



The Solari Report

March 21, 2019

Tax & Spend – The Next Deep State Harvest with Amy Benjamin



Catherine Austin Fitts

Amy Benjamin



***Tax & Spend –
The Next Deep State Harvest
with
Amy Benjamin***

March 21, 2019

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to The Solari Report. We have a wonderful treat for you today. Amy Benjamin, who is a lecturer at the School of Law at the Auckland University of Technology and has researched and published in many academic journals, articles on false flags, state terrorists, secrecy in the rule of law and is a former attorney at the Department of Justice, has joined us. She was with us last year.

In October 2017 she published a marvelous paper, which I strongly recommend to you called ‘The Many Faces of Secrecy’. In fact, for months Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson was part of the peer review at William & Mary. For months he kept saying, “There is this fabulous article, and I can’t tell you what it’s called and I can’t tell you who it’s by, but you are just going to absolutely love it.”

Finally it was published, and I was so impressed with Amy’s analysis of secrecy and how it is engineered and written in a way that a person who is not an expert in these areas can really understand.

I called her because I was headed down to Australia and then to New Zealand, and I said, “Will you meet me in Auckland?”



In the spring of 2018 we met and did a Solari Report called “The Many Faces of Secrecy’. It was so popular that it was chosen as one of the top four of the year that we republish at Christmastime. So many people said, “I could never understand how all of this stuff could be going on and me not knowing, and now I do.”

Part of it was that Amy also focuses on the role of contractors and outsourcing, which you hear a lot about from us. So with no further ado, Amy, thank you so much for taking time out of your busy schedule and coming here from Auckland and joining us on The Solari Report.

Amy Benjamin: Catherine, it is always a pleasure to speak with you. You are one of my biggest contemporary heroes.

Fitts: We are going to talk today about “Tax & Spend – The Deep State’s Next Harvest,’ but before we do, if you haven’t heard my discussion with Amy and read her piece, I strongly recommend that you do. It’s in the archives, and it’s called “The Many Faces of Secrecy.’

Much has happened in the secrecy world since we did that interview. Your paper came out a month after Dr. Skidmore’s publication of his report on the \$21 trillion of missing money. One thing that you focused on was the role of private contractors in engineering secrecy. I thought that maybe we could touch a little on that before we dive into our topic tonight.

Benjamin: Sure. I wouldn’t be able to say how much private contracting is linked to being responsible for the \$21 trillion. I sense that probably direct secrecy is more responsible for that, “Oops! We can’t account for that \$21 trillion.”



Private contracting is when the government can go dark because the government transfers its functions to private entities that aren't easily subject to the sunshine laws that allow the public to trace what happens in government, like the Freedom of Information Act and the other sunshine laws that came out in the 1970s.

When the government contracts out those functions and those tasks, such as war fighting, troop fighting, private armies, national security functions like airport security that is often outsourced, or welfare programs that are outsourced to charitable organizations. It runs the whole gamut.

When these functions are given to corporations – even to nonprofits – the public cannot see as much via these sunshine laws. They can't see what is going on, the decisions that are being made, or the reasons for the decisions and what was relied upon for making the decisions and how the money was spent. They can't see as well as they used to be able to when some functions were performed directly by government entities.

Fitts: Do you want to explain a bit about direct secrecy versus indirect secrecy?

Benjamin: Yes. Direct secrecy is when the government continues to perform a function but keeps details of the function secret, usually on the grounds of national security state, ranging from whatever the highest classification is – which is probably not 'top secret'. It is the top-secret stamps or classified hearings in Congress or if you request something via FOIA, you might find that some of the document will be given to you, but much of it will be redacted.



There will also be a FOIA exemption ground invoked, usually with national security. That is direct secrecy. That is the government saying, “We are doing something secret. You can’t comprehend what it is, but we have good national security-related reasons.” That is direct secrecy.

Indirect secrecy is when they hand off functions, which can be outsourced to corporations, or in the case of controlling the money supply to the Federal Reserve System; they hand over functions to entities outside of the government. They don’t invoke national security for that; they invoke other reasons like, “The private sector or the banking sector can handle these government functions more efficiently. We’ll get cost savings, etc. We are doing it for these reasons,” and the secrecy is produced indirectly. The sunshine laws don’t tend to follow the handing off of the government functions. So, that is what I label indirect secrecy—secrecy is not invoked directly by the government.

In fact, it is often denied. They don’t want people to know they are giving away their functions in order for their functions to go dark. Instead, they invoke these other values like ‘cost savings’ and ‘greater efficiency’. That is a ‘bunch of bologna’ because contracting is the most lucrative thing that you can do, especially a government contractor.

No one connects those thoughts. No one says, “Hey, wait a minute. If government contracting is so lucrative, how can this be saving the taxpayers money?” It’s a ‘bunch of bull’.



