.B.I. dispatched a pair of agents to London on a mission so secretive that all but a handful of officials were kept in the dark. Their assignment, which has not been previously reported, was to meet the Australian ambassador, who had evidence that one of Donald J. Trump’s advisers knew in advance about Russian election meddling. After tense deliberations between Washington and Canberra, top Australian officials broke with diplomatic protocol and allowed the ambassador, Alexander Downer, to sit for an F.B.I. interview to describe his meeting with the campaign adviser, George Papadopoulos.

The agents summarized their highly unusual interview and sent word to Washington on Aug. 2, 2016, two days after the investigation was opened. Their report helped provide the foundation for a case that, a year ago Thursday, became the special counsel investigation. But at the time, a small group of F.B.I. officials knew it by its code name: Crossfire Hurricane. The name, a reference to the Rolling Stones lyric “I was born in a crossfire hurricane,” was an apt prediction

of a political storm that continues to tear shingles off the bureau. Days after they closed their investigation into Hillary Clinton's use of a private email server, agents began scrutinizing the campaign of her Republican rival. The two cases have become inextricably linked in one of the most consequential periods in the history of the F.B.I.

This month, the Justice Department inspector general is expected to release the findings of its lengthy review of the F.B.I.'s conduct in the Clinton case. The results are certain to renew debate over decisions by the F.B.I. director at the time, James B. Comey, to publicly chastise Mrs. Clinton in a news conference, and then announce the reopening of the investigation days before Election Day. Mrs. Clinton has said those actions buried her presidential hopes.

Those decisions stand in contrast to the F.B.I.'s handling of Crossfire Hurricane. Not only did agents in that case fall back to their typical policy of silence, but interviews with a dozen current and former government officials and a review of documents show that the F.B.I. was even more circumspect in that case than has been previously known. Many of the officials spoke on condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to discuss the investigation publicly.

Agents considered, then rejected, interviewing key Trump associates, which might have sped up the investigation but risked revealing the existence of the case. Top officials quickly became convinced that they would not solve the case before Election Day, which made them only more hesitant to act. When agents did take bold investigative steps, like interviewing the ambassador, they were shrouded in secrecy. Fearful of leaks, they kept details from political appointees across the street at the Justice Department. Peter Strzok, a senior F.B.I. agent, explained in a text that Justice Department officials would find it too "tasty" to resist sharing. "I'm not worried about our side," he wrote. Only about five Justice Department officials knew the full scope of the case, officials said, not the dozen or more who might normally be briefed on a major national security case.

The facts, had they surfaced, might have devastated the Trump campaign: Mr. Trump's future national security adviser was under investigation, as was his campaign chairman. One adviser appeared to have Russian intelligence contacts. Another was suspected of being a Russian agent himself. In the Clinton case, Mr. Comey has said he erred on the side of transparency. But in the face of questions from Congress about the Trump campaign, the F.B.I. declined to tip its hand. And **when The New York Times tried to assess the state of the investigation in October 2016**, law enforcement officials cautioned against drawing any conclusions, resulting in a story that significantly played down the case.

Mr. Comey has said it is unfair to compare the Clinton case, which was winding down in the summer of 2016, with the Russia case, which was in its earliest stages. He said he did not make political considerations about who would benefit from each decision. But **underpinning both cases was one political calculation: that Mrs. Clinton would win, and Mr. Trump would lose**. Agents feared being seen as withholding information or going too easy on her. And they worried that any overt actions against Mr. Trump's campaign would only reinforce his claims that the election was being rigged against him.

The F.B.I. now faces those very criticisms and more. Mr. Trump says he is the victim of a politicized F.B.I. He says senior agents tried to rig the election by declining to prosecute Mrs. Clinton, then drummed up the Russia investigation to undermine his presidency. **He has declared that a deeply rooted cabal — including his own appointees — is working against him**. That argument is the heart of Mr. Trump's grievances with the federal investigation. In the face of bipartisan support for the special counsel, Robert S. Mueller III, Mr. Trump and his allies have made a priority of questioning how the investigation was conducted in late 2016 and trying to discredit it. "It's a witch hunt," Mr. Trump said last month on Fox News. "And they know that, and I've been able to message it."

Congressional Republicans, led by Representative Devin Nunes of California, have begun to dig into F.B.I. files, looking for evidence that could undermine the investigation. Much remains unknown and classified. But those who saw the investigation up close, and many of those who

have reviewed case files in the past year, say that far from gunning for Mr. Trump, the F.B.I. could actually have done more in the final months of 2016 to scrutinize his campaign's Russia ties. "I never saw anything that resembled a witch hunt or suggested that the bureau's approach to the investigation was politically driven," said Mary McCord, a 20-year Justice Department veteran and the top national security prosecutor during much of the investigation's first nine months. Crossfire Hurricane spawned a case that has brought charges against former Trump campaign officials and more than a dozen Russians. But in the final months of 2016, agents faced great uncertainty — about the facts, and how to respond.

ANXIETY AT THE BUREAU

Crossfire Hurricane began exactly 100 days before the presidential election, but if agents were eager to investigate Mr. Trump's campaign, as the president has suggested, the messages do not reveal it. "I cannot believe we are seriously looking at these allegations and the pervasive connections," Mr. Strzok wrote soon after returning from London. The mood in early meetings was anxious, former officials recalled. Agents had just closed the Clinton investigation, and they braced for months of Republican-led hearings over why she was not charged. Crossfire Hurricane was built around the same core of agents and analysts who had investigated Mrs. Clinton. None was eager to re-enter presidential politics, former officials said, especially when agents did not know what would come of the Australian information. **The question they confronted still persists: Was anyone in the Trump campaign tied to Russian efforts to undermine the election?**

The F.B.I. investigated four unidentified Trump campaign aides in those early months, congressional investigators revealed in February. The four men were Michael T. Flynn, Paul Manafort, Carter Page and Mr. Papadopoulos, current and former officials said. Each was scrutinized because of his obvious or suspected Russian ties. Mr. Flynn, a top adviser, was paid \$45,000 by the Russian government's media arm for a 2015 speech and dined at the arm of the Russian president, Vladimir V. Putin. Mr. Manafort, the campaign chairman, had lobbied for pro-Russia interests in Ukraine and worked with an associate who has been identified as having connections to Russian intelligence. Mr. Page, a foreign policy adviser, was well known to the F.B.I. He had previously been recruited by Russian spies and was suspected of meeting one in Moscow during the campaign. Lastly, there was Mr. Papadopoulos, the young and inexperienced campaign aide whose wine-fueled conversation with the Australian ambassador set off the investigation. Before hacked Democratic emails appeared online, he had seemed to know that Russia had political dirt on Mrs. Clinton. But even if the F.B.I. had wanted to read his emails or intercept his calls, that evidence was not enough to allow it. Many months passed, former officials said, before the F.B.I. uncovered emails linking Mr. Papadopoulos to a Russian intelligence operation.

Mr. Trump was not under investigation, but his actions perplexed the agents. Days after the stolen Democratic emails became public, he called on Russia to uncover more. Then news broke that Mr. Trump's campaign had pushed to change [the Republican platform's stance on Ukraine](#) in ways favorable to Russia. The F.B.I.'s thinking crystallized by mid-August, after the C.I.A. director at the time, John O. Brennan, shared intelligence with Mr. Comey showing that the Russian government was behind an attack on the 2016 presidential election. Intelligence agencies began collaborating to investigate that operation. The Crossfire Hurricane team was part of that group but largely operated independently, three officials said.

Senator Marco Rubio, Republican of Florida, said that after studying the investigation as a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, he saw no evidence of political motivation in the opening of the investigation. "There was a growing body of evidence that a foreign government was attempting to interfere in both the process and the debate surrounding our elections, and their job is to investigate counterintelligence," he said in an interview. "That's what they did."

ABOUNDING CRITICISM

Looking back, some inside the F.B.I. and the Justice Department say that Mr. Comey should have seen the political storm coming and better sheltered the bureau. They question why

he consolidated the Clinton and Trump investigations at headquarters, rather than in a field office. And they say he should not have relied on the same team for both cases. That put a bull's-eye on the heart of the F.B.I. Any misstep in either investigation made both cases, and the entire bureau, vulnerable to criticism. **And there were missteps.** Andrew G. McCabe, the former deputy F.B.I. director, was cited by internal investigators for dishonesty about his conversations with reporters about Mrs. Clinton. That gave ammunition for Mr. Trump's claims that the F.B.I. cannot be trusted. And Mr. Strzok and Lisa Page, an F.B.I. lawyer, exchanged texts criticizing Mr. Trump, allowing the president to point to evidence of bias when they became public. The messages were unsparing. They questioned Mr. Trump's intelligence, believed he promoted intolerance and feared he would damage the bureau.

The inspector general's upcoming report is expected to criticize those messages for giving the appearance of bias. It is not clear, however, whether inspectors found evidence supporting Mr. Trump's assertion that agents tried to protect Mrs. Clinton, a claim the F.B.I. has adamantly denied. Mr. Rubio, who has reviewed many of the texts and case files, said he saw no signs that the F.B.I. wanted to undermine Mr. Trump. "There might have been individual agents that had views that, in hindsight, have been problematic for those agents," Mr. Rubio said. "But whether that was a systemic effort, I've seen no evidence of it." Mr. Trump's daily Twitter posts, though, offer sound-bite-sized accusations — witch hunt, hoax, deep state, rigged system — that fan the flames of conspiracy. Capitol Hill allies reliably echo those comments. "It's like the deep state all got together to try to orchestrate a palace coup," Representative Matt Gaetz, Republican of Florida, said in January on Fox Business Network.

CAUTIOUS INTELLIGENCE GATHERING

Counterintelligence investigations can take years, but if the Russian government had influence over the Trump campaign, the F.B.I. wanted to know quickly. One option was the most direct: interview the campaign officials about their Russian contacts. That was discussed but not acted on, two former officials said, because interviewing witnesses or subpoenaing documents might thrust the investigation into public view, exactly what F.B.I. officials were trying to avoid during the heat of the presidential race. "You do not take actions that will unnecessarily impact an election," Sally Q. Yates, the former deputy attorney general, said in an interview. She would not discuss details, but added, "Folks were very careful to make sure that actions that were being taken in connection with that investigation did not become public."

Mr. Comey was briefed regularly on the Russia investigation, but one official said those briefings focused mostly on hacking and election interference. The Crossfire Hurricane team did not present many crucial decisions for Mr. Comey to make. Top officials became convinced that there was almost no chance they would answer the question of collusion before Election Day. And that made agents even more cautious. The F.B.I. obtained phone records and other documents using national security letters — a secret type of subpoena — officials said. And at least one government informant met several times with Mr. Page and Mr. Papadopoulos, current and former officials said. That has become a politically contentious point, with Mr. Trump's allies questioning whether the F.B.I. was spying on the Trump campaign or trying to entrap campaign officials. Looking back, some at the Justice Department and the F.B.I. now believe that agents could have been more aggressive. They ultimately interviewed Mr. Papadopoulos in January 2017 and managed to keep it a secret, suggesting they could have done so much earlier.

"There is always a high degree of caution before taking overt steps in a counterintelligence investigation," said Ms. McCord, who would not discuss details of the case. "And that could have worked to the president's benefit here." Such tactical discussions are reflected in one of Mr. Strzok's most controversial texts, sent on Aug. 15, 2016, after a meeting in Mr. McCabe's office. "I want to believe the path you threw out for consideration in Andy's office — that there's no way he gets elected," Mr. Strzok wrote, "but I'm afraid we can't take that risk. It's like an insurance policy in the unlikely event you die before you're 40." **Mr. Trump says that message revealed a secret F.B.I. plan to respond to his election. "We'll go to Phase 2 and we'll get this guy out of office,"**

he [told The Wall Street Journal](#). **“This is the F.B.I. we’re talking about — that is treason.”** But officials have told the inspector general something quite different. They said Ms. Page and others advocated a slower, circumspect pace, especially because polls predicted Mr. Trump’s defeat. They said that anything the F.B.I. did publicly would only give fodder to Mr. Trump’s claims on the campaign trail that the election was rigged. Mr. Strzok countered that even if Mr. Trump’s chances of victory were low — like dying before 40 — the stakes were too high to justify inaction. Mr. Strzok had similarly argued for a more aggressive path during the Clinton investigation, according to four current and former officials. He opposed the Justice Department’s decision to offer Mrs. Clinton’s lawyers immunity and negotiate access to her hard drives, the officials said. Mr. Strzok favored using search warrants or subpoenas instead.

POLICY AND TRADITION

The F.B.I. bureaucracy did agents no favors. In July, a retired British spy named Christopher Steele approached a friend in the F.B.I. overseas and provided reports linking Trump campaign officials to Russia. But the documents meandered around the F.B.I. organizational chart, former officials said. Only in mid-September, congressional investigators say, did the records reach the Crossfire Hurricane team. Mr. Steele was gathering information about Mr. Trump as a private investigator for Fusion GPS, a firm paid by Democrats. But he was also considered highly credible, having helped agents unravel complicated cases. In October, agents flew to Europe to interview him. But Mr. Steele had become frustrated by the F.B.I.’s slow response. He began sharing his findings in September and October with journalists at The New York Times, The Washington Post, The New Yorker and elsewhere, according to congressional testimony. So as agents tried to corroborate Mr. Steele’s information, reporters began calling the bureau, asking about his findings. If the F.B.I. was working against Mr. Trump, as he asserts, this was an opportunity to push embarrassing information into the news media shortly before the election. That did not happen. Most news organizations did not publish Mr. Steele’s reports or reveal the F.B.I.’s interest in them until after Election Day.

Congress was also increasingly asking questions. Mr. Brennan, the C.I.A. director, had [briefed top lawmakers that summer](#) about Russian election interference and intelligence that Moscow supported the Trump campaign — a finding that would not become public for months. Lawmakers clamored for information from Mr. Comey, who refused to answer public questions. Many Democrats see rueful irony in this moment. Mr. Comey, after all, broke with policy and twice publicly discussed the Clinton investigation. Yet he refused repeated requests to discuss the Trump investigation.

Mr. Comey has said he regrets his decision to [chastise Mrs. Clinton as “extremely careless.”](#) even as he announced that she should not be charged. But he stands by his decision to alert Congress, days before the election, that the F.B.I. was reopening the Clinton inquiry. The result, though, is that Mr. Comey broke with both policy and tradition in Mrs. Clinton’s case, but hewed closely to the rules for Mr. Trump. Representative Adam B. Schiff of California, the top Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee, said that alone proves Mr. Trump’s claims of unfairness to be “both deeply at odds with the facts, and damaging to our democracy.”

SPYING IN QUESTION

Crossfire Hurricane began with a focus on four campaign officials. But by mid-fall 2016, Mr. Page’s inquiry had progressed the furthest. Agents had known Mr. Page for years. Russian spies [tried to recruit him in 2013](#), and he was dismissive when agents warned him about it, a half-dozen current and former officials said. That warning even made its way back to Russian intelligence, leaving agents suspecting that Mr. Page had reported their efforts to Moscow. **Relying on F.B.I. information and Mr. Steele’s, prosecutors obtained court approval to eavesdrop on Mr. Page, who was no longer with the Trump campaign.** That warrant has become deeply contentious and is crucial to Republican arguments that intelligence agencies improperly used Democratic research to help justify spying on the Trump campaign. The inspector general is reviewing that claim. Ms. Yates, the deputy attorney general under President Barack Obama, signed the first

warrant application. But subsequent filings were approved by members of Mr. Trump's own administration: the acting attorney general, Dana J. Boente, and then Rod J. Rosenstein, the deputy attorney general. "Folks are very, very careful and serious about that process," Ms. Yates said. "I don't know of anything that gives me any concerns."

After months of investigation, Mr. Papadopoulos remained largely a puzzle. And agents were nearly ready to close their investigation of Mr. Flynn, according to three current and former officials. (Mr. Flynn rekindled the F.B.I.'s interest in November 2016 by signing an op-ed article that appeared to be written on behalf of the Turkish government, and then making phone calls to the Russian ambassador that December.) In late October, in response to questions from The Times, law enforcement officials acknowledged the investigation but urged restraint. They said they had scrutinized some of Mr. Trump's advisers but had found no proof of any involvement with Russian hacking. The [resulting article](#), on Oct. 31, reflected that caution and said that agents had uncovered no "conclusive or direct link between Mr. Trump and the Russian government." The key fact of the article — that the F.B.I. had opened a broad investigation into possible links between the Russian government and the Trump campaign — was published in the 10th paragraph.

A year and a half later, no public evidence has surfaced connecting Mr. Trump's advisers to the hacking or linking Mr. Trump himself to the Russian government's disruptive efforts. But the article's tone and headline — "Investigating Donald Trump, F.B.I. Sees No Clear Link to Russia" — gave an air of finality to an investigation that was just beginning. Democrats say that article pre-emptively exonerated Mr. Trump, dousing chances to raise questions about the campaign's Russian ties before Election Day. Just as the F.B.I. has been criticized for its handling of the Trump investigation, so too has The Times. For Mr. Steele, it dashed his confidence in American law enforcement. "He didn't know what was happening inside the F.B.I.," Glenn R. Simpson, the founder of Fusion GPS, testified this year. "And there was a concern that the F.B.I. was being manipulated for political ends by the Trump people."

ASSURANCES AMID DOUBT

Two weeks before Mr. Trump's inauguration, senior American intelligence officials briefed him at Trump Tower in Manhattan on Russian hacking and deception. They reported that Mr. Putin had tried to sow chaos in the election, undermine Mrs. Clinton and ultimately help Mr. Trump win. Then Mr. Comey met with Mr. Trump privately, revealing the Steele reports and warning that journalists had obtained them. **Mr. Comey has said he feared making this conversation a "J. Edgar Hoover-type situation," with the F.B.I. presenting embarrassing information to lord over a president-elect.** In a contemporaneous memo, Mr. Comey wrote that he assured Mr. Trump that the F.B.I. intended to protect him on this point. "I said media like CNN had them and were looking for a news hook," Mr. Comey wrote of Mr. Steele's documents. "I said it was important that we not give them the excuse to write that the F.B.I. had the material."

Mr. Trump was not convinced — either by the Russia briefing or by Mr. Comey's assurances. He made up his mind before Mr. Comey even walked in the door. Hours earlier, Mr. Trump told The Times that stories about Russian election interference were being pushed by his adversaries to distract from his victory. And he debuted what would quickly become a favorite phrase: "This is a political witch hunt."

Correction: May 16, 2018 An earlier version of this article misstated that news organizations did not report on the findings of the retired British spy Christopher Steele about links between Trump campaign officials and Russia. While most news organizations whose reporters met with Mr. Steele did not publish such reports before the 2016 election, Mother Jones magazine did.

Reporting was contributed by Michael S. Schmidt, Sharon LaFraniere, Mark Mazzetti and Matthew Rosenberg.

