



The Solari Report

SEPTEMBER 4, 2014

**Russia and the
Ukraine Backstory**
with Anne Williamson





Russia and the Ukraine Backstory

September 4, 2014

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great privilege to welcome to The Solari Report a very special investigative reporter and author. Her name is Anne Williamson, and I first met her in the early 2000's. I was in London and speaking at an investment conference.

Anne had covered Russia and the changes in Russia after the wall came down in the 90's as a reporter for the *Wall Street Journal* and then had become an independent and had covered it on her own. She wrote a very compelling and amazing book about those years called *Contagion* that was then serialized. There were all sorts of dirty tricks around the publication. Hopefully we'll have time to talk about it today.

It was never published, but portions of it were serialized through an investment research firm in London, and I had the chance to read that as well.

The time that I met Anne, I was speaking about the 'rape' of government and privatization is really a way of moving assets below market costs to private companies in America. Anne was speaking about a similar process in Russia. John Lockland, who has been on The Solari Report – a marvelous reporter and writer from London at the time – was talking about Eastern Europe. The three of us realized, "Oh my God! We're talking about the same law firm, the same university endowments, the same investors."

It's sort of this same bunch of pirates who are running around the globe doing this in every place. It's a global model and it's a similar playbook in every continent. It was quite a magical moment when we said, "Oh my God! We're onto something." That's what caused me to write what is



now a very famous blogpost called *Financial Coup d'Etat* which if you haven't read I suggest it on the blog.

Meeting Anne was a life-changing moment. She then, among other things, wrote a series for *WorldNet Daily* explaining the Federal Reserve, the IMF, and a variety of global financial institutions. I daresay it was the first time any of us really understood how all those systems worked.

She has an incredible ability to go in and understand how things work, both bottom-up and top-down and explain it to people who didn't want to make understanding the financial systems' life work. So we're talking to a very, very special person.

Two of the things I have to add, one of my favorite Anne Williamson pieces is a hit job – and a well-deserved hit job – she did on Shiller, making mincemeat of the economists who provide the pro-centralization team air cover.

And finally I just want to say that when it comes to understanding what's going on in Russia and the Ukraine, Anne's work is a very important back story, and of course she is very knowledgeable about that part of the world. We'll be talking about the back story of what happened in Russia in the 90's but bring it down to today.

Finally, Anne, just let me say that I know you're in the process of launching a new business and moving to Europe. So the fact that you're joining us today is a real opportunity for all of us to understand that part of the world and what is going on. We really, really appreciate it.

Anne Williamson, welcome to The Solari Report.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Catherine. Thank you for sharing your Solari audience with me. I appreciate it.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, take us back. How in the world did you end up in Russia after the wall came down? Tell us what you discovered and how it led to *Contagion* and what *Contagion* said.



ANNE WILLIAMSON: It was kind of odd because during the years of the Cold War, Moscow was considered a dead-end zone for a journalist. Mostly it was a lot of drunks hanging out at the Metropol Hotel at 5pm in the bar waiting for the translations to come from the tops and then they would typically go up to their rooms, write up the report based on the information they received from the government, and return to the bar. Day after day, decade after decade.

What I'm saying is that the West found itself really unprepared – completely unprepared – for the collapse of the Soviet Union. We didn't even have common everyday information.

I had studied Russian history and Russian language at university. I had studied in the Soviet Union, hated it, and dropped the whole business and was furious because I'd ruined a beautiful French accent for a very bad Russian accent. It was a bad trade. I kept thinking, "I could have gone to Paris. What have I done!"

But then suddenly – and I don't know why to this day – I got re-interested. I started dragging out the old Gligoldivizieny books and restudying the Russian language. All of a sudden, this guy, Gorbachev came to power. For once, I was 15 seconds ahead of my time.

Why I got such good opportunities was because I knew the language, I knew the country, and I was willing. So off I went. I probably got a lot better work than I would have as just an entry journalist because my first real job was with the *Wall Street Journal* as a journalist.

That was great good fortune. Then I really started covering the country in the arts because prehistorica began in the film industry and the media. That was really an exciting time. It was a wonderful time because you had Russian friends and Soviet friends and the world was finally opening up for these people after having lived under that terrible ideology and economic system for seven decades.