Fitts: It's incredible because I've never seen an outsourcing of privatization that was more efficient than government doing it. It is invariably much more expensive.

Benjamin: Efficient in a micro-economic sense-when they perform the task-they are devoting the least amount of resources for the best product at the lowest cost. But that doesn't mean that they are charging the government the lowest cost; that means that they are making a big profit. So, they might be doing it really efficiently, but that doesn't mean that it is costing the taxpayers less money.

The profit margin is huge.

Fitts: This is one of the reasons I wrote the Dillon Read case study – to show you how government was literally being bankrupt by all these schemes that were making the private sector a fortune while they were saying they were more efficient and that this was all very productive, but it absolutely wasn't.

We used to laugh because we would see these neighborhoods where HUD was paying \$1,200 a month rent on a voucher program for an apartment, whereas the market rate apartment across the street in a nicer building would be going for \$800.

It went on and on and on.

Benjamin: It's just so obvious to any layperson and you don't have to be an academic.



The ‘stupid’ academic economists are still writing journal articles saying that outsourcing is a good thing for the taxpayer. They are ‘idiots’ except for a few legal academics. I am thinking in particular of a man named Paul Verkuil and other colleague of his who for years touted the public benefits of outsourcing.

Fitts: “If I didn’t steal \$21 trillion, I can buy a lot of academics”.

Benjamin: This particular person, Paul Verkuil, realized in the last ten years or so that outsourcing was one of those dispensable benefits. He and his fellow academic wrote an astonishing article saying, “We need to insource. In order to save the taxpayers, we need to start bringing back the functions in the government, and we need to start increasing the Federal workforce to save taxpayer’s money.”

It was an astonishing article. I don’t think that it has gained much traction. It’s a little ‘too little, too late’. The academics were on the bandwagon, and the academics have been bought off indirectly. They are looking for grant money and they are looking for nice invitations to nice conferences funded by all those lovely corporatists standing quietly in the back of the room.

It is difficult. The academics will have to be dragged ‘kicking and screaming’ for the most part into the real world.

Fitts: There is no doubt that if you wanted to stop money from going into the Federal government, you would have to insource the information system and probably even the bank accounts. The more you’ve outsourced, the more money that has gone missing. As far as I am concerned, there is a direct correlation.



Let's go on to the development after we did that Solari Report on 'The Many Faces of Secrecy'. We had the FASB-56 process start. After Dr. Skidmore's report, the Department of Defense announced that they were going to do an extensive audit. So, they proceeded to spend almost \$1 billion on a major audit.

Before they announced that they couldn't complete the audit, they implemented something called FASB-56. Interestingly enough, it was approved by OMB and GAO and promulgated during the Kavanaugh hearing process.

Benjamin: They always love those distractions, don't they?

Fitts: They do. Interestingly enough, the first finding under FASB-56 occurred before the audit was finished.

Grossly oversimplified, what FASB-56 does – and we have published a piece on it for anybody listening or reading this who wishes to know more can find it in the Subscriber Links – is allows all the 24 covered agencies plus more than 150 related entities (and it may include contractors as well, although it's a little obtuse) to create secret books. So, a secret group of people can identify certain projects and flows, move them into secret books, and not disclose that they are doing it.

Unfortunately, it means that the financial statements are entirely meaningless; you have no idea what they mean. You have no idea who controls what they mean and what goes in and out; it is meaningless.



As a result, we published a new piece called ‘Caveat Emptor’, which I wrote with my attorney, ‘Why Investors Need to do Due Diligence on US Treasury and Related Securities’. Basically, I say, “If you have the secret decoder ring, then maybe you understand what the US Federal Credit means, but as far as I can see, for all I know, they are moving all the assets out the back door.”

If you buy a Treasury and the money buys a piece of equipment, for all I know it is going to end up on a corporate balance sheet as an open bailout gift through the back door. We don’t know that it’s not and there is no way to know.

If anything, we are significantly ratcheting up the secrecy in a way that, I fear, we are going to get the worst of both worlds. We are going to get the worst of corporate America combined with the worst of government.

Benjamin: That is very incompetent, corrupt fascism.

Some day someone is going to do a history of the different levels of secrecy that were created, beginning in the late 1940s. The secrecy has ratcheted up in stages. Maybe we have reached peak secrecy with this FASB-56.

It’s simply everywhere, and it is introduced in such a banal way through the OMB and the like. I hate to insult accountants but it’s such a boring way to engineer it. They are taking the financial coup d’état to the ‘umpteenth’ level.



Fitts: One of the things I said was that they tore up the Constitution via an obscure accounting policy.