‘BIGGER THAN WATERGATE’: TRUMP JOINS PUSH BY ALLIES TO EXPOSE ROLE OF AN FBI SOURCE

BY PHILIP RUCKER, ROBERT COSTA, CAROL D. LEONNIG AND JOSH DAWSEY MAY 17, 2018 WP

President Trump’s allies are waging an increasingly aggressive campaign to undercut the Russia investigation by exposing the role of a top-secret FBI source. The effort reached new heights Thursday as Trump alleged that an informant had improperly spied on his 2016 campaign and predicted that the ensuing scandal would be “bigger than Watergate!” The extraordinary push begun by a cadre of Trump boosters on Capitol Hill now has champions across the GOP and throughout conservative media — and, as of Thursday, the first anniversary of Robert S. Mueller III’s appointment as special counsel, bears the imprimatur of the president.

The dispute pits Trump and the Republican chairman of the House Intelligence Committee against the Justice Department and intelligence agencies, whose leaders warn that publicly identifying the confidential source would put lives in danger and imperil other operations. The stakes are so high that the FBI has been working over the past two weeks to mitigate the potential damage if the source’s identity is revealed, according to several people familiar with the matter. The bureau is taking steps to protect other live investigations that the person has worked on and is trying to lessen any danger to associates if the informant’s identity becomes known, said these people, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss sensitive intelligence operations.

Trump reacted on Twitter on Thursday to recent news reports that there was a top-secret source providing intelligence to the FBI as it began its investigation into Russia’s interference in the election process. “Wow, word seems to be coming out that the Obama FBI ‘SPIED ON THE TRUMP CAMPAIGN WITH AN EMBEDDED INFORMANT,’ ” [Trump tweeted](#). He added, “If so, this is bigger than Watergate!”

Trump’s attorney, former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, said in an interview with The Washington Post that the president believes some law enforcement officials have been conspiring against him. “The prior government did it, but the present government, for some reason I can’t figure out, is covering it up,” Giuliani said, adding that confirmation of an informant could render the Mueller investigation “completely illegitimate.” Giuliani said Trump believes it is time for the Justice Department to release classified documents about the origin of the Russia probe, requested by House Intelligence Chairman Devin Nunes (R-Calif.), that are expected to contain details about the confidential source. “It’s ridiculous,” Giuliani said. “You guys in the press should have them. I don’t know why the current attorney general and the current director of the FBI want to protect a bunch of renegades that might amount to 20 people at most within the FBI.”

The Post [first reported](#) earlier this month that an FBI informant and top-secret, longtime intelligence source had provided information early in the FBI investigation of connections between Russia and the Trump campaign. A New York Times [story](#) published Wednesday about the beginnings of the Russia probe reported that at least one government informant met several times with two former Trump campaign advisers, Carter Page and George Papadopoulos. “It looks like the Trump campaign in fact may have been surveilled,” Kellyanne Conway, Trump’s 2016 campaign manager who now is a White House adviser, said Thursday on Fox News Channel. “It looks like there was an informant there. As the president likes to say, we’ll see what happens.”

FBI Director Christopher A. Wray testified Wednesday before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee that the FBI takes seriously its responsibilities to Congress but said the bureau also has important responsibilities to people who provide information to agents. “The day that we can’t protect human sources is the day the American people start becoming less safe,” Wray said. “Human sources in particular who put themselves at great risk to work with us and with our foreign partners have to be able to trust that we’re going to protect their identities and in many cases their lives and the lives of their families.”

The source is a U.S. citizen who has provided information over the years to both the FBI and the CIA, as The Post previously reported, and aided the Russia investigation both before and after Mueller’s appointment in May 2017, according to people familiar with his activities. Breitbart and other right-wing news websites have been abuzz in recent days with commentary

about the source. Sean Hannity, a friend and informal adviser to Trump, speculated about the source on his Fox News show Wednesday night. Trump's allies believe outing the source and revealing details about his or her work for the FBI could help them challenge the investigation and, potentially, provide cause for removing Mueller or his overseer, Deputy Attorney General Rod J. Rosenstein. They also point to [the dossier](#) containing allegations about Trump's connections to Russia, which was partially funded by Hillary Clinton's campaign and was used by the FBI to obtain a search warrant for Page.

"If it were found that the FBI investigation of the Trump campaign was predicated on flimsy facts ginned up by people with a political agenda and used informants to get inside the Trump campaign based on no solid facts, then, yes, I absolutely think it's grounds for dismissing this entire investigation," said Mark Corallo, a former Justice Department official and former spokesman for Trump's legal team. Trump tweeted Thursday that the Mueller probe was a "disgusting, illegal and unwarranted Witch Hunt," which drew a retort from Senate Minority Leader Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.). "I would say to the president, it's not a 'witch hunt' when 17 Russians have been indicted," Schumer said in a speech on the Senate floor. "It's not a 'witch hunt' when some of the most senior members of the Trump campaign have been indicted. It's not a 'witch hunt' when Democrats and Republicans agree with the intelligence community that Russia interfered in our election to aid President Trump."

Rep. Mark Meadows (R-N.C.) has been conferring with Trump — in three or more calls a week — communicating concerns that the Justice Department is hiding worrisome information about the elements of the probe, according to people familiar with their discussions. Meadows declined to discuss his conversations with the president. But he said, "The president has always been consistent in wanting transparency, even when he had no knowledge of what the document might or might not contain, whether it would be good or bad for him."

Nunes, meanwhile, has purposefully not been talking to Trump, to avoid accusations that he is providing sensitive information to the president, according to these people. Instead, Nunes has been relaying the status of his battle with the Justice Department to White House Counsel Donald McGahn. "What we're trying to figure out are what methods the FBI and DOJ used to investigate and open a counterintelligence investigation into the Trump campaign," Nunes said. Nunes said he and his colleagues have been troubled by reports and indications that sources may have been repeatedly reaching out to Trump campaign members and even offering aides money to encourage them to meet. The president, he said, has ample reason to be angry and suspicious. "If you are paying somebody to come talk to my campaign or brush up against my campaign, whatever you call it, I'd be furious," Nunes said. Nunes redirected his attacks Thursday from Attorney General Jeff Sessions to Rosenstein, telling Sinclair Broadcast Group that the deputy attorney general should be held in contempt of Congress for refusing to comply with his subpoena. Sessions is recused from the matter.

Inside the West Wing, Trump often complains about the Mueller investigation, with episodic bouts that can be "all-encompassing," according to a former senior administration official. Trump often talks with his advisers about ways he can fight back against what he views as an encroaching probe — and he sees allies in Congress as more credible surrogates than his own staff, the official said. Trump often agrees with Meadows and at times has encouraged him and other allies to go on television news shows and, in the words of a senior administration official, "beat the drums." White House Chief of Staff John F. Kelly has complained to some colleagues that such conversations between Trump and Meadows and other House allies are not always helpful, according to the former official.

House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) has told the president on several occasions that he should stop talking about the Russia probe, according to an official familiar with their conversations. "You're not guilty, don't act like it," Ryan would say, and Trump would agree, but then the president would go right back to venting about the investigation, according to this official.

For months, Meadows, Nunes and other GOP lawmakers have criticized Rosenstein for refusing to let Congress see a “scope memo” outlining the people and issues under investigation by Mueller. Some House Republicans in March drafted articles of impeachment against Rosenstein as a “last resort” if he does not provide Congress with more information. In early May, Nunes pushed the Justice Department for more information about the source, but **top White House officials, with the assent of Trump, agreed to back the department’s decision to withhold the information. They were persuaded that turning over Justice Department documents could risk lives by potentially exposing the source, according to multiple people familiar with the discussion and the person’s role.**

Former White House chief strategist Stephen K. Bannon is functioning as an informal adviser to the Trump allies, both inside and outside the administration, who are leading the charge against the Justice Department, according to three people involved in those discussions. Working from his Capitol Hill townhouse, Bannon has conferred with Meadows, former Trump campaign manager Corey Lewandowski and former Trump deputy campaign manager David Bossie, among others, about how to bolster support for Trump allies in Congress who are calling for more document disclosures, the people said. These people said the Bannon-advised group sees itself as a bulwark for the embattled president and said there were growing tensions between them and Kelly and McGahn, whom the group sees as not doing enough to force the hand of top Justice officials. Kelly met with Meadows and Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio) a few weeks ago and suggested they give Justice officials more time to comply with their request. But Meadows and Jordan did not back off, a senior administration official said. “The president is frustrated,” Jordan said. “I don’t blame him for being frustrated.” *Devlin Barrett and Shane Harris contributed to this report.*

Hurry Up and Work: DoD's Lack of Momentum on the Women, Peace and Security Act By Jody L. Barth

The Defense Department **may have** fallen behind its interagency partners in a true “hurry up and wait” fashion characteristic of tactical military operations.

Background: Seven years ago, President Obama released the inaugural United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (WPS), a document that helped various institutions within our government coordinate efforts to advance women’s inclusion in peace negotiations, peace building activities, and conflict prevention and response. This document also helped organizations develop their independent strategies to protect women and girls from gender-based violence and to ensure safe, equitable access to relief and recovery assistance in areas of conflict and insecurity. This plan built on the passage of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, which was ratified by the United Nations in 2000. The 2016 United States National Action Plan updated these efforts and in 2017, President Trump signed the Women, Peace and Security Act into law. This act confirms that inclusion of women in peace processes helps reduce conflict and advance stability.

This act, which is now the law, requires **the interagency carry out a** strategy to increase participation of women in peacekeeping and security operations. With heavily defense-oriented propensities, one might think that the Department of Defense (DoD) would take the lead in this field. It is, of course, the *law* and the DoD has the highest stake in promoting anything that would help military service members do their jobs as the arbiters of stability and security.

In August of 2012, the Department of State published its implementation plan of the National Action Plan outlining regional overviews, commitments, monitoring and evaluation, and included a matrix delineating responsibilities of each specific department within State. The report is 83 pages long and very clearly shows a concerted effort on the State Department’s behalf. The

Department of State also created an “Office of Global Women’s Issues” with the responsibility to coordinate implementation of the National Action Plan. One can take a quick glance at its website and speculate that this is an obvious priority for our nation’s diplomats, despite having their budget slashed recently.

...and then there is the Department of Defense.

Buried somewhere within the bowels of the behemoth Pentagon sits the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, the acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Stability and Humanitarian Affairs issued a press release last month that basically said, “we’re working on it.” More specifically, Mr. Mark Swayne, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Stability and Humanitarian Affairs, was quoted as saying, “We have a well-integrated military. Many of our allies and NATO partners are the same. But we have many military partners around the world where females do not have the same level of representation.” This is not groundbreaking news, mind you. If you recall, the United Nations passed Security Council Resolution 1325 in 2000. In the United States, the first National Action Plan was signed in 2011. Where has the Department of Defense been for the past decade as other American institutions have taken the “Women, Peace, and Security” ball and ran with it?

Mr. Swayne stated that the Department of Defense aims to have a new instruction in place by the end of 2018. This lip service is clearly not one of the Department of Defense’s priorities considering how little effort has been put towards codifying an implementation plan. On the other hand, the Defense Department recently opened all combat jobs to women to include highly specialized special operations fields, which shows some level of commitment to reaching gender equality in the military. It also drops the stigma that men would not be able to “carry on the fight” if they observed a woman injured in battle.

In a Council on Foreign Relations discussion paper from 2016, the council recommends the following: “The next U.S. administration should require women’s representation and meaningful participation in conflict resolution and post conflict processes, increase investment in efforts that promote women’s inclusion, reform U.S. diplomatic and security practices to incorporate the experiences of women in conflict-affected countries, improve staffing and coordination to deliver on government commitments, strengthen training on incorporating women in security efforts, and promote accountability.” The recommendation of increasing investment in efforts that promote women’s inclusion and improve staffing would be simple and immediate remedies to ameliorate this abandoned issue.

As the most powerful and well-funded military in the world, the United States cannot continue to overlook its responsibility to adhere to both the recommendations of the United Nations and its own Women, Peace and Security law. With understandably competing interests of war fighting in two separate theaters, the Department of Defense must allocate dedicated resources and have the support of senior military leaders in order to achieve such dynamic goals. The Defense Department is behind the power curve. Despite this, it has demonstrated its ability to adapt and overcome in many previous quagmires. The Department of Defense must take proactive efforts to build women’s capacities to help prevent war and promote stability. It will alleviate the need for intervention in low intensity conflicts that now plague countries such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, and the Central African Republic. It is not too late for the Defense Department – it just needs commitment from its senior military leaders as well as a change in attitude from “hurry up and wait” to “hurry up and work.” Half the world’s population is depending on it. END

What I propose, now that there are women at multiple levels of all branches of the military, is that we have a separate military made up entirely of women, in which, the number of women generals are required to match the number of men. The same being true at every rank, every branch and every level, including college education. That current women members of the army be promoted to the highest ranks to match the numbers in the men's army at equal pay. That new women recruits be brought in with the promise of quick promotion to fill the empty slots available. At the end of five years if the women have not grown to have equal numbers, that the women be able to offer double the starting pay of men, to achieve equal numbers at every rank. What I suggest is a separate women's West Point and Annapolis Naval Academy. What I propose is that the women determine what role the women's military will play in defending the US. What I recommend is that women be equally armed as the men's military but that they choose the role of "peace keepers" after the fighting is over.

NRA LINKS SCHOOL VIOLENCE TO RITALIN BUT EXPERTS DENY

LINK ELIZABETH CONLEY AP HOUSTON CHRONICLE 5/21/2018

The National Rifle Association's incoming president has linked school shootings and other violence to using medications such as Ritalin. Retired Lt. Col. Oliver North told "Fox News Sunday" that perpetrators of school violence "have been drugged in many cases" and "many of these young boys have been on Ritalin since they were in kindergarten." He also blamed a "culture where violence is commonplace," pointing to TV and movies. North's comments followed the attack Friday at Santa Fe High School outside Houston that left eight students and two teachers dead. Investigators have given no indication that they believe the 17-year-old suspect, Dimitrios Pagourtzis, used Ritalin, which treats attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, or other drugs.

Pagourtzis' attorney, Nicholas Poehl, said Sunday that he was not aware that his client was on any specific medication. He said he was surprised that someone with North's experience with the criminal justice system would "make those kind of generalizations with a case that's less than 48 hours old." An NRA spokesman, Andrew Arulanandam, confirmed North was speaking on the organization's behalf and said "there are others who share this viewpoint." George DuPaul, a psychologist at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania whose research has focused on ADHD treatment, said a deeper body of research exists on the effects of Ritalin and similar drugs than of treatments for any other condition in children. He said it doesn't support North's claim. "There's really no evidence whatsoever that links treatment for ADHD with Ritalin and drugs like that with violence, let alone gun violence," he said. If anything, DuPaul said, children tend to be less aggressive.

"Certainly, there is some concern in the scientific and clinical community about the potential overreliance on these drugs," he said, "but it's a real stretch to go from that concern to connecting these kinds of drugs to these kinds of acts." The FDA's medication guide on Ritalin says to watch for "new or worse aggressive behavior or hostility." DuPaul said the warning may be a case of being "overly inclusive" of possible side effects or a hint to underlying issues in patients. "What's more likely is that kids with mental health conditions who engage in this type of violent behavior, it's the underlying condition and not the treatment that leads to this behavior," he said.

2018 has been deadlier for schoolchildren than service members

By [Philip Bump](#) May 18, 2018

The school shooting [near Houston](#) on Friday bolstered a stunning statistic: More people have been killed at schools this year than have been killed while serving in the military. Initial estimates put the number killed at Santa Fe High School at eight. (The death toll has since risen to 10.) We can compare that to figures for the military compiled from Defense Department news releases, including both combat and noncombat deaths. Even excluding non-students who died in school shootings (for example, teachers) the total still exceeds military casualties. A large part of that is the mass shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Fla., on Feb. 14.

This is not usually the case. In 2017, the number of fatalities among service members was far higher than the number of people killed in school shootings, according to [The Washington Post data](#). After this story was originally published, Jared Keller, a senior editor at the site Task & Purpose, noted that the Department of Defense releases offered an incomplete picture of service member fatalities. Separate data compiled by the [Navy](#), including the Marines, adds another seven casualties to the total, excluding motor vehicle accidents. In May, an Air National Guard plane [crashed](#) in Georgia killing another nine — an incident not included in the Department of Defense’s reports. “**The DoD doesn’t always present a clear picture of accidental mishap-related deaths due to worries about operational security**, hence the trouble with [Public Affairs Office] releases,” Keller wrote in an email. “Back in March 2017, Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis even [cautioned](#) public affairs officials across the military to ‘be cautious about publicly telegraphing readiness shortfalls’ because ‘communicating that we are broken or not ready to fight invites miscalculation,’ as his spokesman put it at the time.”

The figures for 2018 do not suggest schools are more dangerous than combat zones. After all, there are more than [50 million students](#) in public elementary and high schools and only about [1.3 million members](#) of the armed forces. So far in 2018, a member of the military has been about 40 times as likely to be killed as someone is to die in a school shooting, including Keller’s revised figures. That said, it is still the case that 2018 is shaping up to be unusually deadly at schools. Comparing the number of deaths and the number of shooting incidents this year directly with those through May 18 of 2017, that difference is stark. The number of deaths and school shooting incidents through May 18 are each higher this year than at any point since 2000. There have been three times as many deaths in school shootings so far this year than in the second-most deadly year through May 18, 2005. **In fact, there were 36 fatalities in school shootings in total through May 18 of each year from 2000 to 2017 — only slightly more than there have been in 2018 alone.** Without the shootings in Florida and Texas, the figure is substantially lower. In 2000 through 2017, there were an average of two deaths in five or six school shootings through this point in each year. Without Marjory Stoneman Douglas and Santa Fe, the totals in 2018 would be four deaths in 14 incidents. With them, it is 29 deaths in 16 incidents.

So far in 2018, there have been 13 service member fatalities in seven incidents. Seven of those casualties occurred in [a helicopter crash](#) in Iraq in March. Three of the total number of military casualties were not related to combat. Philip Bump is a correspondent for The Washington Post based in New York. Before joining The Post in 2014, he led politics coverage for the Atlantic Wire.

Pence Is Trying to Control Republican Politics. Trump Aides Aren’t Happy.

While past vice presidents have played important roles maintaining the political coalitions of their ticket-mates, none wielded Mr. Pence’s independent influence over an administration’s political network and agenda. **By Alexander Burns, Jonathan Martin and Maggie Haberman 5,14, 2018 NYT**

Representative Jeb Hensarling of Texas needed a favor: Before retiring, he wanted to anoint a local activist as his successor. Mr. Hensarling, a veteran conservative, reached out to President Trump for help, but the White House hesitated to intervene, according to a person familiar with the overture. Instead, Mr. Hensarling found a willing ally at Mr. Trump’s right hand:

Vice President Mike Pence. Mr. Pence backed the congressman's favorite, Bunni Pounds, last month [in a tweet](#) that blindsided key White House aides.