“The West found itself really unprepared – completely unprepared – for the collapse of the Soviet Union. We didn't even have common everyday information.”



It was just a great time. Then they finally got to travel and visit the United States and we all thought everything was going to come out really well in the end. I remember thinking all the years I'd watched the Soviets struggle that they were like a prize fighter in the ring with one hand tied behind them, thanks to the ideology.

I really thought, "This country has so much wealth, and the people are so clever. It will be fantastic to see what they come up with."

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right, and science and technology.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: The science and technology, the resources for the world – it was just great contemplating this future. To cease the wasteful spending on the military, the desire-to-peace dividend. Well, how naïve was I! The ugly truth was that Washington went into a panic. There is this very unfortunate mentality amongst Americans, particularly those who work for the Federal government, a Manichean view of the world. White hats and black hats.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: You hear it all the time when you talk to the foreign policy people. "We're the good guys. We're the white hats. They're the black hats." It's really quite funny talking to them because you keep remembering if you're a baby boomer those old 1950's children's shows and shoot 'em ups because that actually seems to be the governing mentality.

At any rate, the Soviets made wonderful enemies. They looked like Europeans, but inside they were these Asiatic people. So that was confusing, but they were really great enemies because they looked like us – a lot of them – and they were behind this wall they had built themselves. They really couldn't respond very well in the public arena. You could attribute anything to them, and they really didn't have much of a chance to respond. Then, of course, the regime did some pretty ugly things all on its own. That wasn't a very good advertisement.



So the US really did have a field day in the Cold War – the United States did. I don't know if you're familiar with the work of Anthony Sutton.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: He was a researcher at Stanford, a Cambridge man. He did wonderful work. He has traced the whole history of how the United States actually assisted the Soviet Union to viability.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right. We were the ones who really financed the communists.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: We did indeed. Also the fascists, but that's another story.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: At any rate, Herbert Walker Bush was just in a panic. What's interesting when we look back from our perspective today is that Bush wanted in late 1992 after the coup against Gorbachev and his return to Moscow and the collapse of the communist party, Ukraine voted on whether or not it would become an independent country or stay with Russia. That was in late December.

At that time in that referendum, the Ukraine did vote for independence but Crimea voted to stay with Russia by 94%. That referendum was repeated in 1994 and again it was in the 90th percentile. Then, of course, we have the one from last April when we got I think a 96-97% positive for return to Russia.

George Herbert Walker Bush went to Kiev and gave a speech encouraging the Ukrainians to stay as part of Russia or the Soviet Union. In fact, then he was arguing that they stay a part of the Soviet Union. He didn't actually want the country to collapse. That was immediately ridiculed and what became known as the 'Chicken Kiev speech'. It's interesting to see how in those subsequent years from 1991 to 2014 the



very different view that we have today of Ukraine – or that our foreign policy people have of Ukraine and what their goals are.

What we see happening in Ukraine, just the beginnings with the IMF loans and the terrible business with Vice President Biden's son very obviously being put on board the Ukrainian energy company's board, which he was willing to oversee privatization of 49% of that entity's shares for targeted Westerners. It's beginning very quickly, but we see a repeat of what happened in Russia.

Essentially they come in with big money. You have a new leader who's got to get a constituency quickly. So that money is very helpful because it doesn't matter what country; he can use it to buy his supporters.

In Russia's case, you have all the property of what is probably the most naturally wealthy country on earth up for grabs. So Yeltsin had Western money to distribute and property to distribute.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I should also just insert in the reality was that if the United States and the Anglo-American alliance was going to control the oil trade in the post-Soviet period, the big oil companies needed to assert control of that oil and gas load.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Absolutely, and they were frustrated because Gazprom, which was really even gas from today – the Soviet ministry of gas really. Of course, people have come on board, but that is the core of that company which the ministry protegized. They were very proactive. They were smart. They cut themselves out of the whole privatization scheme. I mean, they did privatize, but under a different program. They were never available to the West. That caused even greater focus on the oil companies which were subject to privatization, but of course mostly by insiders and then favored Westerners.

You're quite correct. They wanted to get control of those oil companies. But what is interesting is they soon understood this wasn't going to be easy because there were plenty of Russians and former Soviet citizens who have the same objective.