Benjamin: They did, and it is a Constitutional offense. As such, I would think that it could be legally challenged as unconstitutional. Why every hedge fund manager in the world isn't trying to organize a class action suit through the government, I don't know. How can they invest their clients' money responsibly if there is such secrecy and such darkness as to the number of both private sector companies doing business with the government and the government agencies themselves?

This would be an unconstitutional action; this would be a state action. It's every bit as offensive to the Constitution as racial discrimination by government actors.

I had a thought: When you talk about the different levels of financial secrecy, a couple of years ago I was listening to people like Rob Kirby talk about the Exchange Stabilization Fund and how they just sat on a dark pool of dollars, and that is why the US government could always sell off its bonds and the like. If there were no buyers and they ever had a failed bond auction because there were no buyers, the Exchange Stabilization Fund would buy up the debt itself just to create the illusion that dollars were still in demand, etc.

So you have the Exchange Stabilization Fund, and let's just pause with that as the case. There is a dark pool of dollars, but this just takes it to a whole new level. FASB-56 adds a whole new dimension to a dark pool of dollars. It's not just the dark pool of dollars; now it's significantly more –



– and that was bad enough, not knowing how many dollars are out there or how many governments have been given the dollar template to print out however many trillions of dollars they want by the Treasury or the Federal Reserve.

I would hate to be responsible for anyone else's money in this environment.

Fitts: Last year I closed my individual investment advisory business. One of the reasons was related to what was happening. It was before the final FASB-56 was promulgated, but the handwriting was on the wall.

In a world where everything is dark, how do you know what is happening? It made me extremely nervous about that.

One of the things that I want to bring up is that in 2011 the Standard & Poor's, which at the time was owned by McGraw Hill, downgraded the US Federal Credit from AAA to AA+. Eighteen days later their CEO had to resign. I'm sure that was the punishment from the government.

In early 2013 the Department of Justice and a group of the State Attorney General's brought a \$5 billion lawsuit against S&P for its role in the mortgage fraud, but they didn't bring it against the other two rating agencies who had not dropped the Federal Credit rating.

McGraw Hill finally had to settle two years later for over a billion dollars. It was a huge amount of money, and it really devastated the company.



The message was: If you are an institution in this market, basically what that is doing as a business matter, is requiring you to pretend that the emperor is wearing clothes.

Benjamin: It's using the law as a weapon. "Do what we say or we will sue you."

That is what they do; they take a weapon, and they threaten people. In the case of countries that wanted to go off the petro dollar in the last 20 years, they have threatened them militarily. In the case of S&P, they threatened them legally. It's rule by threat and it's extremely coercive.

Fitts: I think that the reason the hedge fund wouldn't sue the Federal government and challenge the Constitution is because they are worried for their safety and the safety of their investors. They don't have a safe mechanism to challenge.

Benjamin: If that is true, then we have reached a very low state of affairs.

I thought the reason they hadn't challenged that is because it was still in the very early days and the insiders capitalist club – which has a lot of hedge fund managers – are still probably doing quite well in these corrupt markets, precisely because they are insiders. These markets are so dirty and fraudulent and corrupt that you have to be an insider with insider knowledge to do well, and I think that many hedge fund people are such.



I was thinking that, for the moment, they are just sitting and waiting until ‘things go south’. Then, of course, they will say, “Hey! Who knew these markets were dark and rigged?”

You might be right, though. Maybe they won’t go there even when they start losing money because they’re afraid.

Fitts: I think it’s early and I think you’re right, and it’s early. It takes a while for these things to percolate. That is one of the reasons we published the *Caveat Emptor*. We wanted to put investors on notice. “Hey, you need to do due diligence. There has been a material event. You can’t only assume that Treasuries are safe. Something has changed.”

Before we turn to the 116th Congress, one of the things that I want to mention is that there has been a great deal of disclosure about the efforts to sabotage the Presidential campaign by a variety of players in the bureaucracy, including the Department of Justice, the FBI, and other agencies – the intelligence agencies, the State Department, and the NSA. The functioning of those bureaucracies is significantly outside the law, including trying to sabotage the Presidency. Maybe you could talk a little about what has happened.

My concern is that if we have people in significant government positions who feel free to completely ignore a variety of laws and function as mobsters, making things up and playing politics with it, and when you combine that with significant secrecy of operations and finances, you are talking about moving out of the realm of fascism and into the realm of organized crime.



Benjamin: When someone wants to keep something secret from you, you will be inclined to agree if there is trust there and if you feel that you can trust the person. Therefore, if a government is lawless and corrupt, you are not inclined to want to trust that government to keep things secret from you as an ostensibly self-governing public. So, secrecy becomes even more problematic when the government is lawless.