The eager assistance Mr. Pence provided a senior lawmaker **reflected the outsize political portfolio that the vice president and his aides have seized for themselves** as the 2018 elections approach. While Mr. Trump remains an overpowering personality in Republican politics, he is mostly uninterested in the mechanics of managing a political party. His team of advisers is riven with personal divisions, and the White House has not yet crafted a [strategy for the midterms](#). So, Mr. Trump's **supremely disciplined running mate** has stepped into the void. **Republican officials now see Mr. Pence as seeking to exercise expansive control over a political party ostensibly helmed by Mr. Trump, tending to his own allies and interests even when the president's instincts lean in another direction.** Even as he laces his public remarks with praise for the president, Mr. Pence and his influential chief of staff, Nick Ayers, are unsettling a group of Mr. Trump's fierce loyalists who fear they are forging a separate power base.

In addition to addressing dozens of party events in recent months, **Mr. Pence has effectively made himself the front-man for America First Policies**, an outside group set up to back Mr. Trump's agenda. He has keynoted more than a dozen of its events this year, traveling under its banner to states including Iowa and New Hampshire. And Mr. Pence has worked insistently to shape Mr. Trump's endorsements, prodding him in the contests for governor of Florida and speaker of the House, among others.

Word of the internal tensions is getting out beyond the walls of the White House: one prominent lawmaker said the complaints of high-ranking Trump officials were starting to circulate on Capitol Hill. "They're looking for people to stay on the team, not break away from the team," Senator Lindsey Graham, Republican of South Carolina, said of the Trump side of the West Wing. Mr. Trump and Mr. Pence remain on good terms personally, and the president has largely welcomed the vice president's political guidance, according to people close to both men. And Mr. Pence has been intimately involved in planning for the 2020 campaign: He joined Mr. Trump for the meeting where the president [told Brad Parscale](#), a digital strategist in the 2016 election, that he would manage the 2020 race. **Mr. Pence stood behind Mr. Parscale, rubbing his shoulders, as Mr. Trump spoke.**

Yet in at least two instances, the vice president, Mr. Ayers and other aides have badly overstepped. **Mr. Pence recently abandoned** an attempt to hire Jon Lerner, a Republican pollster close to Mr. Ayers, as a national security aide, after Mr. Trump discovered Mr. Lerner had helped lead attacks on him in the 2016 election. The quick dismissal of Mr. Lerner was widely seen as a brushback against Mr. Pence and Mr. Ayers, a way for Mr. Trump's advisers to signal that they were closely watching the vice president's office. **Two senior White House officials said the Lerner episode made Mr. Trump more acutely aware of what these aides described as Mr. Pence's empire-building.** Tensions also flared last year, after Mr. Ayers and another Pence aide were reported to have [made suggestive comments](#) to Republican donors about planning for an unpredictable 2020 election. **Most brazenly, Marty Obst, a senior Pence adviser, told a Republican donor that Mr. Pence wanted to be prepared for the next presidential race in case there was an opening.**

For now, Mr. Pence and his aides have found a yawning opening within the West Wing, as Mr. Trump's principal political aides spend much of their time managing his impulses and vying with each other, instead of overseeing the party and this year's campaign. While past vice presidents, like Joseph R. Biden Jr. and Dick Cheney, have played important roles maintaining the political coalitions of their ticket-mates, **neither man wielded Mr. Pence's independent influence over an administration's political network and agenda.** Steering Mr. Pence's strategy is Mr. Ayers, a [35-year-old operative](#) who is the subject of the most pointed criticism from Trump stalwarts. Mr. Ayers regularly joins Mr. Pence in meetings with the president and has told associates that if aides in the West Wing cannot stay on top of things, his office will step up, White House officials said. **Mr. Ayers again unsettled skeptics in the West Wing this month by poaching a politically savvy aide to Mr. Trump, William Kirkland, to join the Pence team.** Mr. Kirkland ran

Senator David Perdue's 2014 campaign in Georgia, and Trump officials believe he will effectively run a shadow political office for Mr. Pence, a setup unheard-of so soon into a new administration. Mr. Pence's team is aware of the unease within the White House, and Mr. Ayers recently told one Republican ally that one reason Mr. Pence is so effusive in his public remarks about Mr. Trump — he has recently hailed Mr. Trump as a "champion" for conservatives and branded the recent tax cuts a "Trump bonus" for America — is to tamp down questions about his loyalty.

Alyssa Farah, a spokeswoman for Mr. Pence, said in an email that the vice president's activities were planned in "close coordination" with Mr. Trump and congressional leaders. She said they had formulated a 2018 campaign plan at a Camp David retreat in January and followed the blueprint since then. "The vice president's political and fund-raising travel advances the president's agenda by aiding targeted candidates and committees during the midterms, which is what the president asked us to do," Ms. Farah said. "Our team works hand-in-hand with our colleagues and have tremendous respect for the work they do." Ms. Farah denied that Mr. Ayers had made comments about displacing the White House political office. "Nick has never said anything of the sort," she said. She also said Mr. Ayers had not described Mr. Pence as being publicly ingratiating to prove his loyalty: "This is false."

Marc Short, the White House director of legislative affairs, said in a statement that Mr. Pence was vital to the administration's political strategy. "The vice president's tireless efforts to protect the majority in the House and expand our majority in the Senate are essential to our legislative agenda," he said. Mr. Pence and his aides, however, have plainly functioned in many cases as allies of traditional Republican Party leaders, at times checking Mr. Trump's instincts. In April, after Paul D. Ryan announced he would step down as speaker of the House, Mr. Pence urged Mr. Trump against endorsing Kevin McCarthy, the California Republican who is the House majority leader, to succeed Mr. Ryan. Mr. Pence counseled the president to let congressional Republicans work things out on their own, according to Republicans close to the White House and congressional leaders.

(Kevin McCarthy is the Majority Leader of the United States House of Representatives. He is dedicated to preserving and promoting the American Dream for all hardworking Americans. He proudly serves as Representative for California's 23rd Congressional District and as the Majority Leader of the United States House of Representatives. Kevin believes in a strong, fiscally responsible, and free America where every person has the opportunity to achieve the American Dream. In Washington, Kevin fights every day for the constituents of California's 23rd District and for the future of America with the simple promise: to have the courage to lead with the wisdom to listen.

A fourth-generation resident of Kern County, Kevin is the son of a firefighter and the grandson of a cattle rancher — raised in a working-class Bakersfield household, Kevin learned the value of hard work at a young age. Ultimately, he fulfilled his dream of opening his own small business, Kevin O's Deli. He quickly learned firsthand how government is too often an obstacle to success — a lesson that compelled Kevin to enter public service. Kevin worked hard to grow his business, eventually selling the deli to pay his way through California State University Bakersfield, where he received his undergraduate and graduate degrees in business. Kevin married his high school sweetheart, Judy. They still live in the first house they bought together — the Bakersfield home where they raised their two children, Connor and Meghan.

Kevin McCarthy is a principled conservative, who strongly believes that we must protect our nation's founding ideals. Throughout his time in public service, Kevin has earned a strong conservative record, fighting for policies that will grow our economy, keep our country safe, and protect our values. In 2008, Kevin successfully fought to include a ban on earmark spending in the Republican Party platform — and when House Republicans took the majority, earmarks were abolished. He has protected Americans from the largest tax increase in history, eliminated overly burdensome regulations that inhibit job growth, and promoted North American energy


independence. Kevin has led the fight to reduce government spending to protect future generations from carrying the burden of Washington's irresponsible choices. During his time in the House Leadership, year-over-year spending on the federal budget was cut for the first time since the Korean War. In 2015, Republicans secured the first entitlement reform in decades – saving taxpayers over \$2.9 trillion.

Throughout his tenure in public service, Kevin has advanced policy solutions that foster more private-sector innovation and job growth. As a legislator who sits at the cross-section of America's innovation economy, **Kevin has a strong interest in finding new ways to leverage technology to build a more efficient, effective and accountable government for all citizens.** As Majority Leader, Kevin has a unique ability to bring people together to solve problems and deliver meaningful results. Throughout his office, there is a mantra: have the wisdom to listen and the courage to lead.) From the Congressman's web page.

(“Kevin has a strong interest in finding new ways to leverage technology to build a more efficient, effective and accountable government for all citizens.” **This is very much in line with what Mr. Trump started out trying to achieve but because of the controlling influence of others was prevented. My vote is for Kevin McCarthy to replace Pence as vice president, mainly because he is a fellow republican that Pence doesn't like so he must not be a member of the Pence's White Supremacist, Alt-right, Nazis.**)

The same month, Mr. Pence weighed in to deter Mr. Trump from intervening aggressively in the race for governor of Florida. The president had endorsed Representative Ron DeSantis, a vocal defender of Mr. Trump and critic of Robert S. Mueller III on Fox News, in a December tweet, and privately told Mr. DeSantis to expect a joint appearance this spring. But Mr. DeSantis faces a contested primary against Adam Putnam, Florida's agriculture commissioner and a former House colleague of Mr. Pence. After allies of Mr. Putnam appealed to the vice president, Mr. Pence — along with cautious White House aides — argued against further meddling in the race, according to people briefed on the White House deliberations. Mr. Trump has yet to appear with Mr. DeSantis. Advisers to Mr. DeSantis remain optimistic that Mr. Trump will intervene again in the race, despite internal resistance.

Even skeptics of Mr. Pence have done little to block him from building his own political apparatus, and some concede he is performing a role that has been left more or less vacant. Mr. Pence formed a joint fund-raising committee with Mr. McCarthy and also created his own political action committee, taking in millions of dollars to give congressional candidates. On Monday, Pence allies sought to tamp down any suspicions of disunity by circulating word via Fox News that Corey Lewandowski, Mr. Trump's first campaign manager, was signing on as an adviser to the vice president's political committee.



Mr. Pence walks on stage at the National Rifle Association's annual convention in Dallas this month, where he earned appreciative but not overenthusiastic reviews. Credit, Tamir Kalifa for The New York Times

Hitler is in the White House "America First"

was the slogan of the American Nazi Party before they're leaders went underground after WWII as evangelists to continue their crusade of hate and death, without government oversight and free of taxes. Pence is a Christian White Supremacist Evangelist groomed to creep into a high position of power by lying about his racist roots if questioned publicly.

President of the United States of America

is, of course, the ultimate goal.

For Pence, the ends justify the means.

Jan Brewer, the former governor of Arizona, who introduced Mr. Pence at a Phoenix event convened by **America First** in early May, said he could operate more freely than Mr. Trump at this point. "We really, really appreciate him leading our party in that respect," Ms. Brewer said, adding: "His mission is maybe a little bit different than the president, and he is not under attack 24/7 like the president is."

The vice president drew wide criticism, and grumbling from White House aides, for hailing former Maricopa County sheriff Joe Arpaio as a "tireless champion of strong borders and the rule

of law.” Mr. Arpaio, who is running in a Senate race Mr. Trump’s advisers tried to keep him out of, was [convicted of criminal contempt](#) but pardoned by the president last year. Attendees at the gathering cheered Mr. Pence but said they were drawn to him chiefly because of his association with Mr. Trump. “I don’t know if he can get the nomination or not,” said Lyle Campbell, a retiree living in Scottsdale. “I like Pence very much, but I’d rather have a woman run — I’d rather have the ambassador to the U.N.” That would be Nikki R. Haley, the former South Carolina governor who currently employs Mr. Lerner and intended to retain him as a joint adviser with Mr. Pence. After opening for Mr. Trump at the [National Rifle Association’s convention](#) in Dallas on May 4, Mr. Pence earned appreciative but not overenthusiastic reviews. John Ray, a retired medical-equipment executive from Missouri, called him a useful sidekick. “He brings to the table staunch support of the president,” Mr. Ray said. “And the president needs that.”

Alexander Burns reported from Dallas; Jonathan Martin from Tempe, Ariz.; and Maggie Haberman from Washington.

There is a book, written by those who were assigned to investigate the American Nazi Party during World War II that named Billy Graham and Norman Vincent Peale as two ANP leaders that became evangelists. If you own a copy of this book, please take the time to make printed copies of it and distribute it widely to friends and family. I once had the name of the book written down back in the 80’s but unfortunately I no longer have it and I have not been able to find it on the computer. For this reason, I suspect that there has been an effort to expunge its existence from the record. I would appreciate a copy of it, even if it was printed out on a stack of papers.

They sold that Chinese technology deal to the public as if China was the only place WV and PA could get the capability to extract Rare-earth Elements from coal smoke, but if you Google this technology you’ll dozens of US businesses, colleges and private laboratories that have years of research in this very thing. No one born in this country over the age of 14 is thoroughly programmed enough to survive the purge when the Chinese communists take charge, but your all too deeply programmed for denial to face the fact that the Alt-right and the Hard-core-left are using the Russia smokescreen to sellout the country to China. They started bringing teachers from China into WV elementary schools in 2008 to teach Mandarin Chinese, not because anyone can make any logical argument for American children to be taught the language, nor because anyone can seriously imagine American children mastering the most difficult language on earth. There’s only one reason this is happening, and it’s because you all deny the truth we all know, and that is that the Chinese have been a fully programmed society since the “Cultural Revolution” and their goal is to control every living thing on earth from birth or kill it if they haven’t controlled it from birth. Which is to say that teaching our children Mandarin Chinese is a ploy to program them to allow China even greater control until they own us. If the US goes down it’s over for democracy. The people of Russia are as afraid of their secret services as US citizens are of ours, and Vladimir Putin is an ex-director of the KGB. Keep on hiding your heads in the sand while the hyenas rip you to shreds. In an interview with Charlie Munger recently, he brought up something utterly hideous that I had never heard of before, that is the concept harvesting new-born babies’ brains for use in computers. God knows that changed my opinion of this man, despite the caveat. One in sixty-five children are not born autistic, but it is no mistake that has driven this number up so dramatically since the seventies, they know there is nothing wrong with these children’s minds, I pray that what Munger suggested has never happened. But what I believe is happening with the ridiculously high number of children being diagnosed as autistic, is that they are preserving these nearly empty minds for use later when they will be so eager to occupy their

blank minds that they will gladly sit on a stationary bike with a Virtual Reality mask on and joyfully analyze communications for Chinas' Ministry of State Security to determine who should be the next to die. Keep on thinking that I don't know what I'm talking about. Keep on believing that the overt securing borders is not the best alternative to covert security. Keep on believing the Hard-core-left will usher in a better kind of communism than exists in China. There is only one kind of communism and there is only one kind of Nazi-ism, and that is dictatorship. Fear comes first, the fear that already control everything when they don't, the CIA and the FBI are under the control of the senate, but the senate is in fear of the compromising dossiers the CIA and the FBI hold over each member's heads, but they are trying to force them to comply in the face of a serious threat to their careers. Our elected president and the rest of the elected officials, right down to the city, state and county and especially the judges whether elected or appointed need the public to grant them what they could never grant themselves, immunity and forgiveness and pray they will be strong enough to forgive themselves when they come face to face with the horrors they have been lured into but are often unaware of. We need to extend this even beyond the elected officials to the fire departments and police departments because since DHS crawled out of its hole, they have been putting children in our local fire departments and police departments for the sole purpose of gathering compromising information on them. So, if you are living in fear of the knowledge that they could have compromising information of a sexual nature involving children, don't for one-minute think that you are all alone. Overcome your fear, the battle is raging inside your home.

Grace: To be in the kindness, love and favor of God. **Pride:** To delight in the glory and value of self-esteem. I celebrate you if you **remember the power of grace and pride**, and I challenge you to **choose freedom over fear**. - Janelle Monae

Analysis: China is playing the long game against Trump

Julia Horowitz - CNN - Tuesday, May 22, 2018

China knows what it's doing in negotiations with President Donald Trump on trade. In recent months, Beijing has shown a willingness to make concessions. It's lowering tariffs on auto imports. It's opening its financial markets to foreign lenders. And it will start allowing US automakers to make cars in the country without local business partners. But as notable as those changes are, China is standing firm on big issues. It's plowing ahead with its plan to dominate tech, including artificial intelligence. At the same time, China is pumping hundreds of billions of dollars into infrastructure projects in Asia, Africa and Europe — buying years of goodwill and geopolitical influence.

Trump, meanwhile, focuses on the trade deficit. But economists say that fixation is misplaced. China will continue to be a giant producer on the global stage, while the US economy is driven by consumer spending. It would take enormous long-term guarantees to alter the trade imbalance in a meaningful way — not just increases to agriculture and energy exports, which China pledged over the weekend. "This is China humoring the US," said Phil Levy, senior fellow on the global economy at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. On Tuesday, the Chinese Finance Ministry said China will cut import duties on passenger vehicles from 25% to 15% starting on July 1. It's a flashy move that would let the United States claim a win. President Trump singled out China's tariffs on cars for criticism last month, pointing out that they're far higher than **the 2.5% import duty on autos levied by the United States**. "Does that sound like free or fair trade?" Trump tweeted. "No, it sounds like STUPID TRADE - going on for years!"

The easing of import duties isn't the only move China has made recently to show that it's willing to liberalize its economy. The Chinese government has also promised to remove restrictions on foreign

carmakers that want to manufacture vehicles in the country. Previously, companies such as GM and Volkswagen had to form joint ventures with local partners in which the Chinese companies have the controlling stake. **China said last month it will phase out those rules by 2022.** And Beijing is working to lift restrictions on foreign access to the country's banking, securities, insurance and asset-management markets, with changes expected by the end of June.

Such shifts benefit China on two fronts, according to Levy. They temporarily appease the United States, and they make it look like China is taking steps to become a team player on global trade, he said.

At the same time, China remains full speed ahead on its state-directed push to dominate high tech fields from electric cars to 5G wireless technology. "The US is not going to change China's approach to technology policy," said Sam Sacks, senior fellow in the Technology Policy Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. "They certainly are not going to do it from any unilateral US action." Beijing is also expanding its global clout by investing in ports, rail lines and other development projects through its Belt and Road initiative. These plays for global dominance could position China as a much bigger threat to US hegemony (**The predominant influence, as of a state, region, or group, over another or others.**) down the road.

The Chinese government knows that Trump remains laser focused on two big issues: North Korea and the trade deficit. Trump has made it clear that he wants a potential summit with North Korea. Additionally, the president's emphasis on the trade imbalance has allowed China to provide the United States with **nominal victories by making commitments to purchase more goods.**

Even on this, experts are skeptical. Global saving and spending patterns are fairly entrenched, making bilateral trade deficits difficult to manipulate. **"If your metric is the US deficit on trade with China, the programs that have been unveiled so far are not going to decrease it significantly,"** said Nicholas Lardy, a fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and expert on the Chinese economy. "It may prevent it from increasing further."

China plans to ban sales of fossil fuel cars entirely

Darrell

Etherington, TechCrunch, 9/10/2017

China's big electric vehicle (EV) push is about to get even bigger: The country is planning to end the sale of fossil fuel-powered vehicles entirely, with regulators working currently on a timetable of when the ban will ultimately take effect, according to [Bloomberg](#). **China is the world's largest auto market, with 28.03 million vehicles sold last year,** a boost in demand of 13.7 percent vs. 2015 sales numbers. The nation has already done a lot to incentivize manufacturers to develop and sell new EVs, including allowing foreign automakers to create a third joint venture with local automakers [a standard requirement for doing business in the country for auto OEMs (original equipment manufacturers)] so long as it's dedicated to the creation of EVs exclusively.