The West got the big idea: We'll ace them another way, through the transport system. This is the theme that is still playing out today, and Ukraine now is the latest chapter of that story.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: One of the things I just wanted to mention is we've done a series of interviews with Jim Norman, who I think is really terrific. I don't know if you've read his book *The Oil Card*, but his theory is that the Reagan administration did everything they could to bring the oil price down to help bust the Soviet Union, but then afterwards one of the important reasons to get control of the Russian assets was if you were going to checkmate China, you needed to bring the price up. You didn't want to do that until you asserted control of those Russian assets.

That is why treasury was so critical to the Rape of Russia because the whole treasury covert side was in there from the beginning. That was part of manipulating the oil price up, making sure you controlled those before that happened.

“That was part of manipulating the oil price up, making sure you controlled those before that happened.”

ANNE WILLIAMSON: That's right. There is even an earlier chapter from before Reagan under Brezhnev who really began exporting energy. That is when Europe began building and constructing the pipes and so forth for Russian gas.

But what Brezhnev did by doing that is he began to trade in dollars. He became part of the Petrodollar system and thereby began importing US inflation into the Russian economy. That was the Soviet economy, and that was one challenge that they confronted only in the 90's. Only then did the chickens come home to roost, so to speak.

That made them very vulnerable to Reagan's program in which Mr. Norman is correct. They were reducing the price of oil with cooperation with the Saudi's. And, yes, that is the other conundrum of the Iraqi War because people think, “Oh, what is it?” It wasn't about oil. But the important thing there is that was to hold the price of oil down. They did not want all the Iraqi oil to come to market. Saddam Hussein was



interested in doing that, just as Gaddafi was very interested in developing his oil industry, and we see what happened to both gentlemen. But it was because the West did not want that oil to come to market yet.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right. They want to control the price.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Then you see Mr. Norman's theory.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right, and you have to control the supply. So the privatization went forward in Russia. Tell us what it did to the Russian economy and the Russian people.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Well, there are a couple of interesting points about privatization. Number one, you'll hear the people who conduct it defend themselves and their miserable results with the idea that they had no choice. "We were under pressure. We had to do this. The communist may have come back. It was such pressure and anxiety!" It's really a lot of poppycock because it was actually the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union in July 1992 that mandated a national privatization program.

It was that Duma of that Supreme Soviet that was furious that the program was not being presented. Then when the new Duma was under Russian president Boris Yeltsin, the people from the communist party and other non-Western reformer parties were very anxious to get the privatization program going and were actually very unhappy with the foot dragging that was going on, which was really just power plays between Goldman Sachs and Jeffrey Sachs of Harvard.

That was part of the reason for the delay. Then when the program after the program was complete – the voucher privatization – listeners may recall that Yeltsin then attacked his own parliament with cannons. It was a siege of the parliament in 1994, which was very shocking to the Russian people.

The reaction in the West I'll never forget. The New Republic called Boris Yeltsin a muscular democrat when he's bombing his own parliament, but what was never communicated in the United States was



that the dispute was over voucher privatization.

The Duma wanted it reversed. They said it was a horrible result. They did nothing but thieving and swindling, and they were quite correct. But I doubt that you can find that mentioned anywhere in the West coverage of those events.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I never did.

So privatization was controversial from the beginning. And what they did is they took a valuation for the nation's assets as of July 1, 1992. They just sort-of drafted a balance sheet, divided it by a population of 150 million and he came up with this 10,000 ruble voucher that was to be used as privatization options by each Russian citizen who was entitled to one voucher.

But what they did was fascinating. First of all, two-thirds of the assets were immediately excluded from voucher privatization. Then the remaining one-third was divided in half again. Half of that remaining third was excluded. And then the remaining half of that third from two previous divisions was what was actually auctioned.

So very little of the national property was made available to the people. You couldn't get information. If you wanted to do a little due diligence you couldn't get it. You had to bribe people in the government to get it. Of course, much more vigorous players got that information. And who were those vigorous players? They were the golden children of the old Soviet nomenklatura. You see, overnight Russia became a young man's country.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: All the Bolshevik knew they weren't in any kind of condition to deal with it. They only knew they wanted to get the property in their own hands, so their sons came to the fore. You have a



lot of famous characters from that era who really began operating as early as 1985, people like Khodorkovsky and Gusinsky, the Great Oligarchs who came up in the following ten years.