If people want to know what these three-letter agencies were up to at the very end of the Obama Administration and then at the beginning of the Trump Administration; if they want to know about the efforts to prevent Trump from winning the Presidency and then to get him out of office once he had won the Presidency; I would recommend listening to any number of interviews by a former Federal prosecutor, Joe DiGenova, who is well-versed in the pre-election campaign to basically infiltrate the Trump Administration with operatives on the specious claim that he was colluding with the Russians.

I'm not sure what they were trying to get, but they were either trying to derail the campaign or use the information after the election if he were to win.

Afterwards, they continued with a lot of the shenanigans. Even though Hillary lost, many of the tenants who were involved in the pre-election naughtiness remained in their positions, such as Comey and McCabe and Strzok and Page at FBI and at DOJ, as well. Then they really ran with this Russian collusion to try to get Trump impeached or the 25th Amendment and so on for two reasons: They didn't want him in office, and 2) They certainly didn't want him finding out about what they had been up to before the election.



I think that all of this is probably going to come out and I sure hope that it does. It just can't be worse – the lawlessness. It can't reach a higher level.

Fitts: If you watch the process of the information dribbling out over the last year, one of the things that really struck me is the extent to which you are really watching *Keystone Kops*. In my experience, it was so easy to get away with these things ten or twenty years ago that you could play *Keystone Kops* and not get caught. Now I think that the body politic is a lot more knowledgeable about the lawlessness. There have been some good players who helped bring all this out.

It's hard to believe they feel that free to engage in criminal practices in their positions.

Benjamin: They've had the last 50 years. Since JFK, they have become more and more emboldened because they have basically become more and more corrupt and achieved more and more of their 'anti-human' goals. Of course, they thought that they were absolutely invulnerable. They never thought that Hillary would lose, and now they're just 'scurrying like rats' because they know that they are caught.

I hope that Trump goes for the jugular on this one; I really do.

Fitts: One of the things that I noted during the McCabe interview and the reporting that came out, "I have to tell Amy about this." I noted that the FBI had repeatedly redacted the discovery responses to the hill.



McCabe had spent \$70,000 on his conference room table. I thought, “If that isn’t a metaphor for what all of this secrecy is going to be used for, there it is.”

Benjamin: I hope that when the ‘dust settles’ someone calls me from Washington and says, “Amy, we need to rewrite the secrecy laws to prevent that kind of ridiculous redaction that we saw in the McCabe hearing. Will you come to Washington and help us?”

Fitts: Wouldn’t that be wonderful!

Benjamin: I would go. In a sense, they don’t need to be rewritten because redaction shouldn’t be done to prevent embarrassment to government officials, and redaction shouldn’t be done to conceal criminal activity. You can’t redact to prevent embarrassment or revelations of corruption and other criminal activity. You can’t, and yet I believe that it is routinely done.

Fitts: Absolutely.

Benjamin: It’s just an abuse of power.

Fitts: I don’t know if you heard Bill Binney describe the games of people lining their own pockets with taxpayers’ money at the NSA. When Binney talks about it, it’s just frightening. It’s out of control.

So, let’s turn to the new Congress. The 116th Congress began in January and just when you say that things can’t get worse, they get worse.



Benjamin: Let's focus on the 1% of light and good.

Fitts: Whatever it is doing, it is certainly stirring the pot. It is also making sure that Trump gets re-elected if he runs.

We have a complete new group of incoming Congressmen, and not one of them that I have heard has spoken up to say, "We have too much secrecy about our finances. We need to do something about it."

There was one moment when Ocasio-Cortez brought up the \$21 trillion, and it was very deftly played to get rid of it and turn it into a joke, which was quite unfortunate.

Among the new Congressmen, we have a group that promote themselves as 'revolutionary', but in fact there has not been one single shred of suggestion that secrecy is a problem. Have you heard a peep about secrecy from any of them?

Benjamin: No, but that being said, I try not to give these people much of my attention because I have a sense that not all is what it seems with regard to these 'youthful, exuberant' newcomers. Considering the amount of coverage that they are getting and the amount of deference that they are getting from the Democratic leadership, I smell an intelligence operation behind Ocasio – or as Lionel calls her, 'Ocrazio'. I smell an intelligence operation behind her.



I can't figure out whether she is a white hat intel person or a black hat intel person. (The black hat would be Mossad.) I smell Mossad behind the Muslim representative from Minnesota, Ilhan Omar, who is allegedly coming out with anti-Semitic comments. I think that she is Mossad all the way because the Israeli secret service love to get the anti-Semitism up and running and bombing synagogues so that they can then come in and 'rally the troops' on behalf of Israel and whatever.

Fitts: Do you think that she knows?

Benjamin: Probably. I think that the intelligence services – both foreign and domestic – have completely penetrated the Congress. I think there are an abundance of ops occurring with regard to various members of Congress, both in the House and Senate. Definitely these newcomers strike me as ops of some sort.