The government has also created a number of incentive programs for OEMs, including subsidies. This will add to its positive efforts to drive more EV sales in China with the ultimate negative condition on the other side – **at some point, automakers just won't be able to do business at all in the country if they're still selling a mix of fossil fuel and electrified vehicles.** This isn't the first time a governing body has said it would eventually phase out the sale of traditional fuel vehicles: France said it will [stop selling fossil fuel cars by 2040](#) in July, and the UK has committed to the same timeline for sales of those vehicles. Critics have suggested that a ban on fossil fuel vehicles is likely impractical, because it would stretch an already taxed supply chain, **which has some hard limits in terms of the volume of lithium available for lithium-ion battery cells,** for instance. But automakers are already responding to this rising trend with expanded EV model lineups and, in the case of Volvo for instance, plans to eventually sell exclusively all-electric or hybrid cars. China's timeline for establishing this ban will be crucial in terms of

how quickly we see the global shift to EVs occur, as it's going to be an immense lever in terms of automaker strategic planning internationally, as well as in the country. THE END.

I just finished reading Dan Brown's, "Origin" and it helped me to nail down and verbalize my own beliefs. I highlighted areas and made comments in the margins as I was reading the book. I'm going to go through the book, recording the page number of the highlighted material and the comments I made about them to give you a better understanding of who I am and what I think. p. 34 "Gentlemen!" ... "Our decision need not be rushed." ... Might I suggest that we meditate privately on the matter," ... the proper course will reveal itself through reflection." p. 86 ... "whoever wrote the program for the human brain had a twisted sense of humor." ... it's not our fault that we believe the crazy things we believe." God is nature, God is not twisted. God gave us FREE WILL! Totally free of a program. The Chinese started the twisted program. They cause the chaos and program you to rationalize the chaos and accept it. Don't worry about it, don't try to understand it. Trust the Chinese, they have IT ALL under CONTROL. The important questions are! Who is programming you? & What are they programming you to do? P. 88 ... "Where do we come from? Where are we going?" ... Since the beginning of religious history, our species has been caught in a never-ending crossfire – atheists, Christians, Muslims, Jews, Hindus, the faithful of all religions – and the only thing that unites us all is our deep longing for peace." p. 95 "In the eighth century, the city of Baghdad rose to prominence as the greatest center of learning on earth, welcoming all religions, philosophies, and sciences to its universities and libraries. For five hundred years, the outpouring of scientific innovation that flowed from the city was like nothing the world had ever seen, and its influence is still felt today in modern culture." ... p.96 By the end of the eleventh century the greatest intellectual exploration and discovery on earth was taking place in and around Baghdad. Then, almost overnight, that changed." ... The study of theology was made compulsory, and eventually the entire Islamic scientific movement collapsed." ... Revelation replaced investigation and to this day the Islamic scientific world is still trying to recover. Of course, the Christian scientific world did not fare any better." Who was responsible for these historic changes that set back and divided man's thinking. The Chinese through covert mind control of kings. The thing that makes Dan Brown novels so popular is the reader friendly way in which he reveals so much of the true history of the world and the behind the scenes history of conspiracy. Of course, he has to make concessions to the powers that be to get his message out. Such as, "Inferno", I started reading it for the first time right after I finished "Origin", but I only got to page 500 and I had to bail.

p. 97 "Texas's Superconducting Super Collider – slated to be the largest particle collider in the world – ... America's super collider could have enormously advanced humankind's understanding of the universe, ..." 'Nietzsche: "Whoever fights monsters should see to it that in the process he does not become a monster.'" The full-time enhanced audio and video must be carefully constructed to record what is happening with accurate time and date readings and not becoming ultimate always connected programmer, victimizing the wearer rather than revealing truth. My writing at the bottom of p. 297 is where I found it possible to better verbalize my own beliefs coupled with a paleo-man philosophy. "Man evolved from single-celled life. Tis the nature of life. God is nature. We find proof of the existence of God in the way the natural world interacts. There is power in prayer. Premonition is a power that we all possess but it's the same as the old joke about the fact that we all have a photographic memory, for some, it just hasn't

developed yet. For those who experience the opening of the eye of wisdom, there can be the power of prophecy. The validity of evolution does not negate the existence of God. Faith in God is faith in God's profits. Jesus Christ was a great profit who spoke with great wisdom by not provoking the powers and principalities that would have crucified Him much sooner in life. As Dan Brown points out in "The DaVinci Code" it was a king that transformed Christ into a God. This is a universal phenomenon, making a deity out of great leaders and great profits that must be laid at the feet of the godless Chinese monarchy that is still essentially the same program in its latest form as the godless communist party.

I'll complete this process later but to make a long story short, my religious belief is an amalgamation of religion supported by science. p. 158 This is a paraphrase to speak directly to you about the political crisis facing the United States. 'You're wondering if the safest option might be simply to let someone else worry about all this. Safe, yes, but an option ... no.' You're going to worry about it, but the question is, will you do anything? The Chinese have stepped into Turkey offering advanced technology to be ready to take over a failing democracy. How long will it take the Chinese to step into Venezuela? They are here in WV teaching mandarin Chinese in our public schools. The deal for them to extract rare earth minerals from coal is not final. But they are here, ready to take charge when the Alt-right begins to disassemble the United States democratic republic. Communism is a republic, but it is far from democratic. The people of China are slaves owned by the party. The US businesses that have transferred manufacturing to China, don't own anything in China. Our businesses will only make a profit from the products that are produced in China as long as their contract states, they hope! But they have no control over that. Are you programmed to believe it is already too late?

Who is programming you? & What are they programming you to do? Nothing, that's what their programming you to do, they're programming you to sit on your hands and do nothing.

Imprimis May/June 2018 • Volume 47, Number 5/6

"Our Greatest Inheritance"—2018 Commencement Address Mike Pence Vice President of the United States.

MIKE PENCE is the 48th vice president of the United States. A native of Columbus, Indiana, he earned a bachelor's degree in history from Hanover College and a juris doctor from the Indiana University School of Law. After graduating, he practiced law, served as president of the Indiana Policy Review Foundation, and hosted a syndicated talk radio show and a weekly television public affairs program. He was elected to Congress from Indiana's Sixth Congressional District in 2000 and served for six terms. In 2012, he was elected the 50th governor of Indiana.

The following is adapted from a speech delivered on May 12, 2018, at Hillsdale College's 166th Commencement ceremony.

To the Board of Trustees, to the members of this remarkable faculty, to all the distinguished honorees and guests, to the proud parents, family members, and friends gathered here, and most

importantly, to the extraordinary men and women seated before me today, the Class of 2018—thank you for the honor of addressing this 166th Commencement ceremony at this beacon of liberty and American ideals that is Hillsdale College.

Let me begin by sharing a message from a good friend of mine, who's also a great admirer of Hillsdale College: I bring greetings and congratulations from the 45th President of the United States, President Donald Trump. *** I've always marveled at Hillsdale College's long, and often lonely, stand for freedom in America. This College was founded at a time of great consequence in the life of our nation—a time when Americans were deeply divided over the meaning and purpose of our country, and over the question of whether, as the Declaration of Independence says, we are, all of us, "created equal." For the founders of Hillsdale College, the principles of the American Founding were universally true—true for all people and true at all times. So upon its founding in 1844, this College became the first to prohibit, in its charter, any discrimination based on race, sex, or national origin. In the words of its Articles of Association, Hillsdale was established to provide "sound learning" of the kind needed to preserve the "inestimable blessings" of "civil and religious liberty and intelligent piety"—and so Hillsdale has done in every era since. Inscribed in a Bible placed in the cornerstone of Central Hall are the words: "May earth be better and heaven be richer because of the life and labor of Hillsdale College." And I know these words will continue to ring true for generations to come because of the men and women of the Hillsdale College Class of 2018. You are an extraordinary group of men and women who have accomplished extraordinary things in your time here, and you've only just begun. You are 366 strong, you represent 37 states and five countries, and you've persevered through one of the most challenging and transformative educations in the country. Although it seems, at times, that we live in an age of grim relativism, this class has seen the power of unchanging truth to change lives. You've learned the vital importance of character, that it is essential for self-government, and that right conduct is its own reward. It also seems, at times, that we live in an age when too many disregard the wisdom of the past. But here at Hillsdale you've been grounded in the teachings and traditions that are our greatest inheritance as Americans—the same teachings and traditions that are the surest foundation of a boundless American future. *** Today you will receive a diploma that has been minted in independence and tempered with truth. It is a day of celebration, but it's also a day of appreciation—especially for those who believed in you and helped bring you to this day: your friends, your professors, and of course, your wonderful families. Today you will graduate and enter new careers and endeavors. And before I go further, I'd like to take a moment to talk about what good timing you have. You'll be glad to know that the America that awaits your energies and ambitions is experiencing a new era of opportunity and optimism. You are graduating at a time of a growing American economy and restored American stature at home and abroad. And I can personally attest, from my travels across this nation, that faith in America is rising once again. On the world stage, we've seen America embracing our role as leader of the free world—with action just this week on Iran and North Korea. And on Monday, America will lead again when we open our new American embassy in Jerusalem, the capital of Israel. Here at home, businesses large and small are growing again. More than 3.1 million new jobs have been created in the last 15 months, unemployment is at a 17-year low, and there are more job openings in America than ever before in our history. This is no accident. Faith in America is on the rise because President Trump and our administration have been returning America to the principles that have always been the source of our national greatness and strength. We've been expanding freedom, cutting

taxes, rolling back the regulatory state, and returning authority to the people and to the states. We've been upholding the Constitution and defending the God-given liberties enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, including the unalienable right to life. The truth is, when you leave this place, you're going to find an America filled with promise, being built anew on a foundation of personal responsibility and individual freedom. And faith itself is on the rise in America as well. Despite the fact that we live in a time when traditional values and religious convictions are increasingly marginalized by a secular popular culture—a time when it has become acceptable, even fashionable, to malign religious belief—I believe with all my heart that Americans' faith in God is growing. People who know me well know that I'm a Christian, a conservative, and a Republican—in that order. As the Good Book says, I'm not ashamed of the Gospel. In fact, it was 40 years ago this spring that I put my faith in Christ as a freshman at another liberal arts college not very far from here. And while, in some areas of society, deeply held religious belief is growing rare, leading to claims that America's rich faith tradition will soon be a relic—it just isn't so. Faith is rising across America: in communities large and small, in good times and in times of great hardship, the faith of the American people shines forth. I see this as I travel across this great land, as countless Americans take the time to tell us, often with great emotion, the sweetest of words: "I'm praying for you." And I see it right now, right here, at Hillsdale College—an institution founded by those who proclaimed themselves "grateful to God for [His] inestimable blessings." Even as many continue to forecast the decline of religion in American life, the truth is, as President Trump recently said, this is a nation of faith— and faith continues to exert an extraordinary hold on the hearts and minds of our people. The percentage of Americans who live out their religion on a weekly basis—praying, going to church, reading the Bible—has remained remarkably consistent over the decades, even as the population of the United States has grown by leaps and bounds. And for my part, I've long believed that nothing is more important to our nation's future. Faith has always been the wellspring of hope for millions of Americans. It has been the foundation of our freedom as well. Our Founders recognized religious faith as essential to maintaining our republic. In the words of our nation's first Vice President, John Adams: "Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." This is not a new thought to those gathered here. Hillsdale is a place where faith flourishes. Indeed, I note with admiration that Hillsdale will soon complete construction of its new Christ Chapel, which will be the largest college chapel built in America in almost 100 years. As all of you can attest, here at Hillsdale, students and professors of many different faith traditions sharpen one another, just as "iron sharpens iron." And as you prepare to leave this special place, I encourage you to take your convictions into every facet of your lives. Add your voices and your convictions to this great American experiment. *** Class of 2018: At Hillsdale College, you have received an education uniquely grounded in American ideals. But as the Bible says, "to whom much is given, much will be required"—and so it is with each of you. Your education in the liberal arts has equipped you to conserve the foundations of our freedom, and you are now uniquely suited—and I believe you are uniquely called—to renew the fabric of our national life with your character and with your ideals. This is an ongoing and monumental task—a task not for the faint of heart or the small-minded. It will require courage and tenacity and greatness of spirit. At times, you will face opposition, even ridicule, for taking a stand for what you know to be right. But to quote Hillsdale's motto, "Strength rejoices in the challenge." And remember, the most heroic acts and the greatest feats aren't the stuff of headlines and fame. They're actually to be found in the daily choices that you'll make and the habits that you've already begun to form. So let me urge you, with the greatest respect, to continue to grow as men and women of

character. Continue to forge friendships that will help you grow and pursue what's right. Form strong, vibrant, and loving families—the foundation of our free society, where we pass along our cherished values to the next generation. Continue to build strong communities, those “little platoons” that shape the citizens within them—and, in the process, shape America. Let me also encourage you to have faith—faith in yourselves, proven by what you have accomplished to get to this day; faith in the principles and the ideals that you learned here, the principles and ideals that bind us together as a people and give purpose to our nation; and faith that America is rising, and that you have a role to play in “redeeming the time.” And lastly, I pray that you'll leave this place with faith in God. As Winston Churchill reflected in his speech to Congress in 1941, “Some great purpose and design is being worked out here below, of which we have the honor to be faithful servants.” Trust that He who brought you this far will never leave you, nor forsake you, because He never will. If you hold fast to Him, if you live according to all that you have learned and the examples that you have seen in this special place, if you rededicate yourselves to the noble mission that has always animated the graduates of this College, I know that once we get done making this nation great again, your generation will make America greater than ever before. Congratulations to the Class of 2018. You did it. This day is yours. Your future starts today. God bless you. God bless Hillsdale College. And God bless the United States of America.

College Factual: Hillsdale College Overall Diversity Unknown

While we are able to calculate at least one measure of diversity for almost all colleges, Hillsdale College is an exception.

Extremely Low Ethnic Diversity

Looking for diverse perspectives to learn from and with? This school may not be the best choice. Appearing near the bottom of our ranking for ethnic diversity with a ranking of [#2,608](#), Hillsdale College is well below average. *Hillsdale College Ethnic Diversity Rank (2,608 out of 2,718)*

California lawmakers pass toughest net neutrality law in the nation

Brian Fung - The Washington Post - Friday, August 31, 2018

California lawmakers rallied enough votes Friday to pass the nation's toughest net neutrality law to prevent Internet providers from favoring certain websites, setting up a fight with federal regulators who voted last year to erase such rules. If Gov. Jerry Brown (D) signs the law in the coming weeks, California will become the powerhouse in a growing group of states at odds with the Federal Communications Commission in a clash that could end up before the Supreme Court. The legislation, which was the subject of intense lobbying by the broadband industry, would prevent Internet providers from blocking, slowing or favoring certain websites. It would bar providers from collecting new fees from apps and sites as a condition of reaching Internet users. And it would make it illegal for carriers to exempt apps from consumers' monthly data caps if doing so could harm competing start-ups and small businesses in “abusive” ways.

The bill seeks to turn California into the leader of a widening state-led backlash against the FCC, which did not respond to a request for comment. On Friday, the state Senate tallied enough votes to pass the legislation. The state Assembly approved a version Thursday. “It would have huge

implications for the U.S., because California is so central to all things Net and is the world's eighth-largest economy," said Carl Tobias, a law professor at the University of Richmond. A lawsuit targeting the bill could eventually find its way to the Supreme Court, Tobias added. The court is already weighing whether to hear an unrelated lawsuit on net neutrality.

California similarly took the regulatory lead in passing a sweeping online privacy law in June — something the federal government has not been able to do. More than 20 states are suing the FCC to overturn the agency's decision on net neutrality. Nearly three dozen states have introduced bills to replace the defunct regulations, and three states have already approved them. California could become the fourth state to approve net neutrality regulations if Brown signs the bill. He has not taken a public stance on it, according to policy analysts, but the bill passed both Democrat-dominated state chambers by wide margins. "This is basic consumer protections, protecting small and midsize businesses, protecting activists and labor unions and anyone else who uses the Internet," said Democratic state Sen. Scott Wiener, the bill's sponsor, who represents the San Francisco area.

A patchwork of state laws could make compliance more difficult for Internet providers and lead to a legal challenge focusing on the power of the federal government to preempt state laws. In some of its provisions, the California bill goes further than the national rules that the FCC repealed, taking an expansive view of the broadband industry's public obligations. Industry groups have said a single, uniform law written by Congress would be far more effective at guaranteeing net neutrality protections for Internet users. **AT&T**, which pushed hard against the California bill through its local lobbyists, **has called for a national "Internet Bill of Rights"** that would cover Internet providers and online platforms alike, such as Google and Facebook. "The internet must be governed by a single, uniform and consistent national policy framework, not state-by-state piecemeal approaches. Governor Brown should use his veto pen on this legislation, and Congress should step in to legislate and provide consumer protections that will resolve this issue once and for all," said a statement from Jonathan Spalter, chief executive of USTelecom, an industry trade group.

FCC Chairman Ajit Pai was a longtime critic of the federal net neutrality rules. Approved under Democratic Chairman Tom Wheeler in 2015, the regulations barred providers from blocking or slowing Internet content, and paved the way for tough new digital privacy protections for consumers. The limitations provoked a loud outcry from Internet providers such as Verizon and Comcast, which said the rules would add unnecessary costs to their businesses and prevent them from investing in upgrades to their networks. Consumer groups, however, argued that the rules were vital to protect users at a time when Internet providers are focused on buying up media companies and establishing **Facebook-like businesses that mine user data for advertising purposes**. After Pai was appointed by President Trump last year to head the FCC, one of his first acts was a plan to roll back the Obama-era regulations. He sided with the broadband industry, adding that the net neutrality rules were an example of unlawful government overreach. Pai's critics have launched a multi-pronged effort to reverse that move, filing lawsuits in federal court, demanding a congressional vote to overrule the FCC and pushing for state legislation — such as California's.

The final bill passage came after the state Assembly voted 61 to 18 to approve the measure Thursday, followed by a 27-to-12 vote Friday by the Senate. Consumer groups such as the Electronic Frontier Foundation and a number of smaller tech companies including Etsy, Reddit and Sonos lined up in favor of the bill. Broadband-industry-backed groups such as CALinnovates and the Congress of California Seniors argued against it. Net neutrality has been a major policy issue in particular for smaller tech companies, which say they stand to be disadvantaged by special commercial partnerships that Internet providers could seek with large, established firms such as Google, Facebook and Netflix. Without strong rules, say companies such as Eventbrite and -Vimeo, Internet providers could engage in anticompetitive behavior that harms smaller online companies, reducing consumer choices.