With the voucher privatization, the other really cruel thing that happened was after these vouchers were distributed, all these investment funds sprang up. The Harvard people and the eager young reformers encouraged the public to use those funds.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I just want to emphasize so everybody understands. One of the roles that Harvard played was they got an enormous contract from the state department to be financial advisor to the government, but their endowment and the different pots related to their endowment was playing in there as well. So there were enormous conflicts of interest, and it was one of those periods when the endowment ballooned tremendously. At this point you also had Bob Rubin in Treasury.

Is this the Clinton Administration? Yes, we're in the Clinton administration now.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Yes.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. So, Harvard is in there playing lots of different sides.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It's good you mentioned that because Harvard got those contracts without competition, which was not really allowed under government regulations.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Except for this. We should mention that Rubin – before he became the National Economic Advisor and the Secretary of the Treasury – was the Chairman of the Harvard Endowment.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Yes, and he was also the co-leader of Goldman Sachs. Mr. Rubin, I want to write this article one day for him. It will be my gift. His bright and shining moment.



It was in the autumn of 1992 and Goldman Sachs was still a private partnership at that time. It had not gone public. Therefore, the partners' personal fortunes were at risk.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It was a far better arrangement than the ones we have today, but at any rate this was a huge opportunity for finance, of course. At the same time that the Harvard Academics are there trying to get their fingers in control of all the pots, Goldman Sachs came in.

“It was a far better arrangement than the ones we have today, but at any rate this was a huge opportunity for finance.”

Robert Rubin did negotiate an agreement with the Russians for Goldman Sachs to handle the privatization of large properties. That would actually have been a good thing because then Goldman Sachs would have been responsible to the government of the Russian Federation by contract. They could be dismissed if the government was unhappy. They had to deliver.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: They had the kind of experience to take on some of those big enterprises and try to break them down and make them palatable to private investors.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: True. That is true.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Well, Goldman Sachs went crazy. There was a picture of Sergey Grigorya who was a Russian official who helped negotiate this agreement and Mr. Rubin shaking hands in the *Wall Street Journal*. That led to a huge embarrassment for Goldman Sachs because the Harvard people – the academics – were running around handing out the money to Chubais, to Yeltsin, to this one, to that one, and thereby getting their support for the academics to run the show, not Mr. Rubin. That's a really unfortunate thing.



That's another problem with foreign aid. The foreign government never has any control. You just take it. We run the show. That's why I say it was Mr. Rubin's bright and shining moment because it would have given control to the Russians with that kind of obscure detail, but I think it's an important one.

The contract was non-competing. It was given to Harvard. Not all those people were money thieves. They were opportunists. They were careerists. They were trying to build great reputations as economists off of Russia.

As one Russian remarked, "It's an old story for us. During the era of Peter the Great, European sergeants would come to Russia to become generals." It was the same thing, really. We know this syndrome. It's happened many times.

So that was really part of the story, too. These people wanted their brilliant program followed step by step because they were trying to build their own reputation.

Of course these people really did not understand at all what they were doing. I think part of the story going forward is: Yes, it's true. Communism was a ridiculous economic system that was doomed to defeat. We never needed the Cold War. We should have just held onto our own ideas. It is an unworkable system. It has never succeeded anywhere it's been put in place without massive coercion of the population. It's just a loser's game, but now we're going to see the collapse of an almost equally stupid economic system.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right. Organized crime doesn't work anywhere near.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Right. Neither does Central Banking.

Now that we've lived through most of the Soviet collapse – though not really. We really haven't lived through all the consequences of World War I if you take the historic view. Ahead of us is the collapse of this very peculiar system that's grown up over the last 40 years since the US



went off gold.

That's the era we're in now, and it's not a very happy one. I only make the point that this system has some really strange contradictions as well – putting consumption before production, penalizing savers, etc. So many things are wrong with [unknown], it's amazing it functions at all really.

A large part of its functioning is due to the reserve role that the US dollar plays.

That was another thing. When the wall collapsed and when the Soviet Union collapsed, we were all looking forward to a peace dividend, but what Washington saw was, “Hey, with India and China and Russia in the mix, there is probably 3 billion new potential dollar-holders out there.” So Washington was very excited. “We can push a lot of money out the door,” and they did.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: The world accepted it.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right. Let me just talk for a minute because I want to get to the Ukraine today.