Ocasio-Cortez comes out with her Green New Deal and her socialism. Of course, this is resounding to Trump's advantage and the Republicans' advantage, I think. Is she run by the White Hats – the pro-Trump military intelligence people? That wouldn't surprise me. Is she a Soros-Mossad creation? That wouldn't surprise me either. So, I haven't quite figured her out.

If you look at the incredibly disproportionate level of attention that she and her other freshmen are getting, this doesn't happen in a normal world. In a normal world newbies go to Congress and they do what they are told and they shut up. These people are not doing that, and they are not being asked to shut up, although Pelosi grimaces and sputters a little.



Fitts: If you look at when the Green New Deal was first slapped out, there was a big protest gathering in Pelosi's office. If you look at Congressional security, none of those people could get in there unless they let them in. So, it was staged.

Benjamin: Almost everything that you are seeing on the political stage is staged. It is all an act, but I am not quite certain who is hiring some of the actors.

Ocasio is getting a great deal of press, but this is not a coincidence; this is an op and it's getting a lot of attention. Everyone is concentrating on her latest utterances and those of Omar from Minnesota, and they are not paying attention to other things that they should be. I'm sure that something akin to the level of importance to FASB-56 is probably in the works. Who knows?

We are all paying attention to the latest utterances, and that is why, as a matter of principle, I say that unless it is 'shoved in my face' I am not going to listen to these people because I know that I am being played.

Fitts: When I published the Annual Wrap Up on pension funds at the end of 2017, I had a picture of a cow and a farmer milking into a milk bucket. The milk bucket had a hole in its bottom, and all the milk was running out into the deep state. The title was 'Does Your Pension Fund Have a Deep State Problem?'

I kept saying to everybody, "Why should we put more milk in the bucket if there is a hole in the bottom? We need to deal with the hole."



The hole is about secret finances and the black budget and money running out of the milk bucket.

What we have with all these incoherent proposals for revolutionary government policies from Ocasio-Cortez and this entire group, all comes down to more taxes and more government. It is more resources flowing into the milk bucket with no discussion of the hole in the bottom. It appears very simply like this is the early part of the marketing campaign to radically increase public support to pour more milk into the bucket with no discussion of the fact that the hole is still sucking money through.

This is the next harvest.

Benjamin: I think the most surreal moment of the State of the Union address was when the President said – and I am paraphrasing here – that we reject socialism in the United States, and he looked at Bernie Sanders and a side glance at Ocasio-Cortez. A number of Republicans in the chamber rose to their feet, chanting, “USA! USA!”

I thought, “This is absolutely ridiculous because these Republican members are chanting ‘USA!’ as if what we have in the United States is an anti-socialist model, as if we have free markets in this country, and as if they are jumping to their feet saying, ‘We oppose socialism, and we are in favor of free-market capitalism.’”

No. They are in favor of a crony capitalist, insider trading riddled markets. That is what they are opposing to socialism. It was surreal.



Obviously, I can't be on the socialist bandwagon, not only because of the milk bucket problem, but because, even if you had a relatively non-corrupt government, there are problems with the socialist model.

Look at the other side opposing the socialism. I think those people are almost as bad with their corrupt crony capitalism. It plays on both sides.

Fitts: One of them is basically saying, "We are going to steal massive amounts of money and let corporations run everything with dark money," and the other is saying, "We are going to tax more and spend it on individuals." I don't think that it is ever going to get there.

Benjamin: Maybe a bit more would get to individuals under the socialist model than under the crony capitalist model, but that is speculation at this point. I think that what we as citizens need to do is realize when you see the Republicans chanting 'USA!' against the socialist slogans, you are being misled there, too. We need to find our grounding with fresh principles, which is a free market capitalist system. That is probably the way to go, but they need to be truly unrigged markets that are truly free and truly transparent with careful and non-corrupt regulation.

So often now, the regulators run cover for the corruption. They are in there saying, "We are regulating," but in fact they are just providing cover-up. It can be precious metals and the manipulation and suppression of precious metals or it can be virtually anything.



But we are so far away from free, transparent markets that for anyone to jump to their feet chanting, “USA!” in response to Ocasio-Cortez is equally ridiculous.

Fitts: I would say that without financial transparency, both in the markets and in the political jurisdictions. America has 3,100 counties. If I can’t see the sources and uses of government money and performance in my place, it’s like a symphony playing in the dark.

One of the things that the freshmen Congress are doing is playing on the legitimate anger of the millennials. Jeffrey Gundlach is my vote for one of the best bond fund managers in the country. He gave an interview to Yahoo Finance recently and essentially said that if you look at how much the boomers are taking out versus how much the millennials are taking out of the Federal budget, it’s very unfair. Certainly, if you look at the student debt situation, I think that the unfairness towards the millennials is off the charts. So, they have a very good reason to be angry.