The fight in California grew so intense that some state residents reported receiving robocalls warning that the legislation could lead to an increase in their Internet bills. In June, the measure appeared to hit a sudden snag when a key Assembly committee voted to strip out its toughest language — provisions that were restored two weeks later amid pressure from activists. Net neutrality activists cited their legislative victory Friday as a validation of their congressional strategy: to pressure vulnerable federal lawmakers who are running for reelection this year to endorse stronger net neutrality rules at a national level. “Internet users are still royally pissed off about the FCC’s repeal,” said Evan Greer, deputy director of Fight for the Future, a consumer advocacy group. “They’re still paying attention. And they’re not going to let their elected officials get away with it if they sell out their constituents by siding with big telecom companies.”
brian.fung@washpost.com

“Consumer groups, however, argued that the rules were vital to protect users at a time when Internet providers are focused on buying up media companies and establishing **Facebook-like businesses that mine user data for advertising purposes.** **Everyone is outraged about the NSA but what about Facebook? How did this happen? How is it “a good thing” for companies to be able to use your personal preferences to target you with advertising? How were they able to pass this off as anything other than a massive invasion of privacy? How does a state or the federal government determine whether a company is using that data to simply target consumers based on what the individual wants? If this is allowed, how can they possibly know when a company does what Cambridge Analytica has been accused of doing during the 2016 election and uses our personal information to bend and mold our preferences.** “Industry groups have said a single, uniform law written by Congress would be far more effective at guaranteeing net neutrality protections for Internet users. **AT&T**, which pushed hard against the California bill through its local lobbyists, **has called for a national “Internet Bill of Rights”** that would cover Internet providers and online platforms alike, such as Google and Facebook.” **I believe Mike Pence should be held accountable for his words about respecting states rights and that each of the 50 states be encouraged to use the California Law as a template for their law if consistency is so important. But this issue is so important and so dangerous I believe each county should be encouraged to grapple with this horrendous problem.**

They're Makin it Hard on the Workin Man

John Conlee

Stumble from my good warm bed
Monday mornin', oh my head
Gotta go & do it all again
Wake up baby, rise & shine
It's coffee, eggs & bacon time
Walk your workin' man out to the car

The boss is in his usual mood
Not one thing does he approve
Sometimes you can't keep him satisfied
Up & down the assembly line
Weary faces much like mine
Showing the wear & tear in their eyes

They're makin' it hard on the workin' man
Tryin' to make a livin' any way he can
Makin' ends meet on the installment plan
His money goes right through his hands
Heaven, help him if you think you can
They're makin' it hard on the workin' man

Big policeman in his prime
Sits behind his billboard sign
Aims his radar gun right straight at me
A letter from the IRS
Says "Boy, you're taxes are a mess"
Is this the way the good life's supposed to be?

They're makin' it hard on the workin' man
Tryin' to make a livin' any way he can
Makin' ends meet on the installment plan
His money goes right through his hands
Heaven, help him if you think you can
They're makin' it hard on the workin' man

Stumble from my good warm bed
Monday mornin', oh my head
Gotta go & do it all again
Too much room in the Frigidaire
The kids all need new shoes to wear
Payment's late on my old truck again

They're makin' it hard on the workin' man
Tryin' to make a livin' any way he can
Makin' ends meet on the installment plan
His money goes right through his hands
Heaven, help him if you think you can
They're makin' it hard on the workin' man

They're makin' it hard on the workin' man
Tryin' to make a livin' any way he can
Makin' ends meet on the installment plan

His money goes right through his hands
Heaven, help him if you think you can

Eighties Ladies by K. T. Oslin

We were three little girls from school
One was pretty, one was smart
And one was a borderline fool
Well she's still good lookin' that woman hadn't slipped
a bit
The smart one used her head, she made her fortune
And me, I cross the border every chance I get
We were the girls of the 50's
Stoned rock and rollers in the 60's
And more than our names got changed
As the 70's slipped on by
Now we're 80's ladies
There ain't been much these ladies ain't tried
We've been educated
We got liberated
And has complicating matters with men
Oh, we've said, "I do"
And we've signed "I don't"
And we've sworn we'd never do that again
Oh, we burned our bras
And we burned our dinners
And we burned our candles at both ends
And we've had some children
Who look just like the way
We did back then
Oh, but we're all grown up now
All grown up
But none of us could tell you quite how
We were the girls of the 50's
Stoned rock and rollers in the 60's
Honey, more than our names got changed
As the 70's slipped on by
Now we're 80's ladies
There ain't been much these ladies ain't tried
'A' my name is Alice
I'm gonna marry Artie
We're gonna sell apples
And live in Arkansas
'B' my name is Betty
I'm gonna marry Bobby
We're gonna sell beans
And live in Brazil
'C' my name is Connie
I'm gonna marry Charlie
We're gonna sell cars
And live in California

CHINA AND RUSSIA HAVE SET A NUCLEAR COLLISION COURSE WITH THE UNITED STATES

GORDON G. CHANG, THE DAILY BEAST TUE, SEP 4, 2018

China, the *New York Times* [reported](#) last week, “can now challenge American military supremacy in the places that matter most to it: the waters around Taiwan and in the disputed South China Sea.” Therefore, Beijing can, in the words of the paper, “make intervention in the region too costly for Washington to contemplate.” **Too costly to contemplate?** Unfortunately, assessments like these, often heard in U.S. policy circles, can embolden the already arrogant Chinese and make their adventurism—and war—more likely.

Moreover, any conflict between China and the United States in the Pacific could quickly escalate to nuclear war. **China, surpassing the U.S. last year, now boasts the world’s largest navy, and it is adding to its fleet “at a stunning rate,”** according to the *Times*. Even last year, the count was lopsided with China claiming 317 surface vessels and subs in active service and the U.S. 283. Of course, it’s not clear how capable the People’s Liberation Army Navy is. The PLAN, as it is known, has never participated in a large-scale wartime engagement at sea, and its fleet is not, on the whole, as modern as America’s.

Nonetheless, China has a few critical advantages. Its naval assets are concentrated along its shores and U.S. forces are spread around the globe; areas of likely conflict are near China and far from America; and the PLAN has some crucial weapons that are better than those of the United States, especially anti-ship missiles. Beijing has also gone big into “asymmetric” warfare, for instance militarizing fishing fleets, enlisting the [“little blue men”](#) of what has become a maritime militia.

“Beijing has clearly relished challenging the U.S. Navy and Air Force.”

The Chinese also have one other advantage: **the will to use force** to take what is in the possession of others. In their peripheral seas, they grabbed control of the Paracel Islands, in the northern portion of the South China Sea, from South Vietnam in 1974 after a short battle. The Chinese also seized Mischief Reef from the Philippines in a series of actions from late 1994 to early 1995, and they snatched Scarborough Shoal, also from Manila, in early 2012. Now, China is, among other things, pressuring other Philippine features in the South China Sea and using menacing tactics to take over a chain of uninhabited islets currently under Japanese control in the East China Sea.

Moreover, Beijing has clearly relished challenging the U.S. Navy and Air Force in the global commons, [threatening and on occasion harassing American ships, planes, and drones](#). The seizure of an American drone in international waters in December 2016, in sight of the USNS Bowditch and in defiance of radio commands, was brazen and nothing short of an act of war.

Moreover, Beijing’s harassment of the USNS Impeccable in March 2009 in the South China Sea, using its maritime militia, was so severe that it constituted an attack on the United States. “The key point is that China accepts the risk of escalation to a greater extent than does the U.S., because China uses confrontation to alter the status quo in its favor,” Anders Corr, editor of *Great Powers, Grand Strategies: The New Game in the South China Sea*, [told](#) the *National Interest* at the beginning of this year. China is apparently willing to escalate all the way. But the *New York Times*, in its reporting last month, did not mention one Chinese threat to American forces in the region: nuclear attack.

“For regional warfare, especially in Asia, the People’s Liberation Army is equipped for nuclear operations both offensive and defensive.”

— Richard Fisher of the International Assessment and Strategy Center

“For regional warfare, especially in Asia, the People’s Liberation Army is equipped for nuclear operations both offensive and defensive,” Richard Fisher of the International Assessment and Strategy Center told The Daily Beast. “If China can conjure a ‘defensive’ political moral high ground to justify offensive military campaigns to retrieve ‘lost’ territory, we should be prepared for China’s very early use of nuclear weapons to support its theater campaign. We can, for example, expect China to ‘demonstrate’ nuclear weapons at sea to deter American or Japanese military support for Taiwan in the event of a Chinese attack, or even outright Chinese use of nuclear weapons against Japanese bases supporting U.S. forces coming to the defense of Taiwan.”

And American planners have to be concerned that **China’s military partner, Russia**, would join a conflict on Beijing’s side. In September 2016 the two militaries, in an eight-day naval drill, practiced “joint island seizing missions” in the South China Sea. Moscow might even take advantage of turmoil in Asia to try to further expand its territory in Europe, perhaps using “little green men” as it did in Crimea in 2014 and later in Eastern Ukraine. Or maybe its nukes. Russian leader Vladimir Putin has long threatened the offensive use of such weapons. As Stephen Blank, a scholar at the American Foreign Policy Council, told me, “Russia evidently views nuclear weapons as a legitimate war-fighting weapon as its deployments, 22 procurement programs, exercises, and doctrine suggest.” He notes that Moscow is constructing a nuclear weapons storage facility in Crimea and deploying nuclear-capable Kalibr cruise missiles to the Mediterranean.

China has an announced “no-first-use” policy, but for decades hostile public statements from Chinese generals and diplomats have cast doubt on whether Beijing would in fact adhere to that promise in a wartime setting. For instance, in August 2011 Xu Guangyu, a retired Chinese general working at the China Arms Control and Disarmament Association, blurted out to Hong Kong’s South China Morning Post a comment indicating Beijing had developed plans to launch “a surprise attack on the U.S.” These shocking comments, at a minimum, indicate that in the post-Cold War world the concept of nuclear deterrence is breaking down.

The erosion of deterrence looks like it is working to the benefit of the Chinese. Because of China’s formidable military advantages and its willingness to escalate, there are many voices, notably Lyle Goldstein of the Naval War College and Hugh White of the Australian National University, **urging American acceptance of Chinese domination of East Asia**.

That is the wrong conclusion.

A pair of European democracies in the 1930s tried avoiding conflict with a militant state, with spectacularly bad results. Of course, the People’s Republic of China is not the Third Reich of Germany, but German territorial ambitions naturally grew in reaction to British and French timidity and Chinese ones now are expanding fast as Americans recoil at the prospect of confronting Beijing.

During the Cold War, the United States maintained a far more resolute stance. Then, Washington and its allies deterred a Soviet attack in Europe when the “correlation of forces” greatly favored the Warsaw Pact, and the West in general prevented nuclear war by deterring a foe with superior conventional and nuclear arsenals. Washington convinced Moscow—and its NATO allies—that the United States was willing to go to war to defend itself and friends, thereby keeping the peace in Europe and, for the most part, elsewhere.

Since the Soviet collapse, however, **Americans** and others think far less about deterrence and **have let nuclear arsenals age. The Chinese and Russians have noticed**. China is bulking up nuke stockpiles. North Korea, after making fast progress on both nuclear warheads and ballistic missiles, has made recent threats to use its most destructive weapons. Iran, a friend of both Beijing and Pyongyang, is not far from weaponizing the atom with their help. Pakistan, an early beneficiary of Beijing’s proliferation, already has a sizeable nuclear arsenal. Russia continues to threaten neighbors, particularly the three Baltic states, all of which are NATO members, and Ukraine, which is not.

It looks, in short, like a new nuclear age.

CHINA'S XI PLEDGES \$60 BILLION IN FINANCING FOR AFRICA AP 9, 3, 2018

BEIJING (AP) — Chinese President Xi Jinping on Monday pledged \$60 billion in financing for projects in Africa in the form of assistance, investment and loans, as China furthers efforts to link the continent's economic prospects to its own. Speaking to a gathering of African leaders in Beijing, Xi said the figure includes \$15 billion in grants, interest-free loans and concessional loans, \$20 billion in credit lines, \$10 billion for "development financing" and \$5 billion to buy imports from Africa. In addition, he said China will encourage companies to invest at least \$10 billion in Africa over the next three years.

China's outreach to Africa aims to build trade, investment and political ties with a continent often seen as overlooked by the U.S. and other Western nations. That has provided lucrative opportunities for Chinese businesses, while African nations are often happy to accept China's offers that come without demands for safeguards against corruption, waste and environmental damage. No details were given on specific projects, although Xi said China was planning initiatives in eight areas, including providing \$147 million in emergency food aid, sending 500 agricultural experts to Africa, and providing scholarships, vocational training and trade promotion opportunities. The pledge comes on top of a 2015 promise to provide African countries with \$60 billion in funding that Xi said had either been delivered or arranged.

Also Monday, Xi promoted Beijing's initiative to build ports and other infrastructure as a tool for "common prosperity" in a world facing challenges from trade protectionism. Addressing businesspeople prior to the formal opening of the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation, Xi said the "Belt and Road" initiative will expand markets. He tried to mollify concern that Beijing wants to build strategic influence, promising Chinese investment comes with "no political strings attached."

"Unilateralism and protectionism are on the rise. Economic growth lacks robust drive," Xi said in a speech. "China-Africa cooperation under the BRI is a way to common prosperity that brings benefits to both our peoples." African and other Asian leaders have welcomed "Belt and Road" but some projects have prompted complaints about debt and other problems. The initiative involves hundreds of projects, most of them built by Chinese contractors and financed by loans from Chinese state-owned banks, across an arc of 65 countries from the South Pacific through Asia to Africa and the Middle East.

In a major blow to China's ambitions, Malaysia recently canceled Chinese-financed projects worth more than \$20 billion, saying they were unnecessary and would create an unsustainable debt burden. Deeply indebted Pakistan is also reportedly reconsidering some projects in the multi-billion dollar China-Pakistan Economic Corridor that is a key link in the BRI. The Beijing forum brings together leaders from China and more than 50 African countries. Dozens of African leaders met with Xi ahead of the conference.

Xi made no mention of the political and debt concerns that overshadow some BRI projects. But Chinese officials previously have rejected accusations that projects leave host countries too deeply indebted to Chinese lenders. "China's investment in Africa comes with no political strings attached," Xi said. "China does not interfere in Africa's internal affairs and does not impose its own will on Africa."

Ethnic cleansing makes a comeback — in China By Josh Rogin Columnist 8/2/2018

If ethnic cleansing takes place in China and nobody is able to hear it, does it make a sound? That's what millions of Muslims inside the People's Republic are asking as they watch the Chinese government expand a network of internment camps and systematic human rights abuses designed to stamp out their peoples' religion and culture.

Since last year, hundreds of thousands — and perhaps millions — of innocent Uighurs and other ethnic minorities in the Xinjiang region in northwest China have been unjustly arrested and imprisoned in what the Chinese government calls

“political re-education camps.”

Thousands have disappeared. There are credible reports of torture and death among the prisoners. [The government says](#) it is fighting “terrorism” and “religious extremism.” Uighurs say they are resisting a campaign to crush religious and cultural freedom in China.

The international community has largely reacted with silence.

Horrific as they are, the camps constitute just one part of Beijing’s effort. The government has destroyed thousands of religious buildings. It [has banned](#) long beards and many Muslim names. People [are forced to](#) eat pork against their beliefs. The Chinese government’s persecution of innocents continues even after their death. [Crematoria](#) are being built to literally extinguish the Uighur funeral tradition, which insists on burials.

Add to that the unprecedented [security and surveillance state](#) in Xinjiang, which includes all-encompassing monitoring based on identity cards, checkpoints, facial recognition and the [collection of DNA from millions of individuals](#). The authorities feed all this data into an [artificial-intelligence machine](#) that rates people’s loyalty to the Communist Party in order to control every aspect of their lives. If that doesn’t bother you, consider that this draconian expansion of Chinese repression is being exported to the United States and around the world. Families of U.S. citizens who speak out against Beijing are targeted as part of Beijing’s effort to snuff out all international criticism. U.S. citizen [Gulchehra Hoja](#), a journalist for Radio Free Asia’s Uighur service, has had more than two dozen family members in China detained in the camps, including her elderly parents and her brother, who has not been heard from since his arrest last September. Many of her RFA colleagues have similar stories.

“I hope and pray for my family to be let go and released, but I know if that happens they will still live under a constant threat,” [she testified](#) last week before the Congressional-Executive Commission on China. “I came to the United States to realize a dream, a dream of being able to tell the truth without fear.”

Despite Beijing’s efforts, [mounting evidence](#) of the camps has managed to make its way to the outside world. [Massive camp construction](#) can be seen from satellites, and advertisements for new construction contracts are publicly available. **Witnesses have told their stories. Yet the world has failed to respond.** Inside the Trump administration and on Capitol Hill, that may finally be changing. At last week’s congressional hearing, Ambassador Kelley Currie, a top official at the U.S. United Nations mission, called on the Chinese government to end its repressive policies in Xinjiang and to free all those arbitrarily detained.

The Chinese government is attempting to “Sinocise religion” and **“transform religion and ethnicity in Chinese society” in a scheme more ambitious than Mao’s Cultural Revolution**, she testified. “The scope of this campaign is breathtaking.” The U.S. government has tools to raise the pressure and costs on China, should it decide to act. Commission Chairman Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) called for U.S. corporations to stop selling China items that can be used for repression, including DNA technologies and video surveillance tools. The administration can also impose sanctions on senior Chinese officials for human rights abuses under the Global Magnitsky Act. Xinjiang Communist Party Secretary Chen Quanguo, who honed his repression skills in Tibet and has now expanded them against Muslim minorities, is one obvious target.

“We clearly know horrible things are happening here to the Uighurs. And wherever there are abuses, there are abusers,” Rubio said. “It’s working. That’s the saddest part of all.” The Chinese government’s obsession with its international reputation is its main vulnerability. Calling out these atrocities in public and to Beijing directly is key. **The horror in Xinjiang is not a China issue, it’s a global issue.** China uses its position on the U.N. Human Rights Council and the U.N. Security Council not only to

stifle discussion of its actions but also to attempt to rewrite international human rights norms to allow expansion of these practices by any dictatorship with the means.

“The United States advances religious freedom in our foreign policy because it is not exclusively an American right,” Secretary of State Mike Pompeo said last week. “It is a God-given universal right bestowed on all of mankind.” Those words mean little if the United States continues to stand by while the situation in Xinjiang worsens. **We may choose to look away, but we can never say again we didn’t know.**

I Am Part of the Resistance Inside the Trump Administration 9/5/2018

I work for the president but like-minded colleagues and I have vowed to thwart parts of his agenda and his worst inclinations.

The Times today is taking the rare step of publishing an anonymous Op-Ed essay. We have done so at the request of the author, a senior official in the Trump administration whose identity is known to us and whose job would be jeopardized by its disclosure. We believe publishing this essay anonymously is the only way to deliver an important perspective to our readers. We invite you to submit a question about the essay or our vetting process [here](#).

President Trump is facing a test to his presidency unlike any faced by a modern American leader.

It’s not just that the special counsel looms large. Or that the country is bitterly divided over Mr. Trump’s leadership. Or even that his party might well lose the House to an opposition hellbent on his downfall. The dilemma — **which he does not fully grasp** — is that many of the senior officials in his own administration are working diligently from within to frustrate parts of his agenda and his worst inclinations.

I would know. I am one of them.