My recollection was that between 1990 and 2000 you literally saw the population of Russia fall. One person said at the beginning there was a very small number living in poverty and by the end of the decade it exploded in numbers and the population shrunk 25 million.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: The population was cut in half when the Soviet Union collapsed if you look at it from a Russian point of view. As for the size of the country, its borders were returned to those who were prevalent under Katherine the Great, so they lost half their population. That was a very shocking thing to people. That's a disconcerting development as you can imagine if you woke up one morning and half the United States was gone, including that part of the population.



You were down to about 150 million people in 1992 – 150 million Russians.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Today it's about 142 million, although the projections are grim. But they are no more grim, I would say, than most of Europe. We are declining.

Mr. Putin has worked very hard to try to reverse that, and they finally got a positive year on the birth rate and it has been going up. It may be another reason for the events in the Ukraine, to stop those positive developments that Russia had worked very hard to create.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: But it's fair to say that what happened after the wall came down is the Western interest behaved in a way that did great harm to the population. Is that fair to say?

ANNE WILLIAMSON: The West did terrible things to the Russian people. So many lives were destroyed! The biggest thing they did – the ugliest thing – was how they managed what they called 'The Ruble Overhang'. It sounds really scary – the Ruble Overhang. What was that?

The Ruble Overhang was the national saving. You see, under communism there wasn't anything to buy. So people saved their money. That was a lot of savings in Russia in 1992. This was a problem because what if those Russian people used their money to buy their national property? Whoa! That would bring a lot of competitors into the auctions, into the market process.

The West cleverly – the Harvard academics – got Yeltsin to announce the freeing of wage and price control, which should have been done, but he named the exact date three months into the future. So therefore all producers ceased delivery. They started hoarding, getting ready for the big feast. When it came, he did release wages and prices. It set off a 2500% inflation in 1992. That was the end of the problem of Ruble Overhang or the people's savings.



That's really something to consider, because if you look at US history, it wasn't World War II that really brought the US out of the Great Depression. That actually continued, even through the war. It was rationing.

The same thing happened to the American people. You couldn't buy anything during the war so people saved their money. When the war ended and all those GIs came home, the people had savings. That was a big part of the Post World War II boom in the United States, particularly the 1950's. So you certainly didn't want something like that to occur in Russia, and it would have.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, we also have stories of banks and pension funds being literally emptied out and the money stolen and plundered out of the country.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I would say that if territory were exploitable, Russia would be the size of Luxembourg. I mean, they just shipped out everything, and some of that – of course – was well-positioned Russians looting the country themselves. But the real role the West played was coming in and showing those people how to move that money and how to get it through the banking system and how to literally empty the pension fund and get the money to some foundation.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: It's kind of like the technology we brought to Russia. The technology we brought was financial fraud. We taught them that being communists they weren't anywhere near as schooled in financial fraud as we were.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Well, the economists didn't understand the country at all – the people who got hold of this process – because the Soviet Union had an economy. It even had a market economy, but it was a black market economy.

“The drugs are produced outside of the United States. They hire a subcontractor to bring it into the United States because it doesn't make sense to try to maintain your own people because it's such high risk that you lose a lot of them.”



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: What needed to be done was to open it up. You didn't necessarily have to come in and start creating all these imitations of the West. There were organic markets already in existence, but as I say, you needed to bring it out into the public square. But they didn't want that because those were experienced players.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: One of the things that got me talking and one of the reasons I was so interested in your work was I had a theory that some of the money that the Russian Mafia laundered out was being used or was coming back into the Exchange Stabilization Fund and being used to bid on the HUD loan sales.

When I started to read all about the Russian Mafia, including Robert Friedman's book *Red Mafia*, one of the things that triggered me wanting to get Anne Williamson on The Solari Report was I was interviewing Zack Taylor. It was an interview that we'll post this week. He is a former Border Patrol officer, including doing intelligence work.

He was explaining to me that the Russian Mafia is the most powerful force in the cartels in Mexico City. I thought, "That makes me nervous." I know that they laundered a lot of money into Israel in the 90's and got a position there. I knew they were laundering into New York. Suddenly now they're in Mexico City, on our border, and I said to myself, "If you look at the people who are looking to build out the big investment in Mexico and Latin America – including Mexico just opened up their oil and gas to investment – this is beginning to look like the guys who did Russia."