It is very clever that the people who have harvested the millennials is the deep state, and the deep state is now playing them in a way that they are going to get the millennials to do their marketing for the next round of harvesting-which will harvest the millennials-not only because it will harvest the millennials, but because it will harvest the money they would have inherited from their parents otherwise.

Benjamin: I think that the millennials – God bless them – are easy pickings for the manipulative tactics of the deep state. They are absolutely easy pickings. Unfortunately, they don’t have an abundance of historical knowledge.



They have no idea what this country once was. So although they will complain if they are pinched, I think they lack the knowledge that is probably needed to discern false solutions from true solutions.

I think we have disabled them from really developing wisdom because of the educational system that we have put them through. So if they are to be rescued, it is going to be by the older generation, by people like you and me maybe.

Fitts: One of the things that I am grappling with is: How can I make the information simple and easy and accessible to them? I was going back and forth with a colleague who had emailed me about homelessness. I was trying to persuade him that homelessness was a symptom, and you can't solve the symptom by throwing money at it; you need to bring transparency to the root causes so that you won't have to fund homelessness. There won't be homelessness if you deal with the root causes.

The question for the millennials is: How do you help them understand to see the root causes, and do it in a way that is not overwhelming?

Benjamin: I wish I had an answer for you; I wish I did. Their existence is really ahistorical in the sense that they don't have an understanding of history. I don't know what tools they have. I think they are going to need some guidance from the older generation.

Revolution is usually the job of the young folks, but it's so deeply ironic that the counter-revolution that is being staged now in some areas of the world against globalization and against neoliberal ——



— and against the welfare warfare model is being staged by the older people, the people who can remember a time when we had much greater freedom – economic and otherwise. These are the people who voted for Brexit in the United Kingdom. These were the ‘old fogies’ down in Wales and Cornwall, not the millennials in places like London and Manchester and all the new ones who just want to be able to travel freely in Europe and go wherever they want to go.

It was the old people who saw and who knew how much has been lost, and they were the ones who tried to take the country back and gain a little freedom.

If you look at our own country, the biggest adherence, the followers of Ron Paul, for example-back in the day-and now many followers in the MAGA movement, tend to be older. There are some young ones, but the demographic is decidedly older because they remember.

This whole issue of historical memory is very important. I think that in this counterrevolution it is going to be this older generation, hopefully, coming to the rescue of the young ones who need to be re-educated or told about an earlier time.

Fitts: One of the things that I hear from people is that anybody who is responsible for assets, whether they are running a business or running a portfolio or responsible for managing family savings, are listening to the discussion on both sides of the aisle in Washington – whether it is the Republicans or it is the Democrats, whether it is tax and spend or crazy corporate fascism. What they are hearing is lawlessness. What they are saying is, “How can I manage assets in a world with lawlessness?”



Then, of course, you watch what the FBI and the Department of Justice was up to. One of my favorite quotes of the incoming Administration was Chuck Schumer saying in a TV interview, “God bless him! The President has to do what the CIA tells him.”

He basically said that the intelligence agencies run the country, not the President, and he has to learn.

Benjamin: “There are ‘six ways to Sunday’ to get you,” is what he said to Rachel Maddow.

Fitts: Chuck Schumer explained the governance model that has been in place since the Kennedy assassination.

I think it is helping people understand that without law it is hard to have an economy and it is hard to have a life. That is what we are grappling with. How do the people who believe in the rule of law move forward?

I refer back to your article on secrecy because I think the first thing that you need to get back to any state of lawfulness is to reduce the secrecy.

Benjamin: Yes, but when we were talking about the hedge funds you said that even the tool of law may be limited by fear of reprisal and retribution such as that which was visited on S&P for downgrading the US.

I think that we have reached a point where even the tool of law might be limited. I think that if it is, there is probably only the tool of the pocketbook. I know that you have spoken about this.



This means: Don't feed the beast.

Don't bank with JP Morgan; don't bank with Citibank; go local; do not feed the beast; do not buy corporate products or corporations that are dark. It's really the only weapon that we have in the short-term.

In the long term, we can hopefully lock up people who abuse power in government and use law as a weapon against people who are trying to bring about more freedom and transparency. But in the short term, I think our only weapon is using our money to the extent that we have any and to fight with that.

Fitts: We not only have money, but we have attention. Withdrawal from media that lies is very, very powerful. The more that we deny them eyeballs, that is also very powerful.

I think that it is a very powerful weapon, and it is one that has been used very successfully throughout history, and we haven't tried it yet.

Benjamin: We are constantly convinced that we have no power. We have all the power in the world. The propaganda is that we have none.

Every single message that you get over the airways during the course of the day is meant to ratchet up your sense of insecurity and inferiority. "Are you worried enough about the latest this or that? No, I need to be worried more."