To be clear, ours is not the popular “resistance” of the left. We want the administration to succeed and think that many of its policies have already made America safer and more prosperous. But we believe our first duty is to this country, and the president continues to act in a manner that is detrimental to the health of our republic. That is why many Trump appointees have **vowed to do what we can** to preserve our democratic institutions while thwarting Mr. Trump’s more misguided impulses until he is out of office.

The root of the problem is **the president’s amorality**. Anyone who works with him knows he is not moored to any discernible first principles that guide his decision making. **Although he was elected as a Republican, the president shows little affinity for ideals long espoused by conservatives: free minds, free markets and free people.** At best, he has invoked these ideals in scripted settings. At worst, he has attacked them outright.

In addition to his mass-marketing of the notion that the press is the “enemy of the people,” President Trump’s impulses are generally anti-trade and anti-democratic. Don’t get me wrong. There are bright spots that the near- ceaseless negative coverage of the administration fails to capture: effective deregulation, historic tax reform, a more robust military and more. But these successes have come despite — not because of — the president’s leadership style, which is impetuous, adversarial, petty and ineffective. From the White House to executive branch departments and agencies, senior officials will privately admit their daily disbelief at the commander in chief’s comments and actions. Most are working to insulate their operations from his whims.

Meetings with him veer off topic and off the rails, he engages in repetitive rants, and his impulsiveness results in half-baked, ill-informed and occasionally reckless decisions that have to

be walked back. “There is literally no telling whether he might change his mind from one minute to the next,” a top official complained to me recently, exasperated by an Oval Office meeting at which the president flip-flopped on a major policy decision he’d made only a week earlier.

The erratic behavior would be more concerning if it weren’t for **unsung heroes in and around the White House**. Some of his aides have been cast as villains by the media. But in private, they have gone to great lengths to keep bad decisions contained to the West Wing, though they are clearly not always successful. It may be cold comfort in this chaotic era, but Americans should know that **there are adults in the room**. We fully recognize what is happening. And we are trying to do what’s right even when Donald Trump won’t.

The result is a two-track presidency.

Take foreign policy: In public and in private, President Trump shows a preference for autocrats and dictators, such as President Vladimir Putin of Russia and North Korea’s leader, Kim Jong-un, and displays little genuine appreciation for the ties that bind us to allied, like-minded nations. Astute observers have noted, though, that the rest of the administration is operating on another track, one where countries like Russia are called out for meddling and punished accordingly, and where allies around the world are engaged as peers rather than ridiculed as rivals.

On Russia, for instance, the president was reluctant to expel so many of Mr. Putin’s spies as punishment for the poisoning of a former Russian spy in Britain. He complained for weeks about senior staff members letting him get boxed into further confrontation with Russia, and he expressed frustration that the United States continued to impose sanctions on the country for its malign behavior. But **his national security team knew better** — such actions had to be taken, to hold Moscow accountable.

This isn’t the work of the so-called deep state. It’s the work of the steady state. Given the instability many witnessed, there were early whispers within the cabinet of invoking the 25th Amendment, which would start a complex process for removing the president. But no one wanted to precipitate a constitutional crisis. So we will do what we can to steer the administration in the right direction **until — one way or another — it’s over**.

The bigger concern is not what Mr. Trump has done to the presidency but rather what we as a nation have allowed him to do to us. We have sunk low with him and allowed our discourse to be stripped of civility. Senator John McCain put it best in his farewell letter. All Americans should heed his words and **break free of the tribalism trap, with the high aim of uniting through our shared values and love of this great nation**.

We may no longer have Senator McCain. But we will always have his example — a lodestar for restoring honor to public life and our national dialogue. Mr. Trump may fear such honorable men, but we should revere them. There is a quiet resistance within the administration of people choosing to put country first. But the real difference will be made by everyday citizens rising above politics, reaching across the aisle and resolving to shed the labels in favor of a single one: Americans.

The writer is a senior official in the Trump administration.

What follows will be quotes from the above article with my analysis:

This article really says it all doesn’t it! The President is being remorselessly and deeply frustrated by the **GOP** and the **DNC** swamp rats! Don’t you get it people they started to destroy me just for handing out a political petition regarding the Mexican border in the early eighties and I was just a green plumber’s helper that was scrambling because I had flunked out of college. Can you imagine what they have been up to since the young and successful Donald Trump started talking about what he would do if elected president. It would not surprise me in the least to find out that they had manipulated him into the reality

show "The Apprentice" just to try to get him into harness before he made that move. And to set up just the kind of thing as the "Access Hollywood" tape. I haven't seen it but from what I got out of CNN's Anderson Cooper's interview with Arianne Zucker 13 months after the tape was aired was just what she said, "I don't know what to believe!" in reference to Donald Trump's statements about the tape, but that it hasn't affected her because she has moved on. Well, guess what, nobody knows what to believe about much of anything anymore. Women are blaming everything on Donald Trump for what the Trump Administration is doing regarding women's health. Read the above article again and remember it was Mike Pence that tried to pass a law forcing women that have had to choose abortion for personal reasons, most of which have a lot to do with the lack of money in the first place, to spend yet more money to bury their fetus. When we live on a planet that has more than seven and a half billion people that would be better off in many ways if there were between 2 and 4 billion people. Why can't the World Health Organization just require that all children born be given a reversible neuter operation that is fully taped and fully guaranteed to be reversible with a fund set up to pay anyone who wants children and goes for the operation and finds that for some reason it was not able to be reversed is paid a million dollars at today's dollar value so they can adopt. Then everyone could enjoy all of the sex they want without the woman having to worry about her and her child starving to death. With the level of violence in many parts of the world this can put her and her child in a much less survivable situation. The reversal operation should be made as cheap and accessible as possible so when a couple want to have a child they can. I've gotten rather far from the above article. But that is the kind of world problem that our House and Senate should be wrestling with instead of worrying about things that can be much more efficiently and personally handled on the county level.

"President Trump is facing a test to his presidency unlike any faced by a modern American leader."

Yes, and the one true statement I believe that has come out of Mike Pence's mouth about our elected President, "Donald Trump is an honest man. A man who keeps his promises." But I believe as soon as this top Nazi came on board he started trying to control Donald Trump and get him to make the promises that suited Pence's Alt-Right Tea Party agenda and between him, Mike Pompeo and John Kelly I believe they control more than the agenda, I believe they control his Tweets. Mr. Trump also promised that he would have the American people's backs, but he has not been in control of anything, not even the words coming out of his own mouth. We must stand up for the man we elected and find out what he can do. Every indication I get about this man is that he is a good and deeply caring man that hated the idea of Syrian children dying from the effects of nerve gas. I don't believe this man had any idea of how powerful, corrupt, ruthless and determined the democrats and republicans are to stay in office. My guess is that he thought he would be the boss and people would show him some respect and that he would bring in some key people, like Stephen A. Feinberg as the Director of National Intelligence to lead a broad review of American Intelligence. And so, he not only had the democrats and republicans against him, he also had the Intelligence Community against him the very first week in office.

STEPHEN FEINBERG, THE PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTOR WHO HAS TRUMP'S EAR BY [STEPHEN WITT](#) JULY 13, 2017 "...GIVEN TRUMP'S OPENNESS TO OUTSIDE COUNSEL..."

As you know Senator Dan Coates, an Indiana Republican, the preferred choice of the republican congressional leadership with longstanding close ties to VP Mike Pence is the Director of National Intelligence. There will be no broad review of American Intelligence if we continue to sit on our hands and watch the swamp rats gnaw away at our president who would like nothing more than to be successful and be praised for doing great things for our country.

“The dilemma — **which he does not fully grasp** — is that many of the senior officials in his own administration are working diligently from within to frustrate parts of his agenda and his worst inclinations.

I would know. I am one of them.

To be clear, ours is not the popular “resistance” of the left. We want the administration to succeed and think that many of its policies have already made America safer and more prosperous. But we believe our first duty is to this country, and **the president continues to act in a manner that is detrimental to the health of our republic. That is why many Trump appointees have vowed to do what we can to preserve our democratic institutions while thwarting Mr. Trump’s more misguided impulses until he is out of office.**”

Listen to how this, so called Trump appointee talks down about the man behind his back. It seems to me that this person is stately plainly that they support Pence but not Trump.

“The root of the problem is **the president’s amorality**. Anyone who works with him knows he is not moored to any discernible first principles that guide his decision making. **Although he was elected as a Republican, the president shows little affinity for ideals long espoused by conservatives: free minds, free markets and free people.** At best, he has invoked these ideals in scripted settings. At worst, he has attacked them outright.”

This is it, right here, he has attacked their so-called principles because he knows they are outright lies, **free markets are the only kind of freedom that the GOP believes in.** They attack him because he won’t buy into their lies no matter how much control they wield over him, he remains defiant. And for that I, the lonely tree falling in the woods, applaud him and I call on county officials, republicans and democrats, rise above your daily call of duty and print out this document and distribute it widely to your constituents and encourage them to work out the details among themselves to occupy the county court yard to call out to the president and say; “Mr. President, we have your back, we support you, Mr. President! We want you to lead us to complete autonomy for county government. To simplify the tax code, to make healthcare truly affordable for all of our people including those who are not yet citizens. To end all secrecy so that leaks are no longer an issue. We want more investigations Mr. President. We want the Seth Rich murder investigated and its connection to the WikiLeaks DNC email scandal. And we want the DNC email scandal thoroughly investigated, let the chips fall where they may! We know the Intelligence Community, the GOP and the DNC have a great deal riding on this cover-up being orchestrated by Rod Rosenstein, Robert Mueller and let us not forget Jeff Sessions as he washes his hands of it. Lucky for him, huh, well, we’ll see how lucky he is. **We’ve got your back sir**, yes, we do, Mr. President we’ve got your back Mr. President! **Do you have our backs?** We know you advised your children to conduct themselves as if they were be taped at all times when you traveled together in Russia. This Mueller has been digging for over a year and the best he can do is break the law himself to invade the privacy of your personal attorney for the purpose of breaking attorney client privilege to steal the private information of a sitting president and all he got was Stormy Daniels. SAD. “We the People” say its time to end this so that indictments can be handed down in the case of the 911 cover-up. We want to say, **“We forgive you!”** to all of the current elected officials after Mike Pence has resigned and taken **“the most conservative cabinet in history, bar none!”** with him. We want you to be free of influence from any else. We elected you and want you to deliberate over the issues yourself. **Promise but verify.** Call on all elected officials to accept this full package but most important of all, for them to start wearing bodycams 24/7 immediately to verify if necessary that

no one is having undue influence on their decision making but also to defend themselves in the DC Swamp, they're not inflatable snowshoes but in the DC Swamp bodycams are a lot better protection. We want you to carry this message to Vladimir Putin, Kim Yong Un and Xi Jinping, "We want you to ask yourselves; 'Who is programming you and what are they programming you to do?'" and offer them some bodycams to wear so they can find out for themselves. This is the key, and I mean this is "THE REALLY BIG OMNIBEAUYIFUL KEY"! You can hate on me all you want, call me a nut case, conspiracy theorist but you've got to get this technology distributed to the general public if you want to get to the truth. I'm not saying, I know everything or that I'm right about everything, but YOU know, and I know human programming is extremely popular, and maybe you just think that's a good thing. It's not. Things haven't been getting better in the sixty years I have been alive, they have gotten much, much worse. I'm not a highly educated man but I have had two extraordinary teachers. The truth is, I'm just a house plumber. Like I like to say. "There's a reason for that. Because I'm not a rocket scientist that's why." That's my idea of a joke. Not many people laugh. Some do. I was raised by my mother almost exclusively while my two brothers and my five sisters were raised almost exclusively by my mother's brother. He was "The Big Honcho" in Mercer County WV and he had a wide territory of influence. He was the programmer, mainly of the young girls in his territory but also some boys. I grew up as an outsider an observer of this and during the sixties and seventies my five sisters spoke quite frankly about what they were being programmed to do while they were ironing their hair. Their main objective seemed to be to marry a man and raise their daughter to go to her father the way they went to my uncle. So, they would have the upper hand and be the one in control. I'm working on an autobiography and I will distribute it when I get done to give people as many examples of what went on if it is necessary to get people to admit that programming has been taking place in their family too. But I really hope you know it and can admit it and can realize that it is the main reason things continue to worse despite the fact that technology has made life much easier. The simple truth is that a woman that has the upper hand on the man in her life can not be happy. That quite simply is not the way it is meant to be in the natural world. When a woman succeeds in dominating her man, it will not make her happy and she will no longer be able to be happy with him. When women were worshipped as the sacred feminine it was a way of equalizing a relationship, which in men dominated women physically but women excelled in their knowledge of nature and midwifery. Men excelled in their knowledge of hunting fishing and the stars. Mankind never believed the world was flat based on observation and logic. This was just part illogic China spread to set science back and to disrupt mankind's increasing knowledge. It is true that the Bible is coded but it is right out there for anyone to decipher. I was taught it. The devil is not of the spiritual world the devil is of this world and the devil comes from the powers and principalities that emanate from the far-east, the orient and guess what that's where the mysteries come from too. There were no adepts with super human power, science was regaining its grasp on the truth of the natural world after the flat earth period and China once again went about spreading supernatural BS to try to set science back pondering the illogical. China is not very imaginative, but they do have thousands of years of experience programming and controlling, and they learn from those who have an imagination. Noetic science is history repeating itself, the anti-science of the mysteries revamped. When you see something when imagine you see it and believe this proof of the existence of the supernatural powers of the human mind, I'm sorry but this is proof of something else entirely, this is proof that you have been programmed to deceive yourself. So, it is only a small deception that the Bible speaks of the devil as if it is a single individual, entity or creature, "THE BEAST" when in fact it is the powers and principalities of the orient, the Chinese government or the rulers of the orient. Did you know that the Bible tells us that China the devil also refers the coming savior as the beast? But this is just another of their deceptions. The Bible also says to never point your finger at someone else because you have three fingers pointing back at you. This means that you should never zealously point the finger of accusation at another because wise men know that an effort to put on a great show that "Oh, I can't stand that, I would

never do anything like that!” more often means you are trying desperately to hide your guilty conscience. These are simple strait forward truths spelled out quite plainly in the Bible that the accomplished scholars that were Catholic nuns and priests that we referred to as sister or father so that orphans would be a member of the family of God. Then there was Vatican II that did away with teaching Latin in Catholic schools and saying mass in Latin. They even put the priest behind the altar to preach to the congregation instead in front of the altar facing away from the congregation worshipping God with the congregation. And there was the purge.

“In addition to his mass-marketing of the notion that the press is the “enemy of the people,” President Trump’s impulses are generally anti-trade and anti-democratic. Don’t get me wrong. There are bright spots that the near- ceaseless negative coverage of the administration fails to capture: effective deregulation, historic tax reform, a more robust military and more. But these successes have come despite — not because of — the president’s leadership style, which is impetuous, adversarial, petty and ineffective. From the White House to executive branch departments and agencies, senior officials will privately admit their daily disbelief at the commander in chief’s comments and actions. Most are working to insulate their operations from his whims.”

This statement; **“The press is the enemy of the people”** strikes me as exactly the words that the White Supremacist Christian Evangelist Neo-Nazi Mike Pence would have John Kelly put in the president’s mouth. The president is aging at an alarming rate under the pressure of being surrounded by people that are working against him. **“We the People”** must rise to the occasion and express our support for our elected official’s ability to shed the burden of the compromising information that has been gathered to use against them. If you do not do the bidding of the corrupt and anti-democratic, anti-republic Intelligence Community then **“WE FORGIVE YOU”**. The IC is doing the bidding of China to wreck the nearly indestructible US Constitution, buttressed by 50 separate state constitutions the only way they think they can. By manipulating both democrats and republicans to drive the national debt higher and higher until the interest on the debt is insurmountable. This is the crisis that we must avoid. We cannot stop this train wreck riding with the status quo. We elected Donald Trump because he promised to do something about the status quo. Donald Trump is not the problem, Donald Trump can be this great nation’s salvation and we are incredibly lucky that Hillary Rodham Clinton, the daughter of Hugh Rodham is not the president of the United States. Regardless of all of the trash we hear about the total lack of integrity of this president and all of the diligent searching for a way to bring him down and he is still standing. Compare that trash to the way his two ex-wives speak of this man and you will see that something just doesn’t add up here. Mike Pence is an extremely dangerous man, but in one sense, we, as a people and a nation are fortunate that Trump picked him as his running mate because in a very real sense, Mike Pence carried Donald Trump into office. Until Donald Trump chose Pence, James Comey and the FBI were backing Hillary all the way. James Comey had just publicly exonerated her of any wrong doing and it is my belief that the plan at that time was to expose the Trump-Russia investigation just before the election. But then Trump chose Pence and the whole dynamics of the threat to the status quo by a Trump presidency changed with it. The status quo had their pro-establishment blood-sucking barnacle attached to Trumps Ship of State and James Comey had to reevaluate the situation. To the Intelligence Community bent on finally being able to **“initiate the destruction of the republic.”** Mike Pence groomed by a full-blown Nazi White Supremacist Evangelist since he was 21 years old to keep himself free of scandal and work his way up and the Bush family with the help of the CIA and the FBI would help him along. Well now, James Comey and the FBI failed to stop all of the Clinton investigations and she had played it too loose and free for the past not to come back to haunt her as president and most likely bring her down since the republicans controlled the House. And Mike Pence is a full-blown Alt-Right republican and they not only controlled the House but also the Senate. This really changed things

and right then I think James Comey decided the Trump-Russia investigation could be used for a different purpose. I'm doing a lot of speculating, but I think I'm on the right track. (I'll just put this out there right now while what happened after Comey tossed the election to Trump and his barnacle. Listen here people if you think I don't know this is a deadly game I'm playing, you've got me mixed up with somebody else. And if we step up to the challenge of scraping the barnacles off of Trump's Ship of State it will be an even bigger challenge to keep Trump alive while changes begin to take place. I believe the governor of West Virginia, Jim Justice, who also happens to own the White Sulphur Hotel might be able to help by using the state police, National Guard and reserves as security, so Trump could lead the country from that remote location, the purpose that it was built for.) I'm not sure exactly why they didn't impeach him during his first month as president, but I believe it was a combination of things rather than any one thing. The main problem with that seems to be that they still don't have anything substantial to use to impeach him. Another aspect is that they quickly got control of him and were able to isolate him and frustrate him and derail best policy agenda plans like the meetings with the leaders of industry that went no-where. Clearly this did not play to James Comey's liking, but I think Comey is going to run for president himself. (The above article tosses Stephen A. Feinberg in with Eric Prince says that he was advising specifics like; the CIA taking charge in Afghanistan but that doesn't ring true to me. This is a successful business man not a mercenary like Eric Prince and Trump wanted him to conduct a broad review of American Intelligence.) What I believe is happening here with this strange anonymous op-ed is that they are creating another insurance policy to get Trump out of office whenever it seems necessary by questioning his sanity and that would explain why they are prompting him to have unusual responses to such things as the Bob Woodward book coming out. Suggesting that they beef up the libel laws just is too ridiculous to be believed. (I haven't been able to get this to all of the county commissions, so if any of you have the ability to forward email to all county commissions it would be a big help, even if it just all county commissions in your state.) Look, I know I have put myself way out there on a limb, but I believe in this great country and I believe that this country has a great destiny yet to fulfill. I also believe that this man, at this time, will play a critical role in frustrating the grand plans of the Alt-Right, as well as, the Hardcore Left to bring this country down under a mountain of debt. There, I've supplied the zealots that can only argue and criticize plenty of ammunition to lump me in with Trump. But I'll tell you something if you haven't caught on by now. I like this man, President Donald Trump and I respect him, because he hasn't knuckled under yet. It should certainly be clear to everyone that reads these articles and books that this man is being put under enormous pressure. It shows on his face. This heartless anonymous writer says that he or she is the resistance to Trump's insanity, well, I am not anonymous, I'm certainly not well known but I've got the backbone to stand up for our Constitution and the president we elected the only way I can. I hope there isn't anyone out there that still thinks we can just sit back and watch and everything will be okay. I don't see how anyone can imagine that Trump is going to be able to turn this around by himself, he can't do it alone! **No one can accomplish much all alone.** Pence and the GOP are running it and they are setting it up, so they can toss Trump out of office whenever they feel the time is right. As county officials this is how you can help our president, our country and vastly improve county government.