I said, "I've got to talk to Anne and see if the Russian Mafia is teamed up with the same people on our border. What does this mean?" I also know they've got a toehold in the Ukraine.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It's so hard to say. When you talk about the Russian Mafia, we naturally associate this term to the mafia as we understand it.



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right, and it's not.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: No, it's not. It's different. How can I explain it? It's hard to understand.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes, because it's fractured.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Yes, and where does it end and the government begin? You can make a big mistake at this point.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Absolutely. You can. Although what Friedman said was that the Russian Mafia was 99% Jewish, so if you looked at the time that I studied them at their linkages they were not just to a particular country but they were very tied into the networks where there is a strong Jewish community – New York and Israel.

I have much less of an understanding of what their networks are in Russia today.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Odessa.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: That's a great traditional city of the Russian Mafia – Jewish Mafia. They're very active. The really odd thing about that is I don't think this was anybody's plan; it just happened this way.

If you recall, in the 70's and 80's there was enormous support for Russian Jews to expatriate from the Soviet Union and they were given preference in the United States. So a large portion – almost all Russian immigration – was actually Jewish immigration. These people had already established themselves in the West by the time the Soviet Union collapsed. They already knew the ropes, they already had businesses, and they already had contacts in Europe for foundations and banks, etc.

Also, in the Soviet Union all those giant enterprises – and this is another part of the market that was there that we didn't see or understand. The



top guy was always a Russian, but number two was always a Jew. There was a whole network of Jewish traders.

The factory needed bolts but the nearest supplier of bolts was out and he was four republics to the west. Suddenly we've got to find these bolts or we're not going to make our production quota and then we're not going to get our bonuses, etc.

These traders actually worked the system and found the raw materials for the giant enterprises.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: So they were a lot of the muscle in the economy already.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Oh, yes. They were smart, clever guys who knew where everything valuable was, and they understood how those enterprises worked and were able to stay alive.

Plus they knew the director's name and they knew this guy over her and that guy over there. They knew all the players, and these are people who the West should have sought out because these guys knew what was going on.

If anybody should have been empowered domestically it was that group.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Not that any group should have been preselected.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: But you needed to get all the intellectual and financial know-how and use it.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Right. So when the system was collapsing, these Jews immigrated and they immigrated right into established communities. They were able to pull, ultimately, a lot of the wealth out of the country.

Now I wouldn't necessarily call that a Jewish Mafia.



C. AUSTIN FITTS: I don't think it was; I just think it's those networks.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It was a network. Exactly. And it was greatly empowered by something. Yes, there was great pressure to get Jews out of the Soviet Union and the United States was a big player in that, but what happened was not necessarily meant to be the end game. But because of the way we played it, we pulled those people out of the country when they should have stayed. They had a great role to play.

Now a Russian would look at that network and call it a mafia, and to them it is. I'm just saying that sometimes when you hear even Robert Friedman – who does not speak Russian by the way.

“...because of the way we played it, we pulled those people out of the country when they should have stayed.”

C. AUSTIN FITTS: He died right after the book was published.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I spoke with Robert quite a few times, and that was a real tragedy that he passed away so young. But he did not actually speak Russian, and he got into the Russian story by some coincidental meetings or introductions.

Sometimes he didn't really always have the context for some of the information he got, so I would just point out that it's such an emotionally-laden word that it conjures up all these images. But you don't want to mess around with real Russian Mafia. They're serious people, they're serious criminals, and of course they are like criminals the world over. They're looking for a way to get their money into the system.

The really big laundry for Russian money today is London.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: That doesn't surprise me.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: That sort-of changed there in the notch. It went from Israel to London.



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Didn't a lot come in through New York?

ANNE WILLIAMSON: That's the reason we still have Pound Sterling because actually governments want that money to enter the banks, but under their terms and to their benefit.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right. So take us to the Ukraine today. What in the world is going on? How did this happen?

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I think the big point for the West (the United States) is that Ukraine, if you look at it geographically, is basically a highway into Russia. That's how the armies of Napoleon or Chares of Sweden or many invaders including Hitler came. They all came through Ukraine because it's the easiest access to Russia.