The more anxious we get, the less ‘in control’ we feel. That is exactly what they want. They don’t want us to have a sense of our own control over the situation. We have all the control, but it’s only mind control. That is how the very few control the many to persuade the many.

Fitts: I’ve been on the other side, and I know how afraid they are of the crowd. I know what you are saying is true.

One of my favorite quotes from Jon Rappoport is, “Hopelessness is an op, and it is planet-wide.”

Benjamin: That says it all. It is an op, and it is a very, very deep op running down into the deepest levels concerning the level of human consciousness. One way to look at organized religion is a way to give humans an avenue for expressing their sense of awe at the universe and their spirituality without letting them know that they have much more power in their mind than they realize.

Organized religion is an op. I believe in a source, but organized religion is an op designed to instill powerlessness if the only way you feel that you can succeed is waiting for God to save you. That is an insidious way of emasculating you and your sense of power and control.

Fitts: In America we have seen that the growth is in all the non-denominational churches, and that is not what they preach at all. It’s spilling out of the control.

One of the things that I wanted to mention to you is that my favorite internet video is something called *The Battle at Kruger*. Have you seen it?



Benjamin: No.

Fitts: I recently met with Robert Duper here in the Netherlands and had him watch it. It's the story of a fight between a group of water buffalos and both lions and crocodiles in the Kruger National Park. It's all about how the water buffalos get together and get up enough courage to attack back and save their little ones from the lions. It's somewhat of a metaphor for what can happen when we decide to start exercising our power of choice to not support these people and to withdraw and not finance.

Next week on The Solari Report we are going to be doing, 'Why Are We Financing This?' with Dr. Katherine Horton and talking about the same exact issue.

Benjamin: She is the physicist who was targeted, right? I've heard her in interviews before. She is absolutely lovely.

Fitts: And she is very interested in finance, and is very sophisticated about finance.

Now I want to turn to you and some of your latest work and how we can follow your work. You have had several publications since 'The Many Faces of Secrecy'. Tell us a little about Amy Benjamin's new thesis.

Benjamin: My oeuvre – such as it is! I did 'Secrecy' and then I turned to the intervention in Syria writing an article on that. The intervention had two stages beginning in about 2000, ———



— and in 2011 it was a humanitarian-ish intervention designed to get Assad out of power. When that didn't really seem to be getting enough international support, when the Libya model seemed to be failing for Syria, they switched over to the ISIS counter-terrorism model. They basically rewrote the script very fast. They created ISIS, and Langley ran with it. That kept us in Syria until recently.

Trump is trying to get us out and we will see if he can do it. That was what the article was about – the unmasking of that ridiculous historical moment where we tried to intervene in order to control the country, probably for imperialist reasons relating to oil pipelines or Israel wanting more land or whatever.

Fitts: Do you know if the numbers are true that ISIS seized up a great deal of gold, and we have now gotten the gold from them? Do you know if that is true?

Benjamin: I don't know if that is true. I did see this article, and I'm not quite sure how to read that.

My question is: If they have the gold, where did they get it? If it's from Syria, why do we have it? Why aren't we delivering it back to the government of Damascus? Where does the gold come from? Did they collect it from the people in the territories that they occupied? Why isn't it being returned to those people? Why did we walk off with it?

Fitts: I'm assuming that is why we created ISIS, to go in and dig up the natural resources

Benjamin: It's so corrupt.



That was what my last published article is about, and I am currently ‘knee-deep’ in a very long article. I’m still writing it, and I hope to be done by August. This is very doctrinal. It is about how globalist legal scholars have manipulated the sources of international law, treaties, and customary law in order to further globalization – the diffusion of authority away from the nation-state upward into international institutions and actors. The title of it is going to be ‘Globalists and the Corruption of Sources’ and it is very hard-hitting and very doctrinal.

It might not be quite as accessible to a layperson, but it is very hard-hitting. I am trying to ‘take down’ (for want of a better word) a couple of high-rolling legal scholars in the United States who I think have really sold their souls. I won’t name names here, but I do in the article.

I’m knee-deep in that right now and it’s going to be every bit as long as the secrecy article. I will see if anyone will publish it. That is my latest.

Fitts: Will you let us know as soon as it is available?

Benjamin: I will. I am going to be sending it out to journals in August, which is the next publication window. If it gets picked up, I will know by September, and I will let you know. Then if it is picked up, it will probably come out in December of this year or January of next year.

I am hoping that it will do a little damage. I hope that they will feel a pinprick of remorse upon reading it, but I’m not holding my breath.



Fitts: In all of your pieces, they do an extraordinary job of helping someone who is interested to understand how all this is engineered. It's hard to put these things together, and you are really a master at digging up the information, integrating it, and laying it out in a coherent form so that we can really get much more intelligent about what you are writing about.