“Meetings with him veer off topic and off the rails, he engages in repetitive rants, and his impulsiveness results in half-baked, ill-informed and occasionally reckless decisions that have to be walked back. “There is literally no telling whether he might change his mind from one minute to the next,” a top official complained to me recently, exasperated by an Oval Office meeting at which the president flip-flopped on a major policy decision he'd made only a week earlier.”

To all of the people that have known Donald Trump for years, does this sound like the man you know or is this the result of overbearing control by John Kelly and the result of extreme frustration and deep dissatisfaction? And maybe, just maybe, the result of programming. I think this is a rather

opportune to apologize for veering off topic, this is bigger than I am now, I don't have an editor or even a proof reader. I'm not even a writer, I'm just a plumber for Christ's sake. It appeals to me now to plant reasons in your head to question my sanity, but that is the reason I am doing this despite the fact that I fear consequences. [For Christ's sake.](#)

[The erratic behavior would be more concerning if it weren't for unsung heroes in and around the White House.](#) Some of his aides have been cast as villains by the media. But in private, they have gone to great lengths to keep bad decisions contained to the West Wing, though they are clearly not always successful. It may be cold comfort in this chaotic era, but Americans should know that [there are adults in the room.](#) We fully recognize what is happening. And we are trying to do what's right even when Donald Trump won't.

[The result is a two-track presidency.](#)

We want to take this opportunity to praise ourselves, oh, forget about the rest of them I am the hero and when you discover my true identity kneel at my feet and refer to me as "The Lodestar". "Adults in the Room"! What about "The Elephant in the Room"? I had a high school friend whose family was well connected politically that explained to me quite succinctly that in political circles "The only Elephant in the Room that matters is sex with children" but Pizza-gate is just a made up story that has been completely discredited without any need for an investigation. This is the way my political friend said they talked in political circles back in the seventies, I wonder if they still say that. The result is unacceptable, and it must be corrected, and I believe it can be, but it won't correct itself and Donald Trump has been isolated and marginalized, and I want to help. Tossing them all out is not an option, there is no way to do it. Unshackling our elected officials from the compromising information being held over their heads separating them from their handlers can only have a chance of working with a very large well organized long enduring movement that takes great care to prevent violence.

"Take foreign policy: In public and in private, President Trump shows a preference for autocrats and dictators, such as President Vladimir Putin of Russia and North Korea's leader, Kim Jong-un, and displays little genuine appreciation for the ties that bind us to allied, like-minded nations. Astute observers have noted, though, that the rest of the administration is operating on another track, one where countries like Russia are called out for meddling and punished accordingly, and where allies around the world are engaged as peers rather than ridiculed as rivals.

On Russia, for instance, the president was reluctant [to expel](#) so many of Mr. Putin's spies as punishment for the poisoning of a former Russian spy in Britain. He complained for weeks about senior staff members letting him get boxed into further confrontation with Russia, and he expressed frustration that the United States continued to impose sanctions on the country for its malign behavior. But [his national security team knew better](#) — such actions had to be taken, to hold Moscow accountable.

This isn't the work of the so-called deep state. It's the work of the steady state."

Just complementing the fine work we do behind the presidents back keeping a steady hand on the ship of state. Somebody should get started scraping those barnacles off I think we're starting to pull to the right.

"This isn't the work of the so-called deep state. It's the work of the steady state. Given the instability many witnessed, there were early whispers within the cabinet of invoking the 25th Amendment, which would start a complex process for removing the president. But no one wanted to precipitate a constitutional crisis. So we will do what we can to steer the administration in the right direction [until — one way or another — it's over.](#)"

Can there be any doubt that these words treason against the United States of America.

“The bigger concern is not what Mr. Trump has done to the presidency but rather what we as a nation have allowed him to do to us. We have sunk low with him and allowed our discourse to be stripped of civility. Senator John McCain put it best in his [farewell letter](#). All Americans should heed his words and **break free of the tribalism trap, with the high aim of uniting through our shared values and love of this great nation.**”

Sounds like this person talking about the way the House and the Senate has behaved for at least 30-years.

“We may no longer have Senator McCain. But we will always have his example — **a lodestar** for restoring honor to public life and our national dialogue. Mr. Trump may fear such honorable men, but we should revere them. There is a quiet resistance within the administration of people choosing to put country first. **But the real difference will be made by everyday citizens rising above politics, reaching across the aisle and resolving to shed the labels in favor of a single one: Americans.**”

There it is, a lodestar, I can add a new word to my limited vocabulary, the guiding star, the north star. I like it. **“But the real difference will be made by everyday citizens rising above politics, reaching across the aisle and resolving to shed the labels in favor of a single one: Americans.”** I wish I had written those words. Democrats, Republicans, Americans we have some serious issues that must be resolved, and they must be resolved soon. There is something better that leads to great joy in this world. We must act, for there will be a point when it is too late. The nun that taught me the history of World War II from her own life experience believed as long as the United Constitution is still the law of the land there is still a chance. We must act.

Analysis: A storm gathers around Trump. Constitutional crises could follow. USA TODAY Susan Page 9/6/2018

WASHINGTON – A storm is gathering. The voices raising alarms about President Donald Trump’s temperament, steadiness and attitude toward the competing power centers of a democracy aren’t new; they date to his days as Candidate Trump. But the new authors of those arguments are making those concerns louder and more credible. The consequences ahead – the speed and direction of the storm – aren’t set, at least not yet. But the stakes are already pretty clear, and they could include Trump’s presidency. Consider just the past week.

Last Saturday, two former presidents, Democrat Barack Obama and Republican George W. Bush, spoke at Arizona Sen. John McCain’s memorial service with words that were hard to interpret as anything but castigation for the current occupant of the White House, though Trump’s name was never mentioned. The Washington establishment, past and present, was listening in the pews of the National Cathedral.

McCain, who was perhaps Trump’s most persistent critic within the GOP, “could not abide bigots and swaggering despots,” Bush declared. Then Obama spoke. “So much of our politics, our public life, our public discourse, can seem small and mean and petty, trafficking in bombast and insult, in phony controversies and manufactured outrage,” he said.

“It is politics that pretends to be brave, but in fact is born of fear.”

On Tuesday, details from an explosive new book by journalist Bob Woodward, published in The Washington Post, described a “nervous breakdown” in the Trump administration as top aides maneuver to prevent the president from making disastrous and impulsive missteps. And on Wednesday, there was jaw-dropping confirmation of the point Woodward made when an anonymous “senior administration official” wrote an op-ed in The New York Times describing himself or herself as a member of the internal resistance.

“Many of the senior officials in his own administration are working diligently from within to frustrate parts of his agenda and his worst inclinations,” the official wrote.

At least two potential constitutional crises could follow – from one side, over questions about the president’s fitness for office, and from the other, over the notion of what Woodward calls “an administrative coup d’etat. “Unelected officials, however well-meaning, stand on perilous legal ground when they presume on their own to undermine the decisions of a duly elected president.

“TREASON?”

Trump tweeted to his 54 million Twitter followers Wednesday evening. This uproar doesn’t necessarily mean that congressional Republicans or others who have stayed in the president’s corner are about to speak out against him, or more seriously to consider articles of impeachment or the 25th Amendment, both ways to remove a president from power. Trump retains the solid support among Republican voters – 89 percent of them in last week’s USA TODAY/Suffolk University Poll.

Trump retains the solid support of 89 percent of Republican voters.

He was characteristically defiant Thursday morning. “The Deep State and the Left, and their vehicle, the Fake News Media, are going Crazy – & they don’t know what to do,” he wrote, then ticked off what he says are his greatest achievements: “The Economy is booming like never before, Jobs are at Historic Highs, soon TWO Supreme Court Justices & maybe Declassification to find Additional Corruption. Wow!” – Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) September 6, 2018

The most piercing assault Trump now faces isn’t ideological, however. It’s not over his deregulatory agenda at government agencies or over the conservative stance of his Supreme Court nominee, although Brett Kavanaugh is facing a pounding from Democrats in Senate Judiciary Committee hearings. This debate is much more personal, centering on Trump’s judgment and character, and it is much more unusual.

Presidents have faced questions about their fitness for office before including Bill Clinton during the Monica Lewinsky investigation and Richard Nixon during the Watergate scandal. The clarity of Ronald Reagan’s thinking was a concern for some during his final days in office. But the spectacle of a president’s own top aides, in the Woodward book and in daily news stories, describing a toxic workplace and an erratic boss is stunning. So is the need Vice President Mike Pence apparently felt to deny he was the op-ed’s author. “The Vice President puts his name on his Op-Eds,” Pence communications director Jarrod Agen said. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, traveling in India, told reporters, “It’s not mine.” Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats issued a similar denial.

The furor sets the stage for whenever special counsel Robert Mueller delivers his report on whether the president’s campaign colluded with Russian meddling in the 2016 election and whether the president tried to obstruct the investigation. It makes it harder for Trump to dismiss whatever Mueller concludes as fraudulent or unimportant.

It increases Mueller’s credibility. It erodes Trump’s. And it fuels the storm.

There is Only One Conspiracy that Drives All Others! 8/4/2018

The Chinese conspiracy to rule the world has been going on for thousands of years. Whether that was the Chinese leadership during the Monarchy or the communist dictatorship, the program to rule the world through terrorism and anarchy is still the same because the leadership of China did not change when the communist party did away with the monarchy. There are two key elements that China always aims for in other democratic governments while they are forming that makes it easy for them to exploit that government: The first is that the government be centralized. The second is that the government have secret agencies. A third key element for exploitation that’s arising from the new technology age is related to the secrecy element. The third key element for China to keep our politicians moving toward self-destruction is giving surveillance a bad name. “The “Surveillance State” that’s what the utterly corrupt godless China is, nobody wants that!” But it is surveillance technology that is the key to revealing the way programming humans is accomplished. Surveillance can totally replace covert security with overt security. The programming of all living humans is the goal of the Chinese leadership. The non-governmental element that China brings to bear upon a country is “Organized Crime.” The Tong is where organized crime originated, and all other crime organizations flowed from it. There is only one way to win this, and that is

to develop the third eye technology that every individual can use to free themselves from their programmers. Obviously Xi, would be the most important person to have use this enhanced audio and video bodycam. Xi is a human being and every human being has that "Saving Grace" of the singularly human desire to regain his freewill. All men are born with freewill and all men retain a driving force within themselves to regain their freewill until the day they die, no matter how early in life it is taken away or how often the program is reinforced. I suspect that being so thoroughly programmed that you would commit "Hara Kiri" is the highest level of control that these monsters can drive someone to. This is not a choice, this is an example of the most extreme programming. Even this extreme level of being controlled by hand signals or any other form of cue or prompt will begin to be quickly overcome once the victim has been freed from his handler. The scary thing that is happening here and now is that people are being so influenced and manipulated by the DNC, the GOP and the media, all of whom are scared to death of Trump actually "Draining the Swamp" and leading the country himself, without being manipulated and controlled by others that they openly speak of keeping control of him.

Bill Kristol: 'Reasonable people' are hoping John Kelly and H.R. McMaster 'run the White House' with Bannon gone by Daniel Chaitin 8,19, 2017

Bill Kristol, editor-at-large of the *Weekly Standard*, said on Saturday that the "battle of Bannon" is over after the ouster of chief strategist Steve Bannon, and expressed hope that John Kelly and H.R. McMaster will "run" the White House. "Stephen Bannon is no longer a senior official of the government of the United States," Kristol, a longtime critic of Trump, said in a tweet bearing the hashtag "#MakingAmericaGreatAgain."

He added that Kelly, the chief of staff, and McMaster, the national security adviser, now have an opportunity to rein in Trump. "The hope (destined to be to some degree forlorn) of all reasonable people: Kelly and McMaster run the White House," Bannon said, adding "Trump only lives there." Bannon, along with his right-wing allies, notably had clashed with McMaster during his time in the White House. Allies of Bannon had come to aid his cause by pushing damaging stories about his opponents like McMaster, including labeling them as leakers.

In a statement reminiscent of a *Lord of the Rings* quote, Kristol said, "The battle of Bannon is over. **The battle of Trump is about to begin.**" "Upon this battle depends the well-being of our constitutional republic," he added. Earlier in the month, **Kristol said he has** initiated informal talks about creating a "[Committee Not to Renominate the President.](#)"

"Not content with their success in Iraq, neocon stalwart Bill Kristol in the *Weekly Stanard* (July 24, 2006), writes. 'We might consider countering this act of aggression' – that's what he calls the Lebanon war – 'with a military strike against Iranian nuclear facilities. Why wait? Does anyone think a nuclear Iran can be contained? That the current regime will negotiate in good faith? It would be easier to act sooner rather than later. Yes, there would be repercussions – and they would be healthy ones, showing a strong America that has rejected further appeasement.' □ As Kristol certainly knows, the shoe is on the other foot. The Iranian government has been proposing negotiations for years." Noam Chomsky "Targeting Iran"

POLITICAL POSITIONS OF NOAM CHOMSKY FROM WIKIPEDIA, THE FREE ENCYCLOPEDIA

ON TERRORISM

Obama, first of all, is running the biggest terrorist operation that exists, maybe in history.

— *Noam Chomsky (2013)*[□]

In response to US declarations of a "War on Terrorism" in 1981 and the redeclaration in 2001, Chomsky has argued that the major sources of international terrorism are the world's major powers, led by the United States government. He uses a definition of terrorism from a US army manual, which

defines it as "the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to attain goals that are political, religious, or ideological in nature. This is done through intimidation, coercion, or instilling fear."¹⁰ In relation to the [US invasion of Afghanistan](#) he stated:

Wanton killing of innocent civilians is terrorism, not a war against terrorism. (9-11, p. 76)

On the efficacy of terrorism:

One is the fact that terrorism works. It doesn't fail. It works. Violence usually works. That's world history. Secondly, **it's a very serious analytic error to say, as is commonly done, that terrorism is the weapon of the weak.** Like other means of violence, it's primarily a weapon of the strong, overwhelmingly, in fact. **It is held to be a weapon of the weak because the strong also control the doctrinal systems** and their terror doesn't count as terror.

The fact that the United States was able to come into existence with 50 separate state constitutions makes it far more difficult to bring down. This is the reason the democrats and republicans are both being manipulated into braking us with the national debt. I expect that Hillary Rodham Clinton still could be elected president despite all the evidence that she colluded with Russia to turn over 20% of our uranium production to them. We must, "Praise God" that our electoral college saved us from that powerful machine, but we should be able to recognize that something larger and more sinister was able to put Barack Obama, Loretta Lynch and Condoleezza Rice in power at just the time the Alt-Right Tea Party would be carried to power by Donald Trump. But make no mistake about it Donald Trump was no part of this larger more sinister plan. **Donald Trump is the "Fly in the Ointment"** and we must recognize the blessing that this man is and free him from these controllers. Even though his families minister was Norman Vincent Peale, I do not believe our president is a racist Nazi, our Vice President is. I believe this because of what Trump's ex-wives say about him. Norman Vincent Peale's and Billy Graham's mission was to draw as many followers to them as possible and put the fact that they were leaders of the American Nazi Party during WWII as far behind them as possible. But Mike Pence is an evangelist who preaches White Christian Supremacy from the pulpit according to "The Intercept". Mike Pence tried to make it law that women must burry their aborted fetus and Mike Pence has been so manipulative of this president that he used his wife to block the appointment of Trump's choice to head the Veteran's Hospital. His new spaced out branch of the military will accomplish one goal in one hell of a big hurry and that is to run our national debt right off the cliff.

In the book "Compromised" by Seamus Bruner of the Government Accountability Office, he speculates on what FBI agents are referring to when they speak of "The Insurance Policy" and his apparent answer is that if Trump got elected the FBI would use the Dossier to impeach him. I agree with that up to a point, but I think there is much more to this Insurance Policy than anyone is willing to come out and say. Paul Manafort was clearly a plant, he practically begged for a job, he offered to work for free for Christ sake, and this is a man risking everything, certainly his own life for money in the Ukraine. "Manafort had repeatedly sought to play a role in the Trump campaign and offered his services *gratis*. Trump and Manafort's mutual friend, Tom Barrack, advocated for Manafort's hire through Trump's son-in-law Jared Kushner." Page 98 "Compromised."

"Another exchange between **FBI agents ominously discussed their disdain for 'the republic.'** 'I mean, **I never really liked the Republic anyway,'** said one of the agents. '**...I have initiated the destruction**

of republic...' the other replied." Page 29 of "Compromised." Just mentioned in the book as an ominous exchange but considering what we have known about J. Edgar Hoover for many years, the man who started the FBI and led it for an unprecedented 50 years, rather than being the exception to the rule, this is almost undoubtedly an unwritten requirement for employment in the FBI, or at least a desired result of the first year of employment orientation training. Just as Hoover hated his own black heritage and tried to hide it, we find this is a common theme on many levels of programming. Girls ironing their hair because they've been programmed to hate curly hair and curling their hair because they've been programmed to hate straight hair. Self-hate is a primary goal of programming because when you hate yourself you are capable of any heinous act.

"Angels and Demons" by Dan Brown, page 441, "Infiltration had always been the illuminati powerbase – rearrangement of power from within." This is true about the illuminati because they had already been infiltrated by the true master infiltrators, the Chinese government or leadership. The Chinese are the original infiltrators and they have always done it by programming someone that is already a member. So, infiltration may not be the correct word to describe what they do, or how they go about it. And when it is a secret agency, it is usually a fully programmed dupe of the Chinese that is working to start the agency and they put a Chinese dupe in command of the agency. J. Edgar Hoover is a perfect example. He started out denying organized crime existed while constantly working to undermine the United States House and Senate. Acquiring information of a sexual nature on the members so that he could control them. Of course, he had to do some things to keep up the appearance that he was a law enforcement officer. And he did some good things for law enforcement, which is why it took so long for Congress to catch on to what he was truly up to. When they did he already had compromising information on them and they couldn't make a peep about his true agenda for the FBI. This was very well known long before he died, but he had Congress so sewed up that no one was willing to talk about it until after his death.