This is unbelievably helpful to people who really do want to understand what is happening.

Benjamin: Thank you very much for the compliment, although just to push back on what you are saying, I do think that the ordinary person has everything they need to figure it out. They definitely shouldn't put too much stock in academics.

In a sense, I'm trying to write to wake up the academic class. I think that the 'ordinary folks class' can more or less sort it out on their own; they are that smart. The academics are the idiots and I'm doing my bit to wake them up.

Ordinary people just need to take a deep breath and listen and really think about how they could do some good, old-fashioned harm to a very corrupt system and hopefully bring it down. They will see that they can use their money and withdraw their attention, and they can do that.

Thank you for the compliment, but the ordinary person does not need Amy Benjamin and fellow academics might.



Fitts: I will tell you one story. I was writing about it for a history that I am doing for “The Real Game of Missing Money”, which is our collection of all the material on the missing money. I was expressing about how I once did a radio show on KPFA radio in San Francisco called ‘Community Business’, and every week or so I would be on there. As the former Assistant Secretary of Housing, I would talk about all the corruption and what was happening in the mortgage markets that were wrong.

Suddenly in the summer of 2008, I was removed from it. It was somewhat of an op situation and was very bogus and made up. Then the Bohemian Grove happened right after that, and then Fannie and Freddie are nationalized. Of course, I’m not on KPFA radio to comment on any of it because I’ve been thrown off.

Shortly after they were nationalized, one of the top very prestigious well-admired money managers in San Francisco published a letter on their website. Apparently they had invested \$1 billion in Fannie Mae in April and lost it all in August. So in four months, they managed to lose 100% on their Fannie Mae position.

The letter was beautifully crafted. It said, “We did very thorough due diligence. We had no idea.”

I read it and said, “Every trucker in America knew that the mortgage market was toast. How could they have not known?”

The Assistant Secretary of Housing (myself) was on drive-by radio at 5:00 a couple of times a month during the last five years saying that the mortgage market was toast. How could they not know?



Benjamin: That is a wonderful story.

Fitts: There really are parallel universes. It's amazing. Every trucker in America who I ever dealt with knew; everyone knew and it was quite remarkable.

Benjamin: In this regard, I could just shake the President who I'm generally quite fond of when he gets out and is touting these bogus speeches on economic numbers and all that when you look at so many indicators that real people know about. He just signed an executive order about veterans committing suicide and trying to help them, and how millennials can't afford to buy a house, and student loan debt, and drug crisis, and the opioid crisis, and the homelessness. All the indicators of the well-being of the country that they have greater difficulty fudging are terrible.

So, he comes out with these bogus inflation numbers and job creation numbers, and people know it. They are willing to give him the benefit of the doubt, but they need some truthfulness. The country is in a terrible, terrible state. Is it perhaps better than it would have been had Hillary won? Yes, but it's in a terrible state.

Sooner or later he is going to have to be honest because there is nothing more soul-destroying than constantly being lied to. If he is going to be on the side of the people, he has to start telling the truth. He has lied his way through the first two and a half years of office – for good reason. He is using deception and lies as a weapon against the deep state for the most part, but “don't ask me about Venezuela.”



If he wants to stem the suicide rate, not just amongst veterans but also amongst other classes, he has to start telling the truth. The lies are ‘eating’ people up at this point because they know on the ground how awful it is. Trotting out these bogus numbers is just killing the country and is literally killing us.

Mr. President, if you are listening, please tell the truth – finally, now.

Fitts: If it were up to me, I would make sure that we had fantastic county finances for everyone, and let the reengineering begin. Let it start bottom-up in a way that significantly improves returns and performance and creates a massive amount of jobs.

The problem is that those jobs, more often than not, are going to be small business, not corporations. Small businesses are going to gain in market share vis-à-vis the corporations. The corporations aren’t necessarily going to like it.

I’m with you and that is why I think in regards to financial secrecy, financial secrecy is destroying the economy.

Benjamin: And lies. The manipulation in the markets has distorted asset and commodity prices and the price of everything. There is no price discovery as far as I can tell. We don’t know what the value of anything is because the markets are so manipulated. Don’t get me started on gold and silver!

That’s why this chant of, “USA! USA!” was so crazy. We have a totally managed economy. It’s probably more managed than the Soviet economy was, and it’s administered so nefariously.



We are the most managed economy. So please, sit down in your seat and don't jump up, chanting, "USA!"

I'm a real patriot, but please don't do that because it's ridiculous.

Fitts: Okay, Amy Benjamin. You are great and keep us posted on everything that you are doing, and have a wonderful day.

Benjamin: I will. Thank you so much for reaching out, Catherine. I will talk to you soon.

MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.