One Chinese technique is to foment hate of a specific group, such as the Jewish illuminati that controlled large portions of the banking business (50 years ago, everyone agrees with Dan Brown that the illuminati disappeared, "POOF", they just left behind their plan to drive refugees into Europe and create vacuums in the middle east for Iran, aided by China to exploit), and then expand that hate to all Jews. They had infiltrated the Jewish bank owners well before World War II and given them a bad name by corrupting them and using them to achieve their nefarious goals. After WWII ended, six million Jews were dead in Germany and millions more in Russia, and yet the ones that controlled the banks had mostly survived. One of their most twisted techniques of hate and extermination is to create a group to be hated and then use that group to exterminate itself. An example of this during WWII was gays. The Chinese conspiracy to control the world has been developing the Gay community for centuries. Just as their influence in the world was first aimed at controlling the kings and the ruling classes, this is also where they started programming men to be gay. In Germany, gay soldiers, who believed no one knew they were gay, were asked to identify the people they thought to be gay, so they zealously identified their gay friends to make it clear that they were not gay. Sadly, our own infiltrated, misguided government has done the same thing, after they had been compromised by behavior that was not illegal, very common but not a topic of conversation outside of the home because it had been gradually transformed from normal behavior protected by the constitutional right to privacy into a sin by the religious community and only later made

illegal in 1973. Something that the followers of the Paleo-man philosophy might get. That is a warm and touching and totally natural oral cleansing of each other and their children. This is totally natural for all land mammals, and that is exactly what human beings are, land mammals. You're an animal, a land mammal, get used to it. It creates no conflict for me to say I believe in God and evolution is the way God created all living things on the earth. This is because I believe God is nature! What verifies to me that nature is God is the apparently supernatural way nature provides everything the animal kingdom needs to thrive. I believe that the God that is nature goes beyond the earth to the entire universe. I believe this is how religion began, by man's awe at the natural world and that women became sacred because of the role they play in the natural world, because they give birth to all children. Dan Brown, the most widely read writer on earth is bringing to the public many great truths (and misleading lies) in a very "novel" way. Sadly, women have never been less worthy of being worshipped as the "Sacred Feminine" than they are today. And Baphomet has been presented as symbolic of the devil for nearly a thousand years, it cannot possibly arise like a phoenix from the ashes and become, once again, symbolic of the sacred feminine. Although this very thing appears, on the surface, to be making an astonishing comeback. These women who openly portray themselves as witches, casting spells and displaying ram's horns have not acquired the deep understanding of nature and midwifery that led to the worship of the "Sacred Feminine", they are practicing a devil worship exactly as it was portrayed by those that demonized the "Sacred Feminine" and Baphomet to crush worship of the "Sacred Feminine". To be fair to Mr. Brown he warns of this very thing being an issue.

I'm going to carry-on a bit about the truth and lies in Dan Brown books, what I was taught by my mother about Bible code and the inability for programmed people to think, therefore they rely on zealous arguments and become known as zealots. I'll give some kudos for his revealing the history, that I assume was documented by the scribes of the Roman emperor Constantine, that Jesus became a deity as the result of a vote during the Council of Nicaea. And for this eloquent description; "The vast majority of educated Christians know the history of their faith. Jesus was indeed a great powerful man. Constantine's political maneuvers don't diminish the majesty of Christ's life. Nobody is saying Christ was a fraud, or denying that He walked the earth and inspired millions to better lives. All we are saying is that Constantine took advantage of Christ's substantial influence and importance. And in doing so, he shaped the face of Christianity as we know it today." Da Vinci Code. The Bible is a code, but it is not a deep and difficult code to understand but that truth is revealed in original Jewish and Christian scriptures.

China was able to manipulate the forming of our nation to become centralized through the "Federalist Papers" even though the "Anti-federalists" were clearly in the majority among the people and to make our financial system a giant "Ponzi Scheme", as Noam Chomsky describes it. Like all matters of governing people, the people with the money have the greater influence and China had been manipulating monarchies for thousands of years. Quotes from John Dos Passos' book "The Head and Heart of Thomas Jefferson": ... "the real leader of the party of the rich and well born was Alexander Hamilton." ... "Hamilton's political reputation ... resulted from the success of *The Federalist Papers*." ... "Hamilton's financial system . . ." wrote Jefferson in the preface to *The Anas*, "had two objects. 1st as a puzzle to exclude popular understanding & inquiry. 2nd as a machine for the corruption of the legislature; for he avowed the opinion that man can be governed by one of two motives only, force or interest: force he

observed in this country was out of the question; and the interests therefore of the members must be laid hold of, to keep the legislative in unison with the Executive. And with grief and shame it must be acknowledged that his machine was not without effect. That even in this, the birth of our government, some members were found sordid enough to bend their duty to their interest and to look after personal rather than public good.”

China has shown great patience in taking the reins of the world and we must also be patient in winning the reins of the world for the people. Trump has made many moves in the right directions when Kelley and Pence have been unable to prompt his every move and utterance. Encouraging Europe to pay for their own defense and building up our borders are an absolute necessity. When our leaders say they do not want to create a vacuum in Iraq and Afghanistan yet refuse to engage in “Nation Building” they are doing exactly that, creating a vacuum for our enemies to rush in and take control. What we must do is to stop playing China’s game of secrecy and play our own game, by returning to the most basic rules of self-defense. Our people believe in democracy and are willing to fight for it, but our CIA and FBI despise it, and will not promote it. It would have been much easier for us if we had followed George Washington’s advice to stay out of foreign affairs. If we had decentralized our government as soon as our military was strong enough to defend ourselves and stayed out of the secret agency trap we would be much better off today. By concentrating on our own affairs and leading by example monarchies and all other forms of dictatorship would have crumbled by now. But we must analyze where we are today and prepare a plan accordingly.

The information that supports my thesis is vast, like most investigations throughout history, you seek the truth by following the money, but there is little twist in this investigation, you need to follow the “Real Money”, the gold. There is a reason all gold is eventually is destined for China, answer that question and you will likely come to the same conclusion that the Catholic Nun that was my fifth-grade teacher at Saint Andrews in Roanoke, VA had come to, and taught us. Their programming our president to say and do things to be a distraction and to make it easier to impeach him if need be. It’s all kind of sophomoric from my point of view, General Kelly programs him to say something ridiculous, then when he stands before the world and says exactly what Kelly programmed him to say and likely prompted him to say, Kelly cringes like, “I can’t believe he said that.” Then the media reports, “Trump went off script again.” This paper could go on without end, but I could never organize it like the opening portion, that was supposed to be the end of it. Everything seems so complex that there are no answers, but that is simply “The Grand Illusion” because the answers are truly quite simple. Decentralize our government so that money no longer flows out at a phenomenal rate. Simplify the tax code so that it facilitates a liberal price control to replace the modest integrity of the past. Make Medicare and Medicaid the best deal there is for insurance and let the counties manage it. Federal employees have a “Credit Union” but if residents of each county have their own Credit Union it’s called communism, why is that? End secrecy at every level of government and replace covert security with overt security. I believe I have adequately described exactly how this can be done **while taking individual privacy to a much, much higher level than we enjoy today.** Develop, produce and distribute miniature audio and video bodycams and continue to develop this technology to recognize when someone is using repetitious programming methods and give a silent warning to the wearer. Continue to develop this technology so that it can listen to and view a computer and detect if the

computer is attempting to manipulate or persuade the user. If you are involved in programming, you are being used to eventually cede all power to the Chinese. The Chinese have been using programming for thousands of years and they are the masters of programming. Programming is their game. To defeat them we must defend ourselves against being programmed. We cannot win anything playing China's game. We must play our own game. Education is entirely different from programming. Our Founding Fathers knew the importance of education but our colleges and universities are being brought to their knees by the simple mindedness of programming. Our intelligence agencies have been duped into believing they are ahead of the game where programming is concerned but the truth is, as soon as they got involved in programming, they were in way, way over their heads.

Furthermore, we need to cut off the flow of foreign aid until the national debt is paid in full and provide real foreign aid at a tenth of the cost by relieving Europe of the burden of being overwhelmed by refugees. We are a country of vast land and great quantities of food and we need all kinds of workers that our schools are failing to provide. I believe immigrants can help us solve the problems we have in education, as well. Here's how, pull our military out of Europe and South Korea, obviously not in a way that creates a vacuum. We need to bring all National Guard and Reserves state side, as well as, all enlisted personnel with less than four years in the military, no exceptions. Concentrate the Navy in and around the Philippines and back-off from China and North Korea. Support North and South Korea working out their problems for themselves but stop short of supporting reunification. Don't worry about China's man-made islands just concentrate on keeping the shipping lanes open and curtailing piracy. Be patient with China, levy tariffs to replace the flow of money into the federal government by personal income tax going solely to the counties but make it an across the board 15% tariff on all goods entering the country. Concentrate all enlisted military personnel with more than four-years' experience in only three regions. Afghanistan, Iraq and the Sahara Desert. Secure the borders of Iraq and Afghanistan and begin welcoming but disarming refugees. Begin electing leaders on the county level and begin educating the advantages of a constitution resembling our own Constitution and encourage the establishment of separate regional constitutions that unites the Kurds in the north and so forth. How can our General Mattis allow Iran to have such upper hand in Iraq that the people are rioting because of it. What we are doing is worse this creating a vacuum and letting Iran walk in, we are ushering them in. In the Sahara Desert begin constructing massive underground aqua ducts bringing saltwater from the Mediterranean a couple of miles inland to pass through massive reverse osmosis desalination and purification plants to bring fresh water to the people that will come and to cool the driving force behind the Florida Hurricanes. Call for and work toward, the end of all dictatorships and all remnants of a monarchy, including England and especially the United Arab Emirates. Bring Netanyahu down, grant all lands promised to the Palestinians and allow the newly elected leaders of Israel and Palestine to work out the details of securing those borders themselves. Inform the European Union, South Korea and Israel that "We have your backs, but it's going to be **way back** unless need be. If need be, we will be there, in a big way."

Our intelligence agencies are striving hard to create the illusion that their work is necessary to protect us from the evil in the world, but it is **OUR INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES**, the CIA and the FBI, doing China's bidding that is the greatest source of evil in the world. They want us to believe that the intelligence they gather is what protects us from China and Russia, but this is just an illusion. It is our superior

technology that keeps China from stepping out and using overt aggression to achieve their goal of total world control. But it is our intelligence community doing us the greatest damage right now by using the power they wield over Congress through the compromising information they have collected on both parties to drive up our debt to China until they own us. The Republicans call the Democrats the "Tax and Spend" party that drives up the debt, but the Republicans give tax breaks to the rich and continue to drive up the debt. The whole "Russia Collusion" hearings with Congress trying to get information from the intelligence agencies is a hideous charade to run the national debt off a cliff. It was nuts for Obama to push through the Affordable Care Act in the face of a recession, but Mike Pence wants to create the US Space Command when the national debt is 21 trillion 456 billion plus and rising at an alarming speed at 1PM on 9/2/2018. The national debt clock is going to document the sinking of our ship. Our military strength is what stands between China's quest for a world dictatorship and Democracy, sadly our intelligence community is working against us. Personal surveillance audio and video enhanced to detect subliminal messaging is the key.

To defeat China, we must decentralize and do away with secrecy of all kinds, we must make secrecy in government illegal. Investigations and allegations must be on the table, in the public eye for everyone to see. Don't get me wrong about the cost of investigations because there will be hundreds of investigations necessary to straighten this mess out, but there will be plenty of money with which to conduct them, not debt. There should be no stigma when cleared. Lie detector tests are complete and utter FBI "BS" and they should be forever shelved, put away and forgotten.

For the WV white water enthusiasts, you might recall an obscure "Crash & Burn" tape spliced together from the New and Gauley Rivers in the early nineties when these prophetic words were spoken at the upper Gauley put-in one early morn: "We're gonna take it real close to the edge and bring it right back!" (Well, they seemed prophetic to me afterwards, considering Rusty Levine's comment about a guy putting in a canoe at the Gauley Dam flood gates, "Wow," he said, "that guy must be some boater to take his girl down the Upper-Gauley in a canoe!" We had to bag them, [toss them a rescue rope], at the first real rapid and decided to hang close to them for the rest of the trip, and it was a good thing for them that we did, believe me! Thanks to Rustys' experience and alertness, not mine, I was fairly new at it myself.) We're real close to the edge now my friends! Only "WE THE PEOPLE" guided by county officials providing "Permits of Assembly" in county courtyards across the country continuously until we are back on the right track can "bring it right back" the right way.

Are you ready?

One more time. Billy Joel
"We Didn't Start the Fire"

Harry Truman, Doris Day, Red China, Johnnie Ray
South Pacific, Walter Winchell, Joe DiMaggio
Joe McCarthy, Richard Nixon, Studebaker, television
North Korea, South Korea, Marilyn Monroe

Rosenbergs, H-bomb, Sugar Ray, Panmunjom
Brando, "The King and I" and "The Catcher in the Rye"
Eisenhower, vaccine, England's got a new queen

Marciano, Liberace, Santayana goodbye

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
No we didn't light it
But we tried to fight it

Joseph Stalin, Malenkov, Nasser and Prokofiev
Rockefeller, Campanella, Communist Bloc
Roy Cohn, Juan Peron, Toscanini, dacron

Dien Bien Phu falls, "Rock Around the Clock"

Einstein, James Dean, Brooklyn's got a winning team
Davy Crockett, Peter Pan, Elvis Presley, Disneyland
Bardot, Budapest, Alabama, Krushchev
Princess Grace, "Peyton Place", trouble in the Suez

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
No we didn't light it
But we tried to fight it

Little Rock, Pasternak, Mickey Mantle, Kerouac
Sputnik, Chou En-Lai, "Bridge on the River Kwai"
Lebanon, Charlse de Gaulle, California baseball
Starkweather, homicide, children of thalidomide

Buddy Holly, "Ben Hur", space monkey, Mafia
Hula hoops, Castro, Edsel is a no-go
U-2, Syngman Rhee, payola and Kennedy
Chubby Checker, "Psycho", Belgians in the Congo

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
No we didn't light it
But we tried to fight it

Hemingway, Eichmann, "Stranger in a Strange Land"
Dylan, Berlin, Bay of Pigs invasion
"Lawrence of Arabia", British Beatlemania
Ole Miss, John Glenn, Liston beats Patterson
Pope Paul, Malcolm X, British politician sex
JFK, blown away, what else do I have to say

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
No we didn't light it
But we tried to fight it

Birth control, Ho Chi Minh, Richard Nixon back again
Moonshot, Woodstock, Watergate, punk rock
Begin, Reagan, Palestine, terror on the airline
Ayatollah's in Iran, Russians in Afghanistan

"Wheel of Fortune", Sally Ride, heavy metal, suicide
Foreign debts, homeless vets, AIDS, crack, Bernie
Goetz
Hypodermics on the shores, China's under martial law
Rock and roller cola wars, I can't take it anymore

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
But when we are gone
Will it still burn on, and on, and on, and on...

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
No we didn't light it
But we tried to fight it

We didn't start the fire
It was always burning
Since the world's been turning
We didn't start the fire
No we didn't light it
But we tried to fight it

Thank You,
Robert James Casey
134 Creek Road
Moatsville, WV, 26405

Sayers, Margery

From: Ginna Rodriguez <rodriguez.ginna@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 11:23 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Questions on related to TAO1-FY2019

Dear Council Members:

Below are some questions I have related to the Ellicott City Flood Mitigation Plan that I would like to have the opportunity to discuss with you or other people you think can provide answers.

During the 9/4 presentation, Jim Lee of the National Weather Service mentioned that storms that can produce rain like the 30 minutes before 4:30 PM on May 27th 2018 have a probability of occurring of 1 in 10 percent chance. Did he mean 10%? Is he saying that the probability of a destructive storm in Ellicott City is 10%? When he was asked by Mr. Fox about the likelihood of an event like the one in 2018 occurring, he did not answer. I would like to better understand what probability did he meant.

What changes is the county planning to implement to prevent a daycare center to operate on Main st. going forward? **I would like to learn more about the emergency system initiative from the Department of Homeland Security. We would like to learn more about the timeline of implementation, and the specifics about how residents, business owners, and visitors will be alerted of imminent danger. Are there any plans to encourage people to have a plan for evacuating when there is a high risk of flooding? How are we alerting car traffic of the risk of floods? How are the gauges going to be used to alert residents? We believe there are gauges already deployed that should be monitored, are these being monitored? Does the initiative from the Department of Homeland Security include rain gauges as well as cameras that can feed a predictive model and will enable the issuing of more precise flood watches and warnings with specific instructions that can be texted in the immediate OEC area and blared via sirens / emergency speakers? This is the most urgent life-saving strategy that is immediately needed in many dangerous areas in the watershed, not just the last few hundred feet of main st. We believe this system would give enough warning to residents to evacuate, stay away from the roads, and take other precautions to ensure that lives are preserved and damage is minimized.**

The current plan does not include stormwater retention projects for the New Cut branch. Can you share more details on the reasoning behind it? In the report, there is mention of these likely being high hazard dams, what makes them high hazard dams? Is there an opportunity for site acquisition in the New Cut branch so that we can address the area that contributes the most volume of water. If larger volume ponds are deemed dangerous in the New Cut Branch, why are we dismissing using many smaller ones for this watershed. How do we plan to protect New Cut Rd, or are we just giving up on this thoroughfare?

Who could provide additional details on why we are not considering placing a large culvert under the stream channel itself? I would like to understand if the costs and engineering challenges to deepening the channel sufficiently to achieve this in the critical areas have been studied in detail (geologic and structural engineering analyses). It seems that these have been dismissed as impractical due to the bedrock and left at that but is that impression accurate?

Why is the culvert under main being dismissed as undesirable or practical? During the presentation Chris Brooks seemed to indicate that the major drawback of this idea was the it would close the road for several months. Several months does not sound like a lot. Where can we find information about the cost of this proposal? Additionally, the results are only marginally worse than the expanded stream model that provides the same equivalent conveyance

benefit, (7.5 – 8 ft/s vs 6.7 ft/s). What would happen if a bigger (deeper) culvert was placed vs the one proposed? Could this solution outperform the current plan, allowing the business to operate with minimal risk after implementation?

In the McCormick Taylor, the tunnel boring plan and the results presented on page 40, is this the result of the implementation of the tunnel bores alone or is this the result of the implementation of the tunnels in addition to the implementation of 400 acre-feet of stormwater retention ponds identified by McCormick? If these are the results for the implementation of the retention ponds and the tunnel bores, do we know the effect of just implementing the tunnel bores and particularly the tunnel bore 2 which addresses flows from the New Cut Branch?

Again, please let me know who I can reach out to discuss these questions, or do you plan to including these questions as part as the working session.