It's also the easiest egress. That is why so many of the pipelines – the major energy pipelines – do go through the Ukraine. They have had no success in getting the oil companies under their control. Mr. Putin has been outfoxing them ever since that awful 'Loans for Shares' program of 1995, which was terribly upsetting to the Russian people on top of the awful voucher privatization.

Really it's taken the Putin administration this long to get the oil companies back where he wanted them, which is about where they were in 1995 with half government ownership.

They can't get directly to the oil companies, so the transport routes have become evermore important. With the building of Nord Stream and the now interrupted construction of South Stream – which are two pipes Russia built to usurp Ukraine and are meant to deliver gas to Europe – now they are threatened.

What I don't understand is why the EU is cooperating in this economic suicide that the US is insisting upon because the long gain is to get those transport routes. But if South Stream is built and completed, Ukraine is going to lose its importance as a transport venue. I think the United States is moved now because they wanted to get the job done before that happened.



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: And not only will it pull the gas and the oil through Ukraine, but they want to pull everything else and really isolate Russia and more or less indirectly get control of Russia's energy assets through control of the transport system. It's a very dangerous play. It's very, very bold, and I just don't think it's going to work. But how bad is it going to get? This is the unknown.

I told you just before our interview began that I was reading an article on *Drudge* that there's an accusation – a Bloomberg article – that Russia hacked JP Morgan, I think, in mid-August. Of course, it stated one way that this absolutely happened, and then you read the article and it says, "Russia may have..." There are all these qualifiers. I thought, "That's an interesting allegation that appears just before those talks began in Ukraine between Mr. Putin and Poroshenko." They've already got something ready to hurl at the Russians to make sure.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I told you Ambrose Evans-Pritchard just did an interview with Lars Schall and talked about the group at Treasury that's been developing a whole new set of sanctions. I'm assuming that he was referring to some of the ones they've been using at the Russian leadership, but when you look at those sanctions and what they're doing – and I know both you and I experienced a taste of some of that stuff personally – what you realize is when you say 'bold' this is not only bold but it's bold at an intimate level because they're bringing financial sanctions in very personally vicious ways to a wide variety of people.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: And another interesting development was an insane judgment on behalf of Yukos of \$50 billion for four thieves who never paid a penny for the offset.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I don't understand how the Ukos settlement fits in, and I would love it if you could explain that.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: The Ukos story is really something else. Mr. Khodorkovsky is a brilliant person, and he was a successful person from



the beginning. He was head at one point of Moscow Komsomol, very prominent, and he was given investment capital by the KGB which was a very smart decision because he was successful – as I say – from the beginning.

Of course, he was also rapacious and ruthless. It was actually a man named Mr. Potanin UNEXIM Bank and Norilsk Nickel who came up with the Loans for Shares scheme, but probably Khodorkovsky played it best because he got control of a lot of oil in those auctions with the results pre-agreed. They used stand-ins at the auctions.

I remember the winning bidder for Ukos was tracked down after the auction. He was just a drunk in some podunk Russian town. They used a lot of cut-outs and so forth. Then they get control of the assets. The government actually gave them money and they bought into the Russian bond market which was a creation – very interesting – of the United States Treasury, an off-the-books program initiated by Gerald Corrigan and Herbert Walker Bush. In 1991 they were getting the bond market ready to roll.

That's a program almost nobody knows anything about, and yet it was a key element in the whole mix of the 1990's. At one point they were paying 290% yields on three-month paper, which is crazy.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Good Lord!

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Of course! That's not even a market price.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, it's a way of skimming the equity out through the back door.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Right. It was a pass-through program. Really, essentially the US taxpayers' contributions to the IMF were actually paying those yields on Russian bonds which were known as [unknown]. It was going to people who were buying them illegally because Russia had passed legislation that excluded foreigners above 10% of the market. So everybody ran out and found a Russian to stand in.



Then these guys who participated in Loans for Shares made a fortune investing the government money and those bonds. They never paid for the asset.

Now Khodorkovsky continued his ruthless activities for about three more years, and people who had purchased Yukos – investors – were furious.

If you go back and look you'll find a lot of negative press on him. But then in 1998 he totally changed his tactic. The guy is so smart. He started paying a huge dividend and said, "I'm going to play by the rules." He brought in appropriate accountancy work from the West and he put out clean books. He paid a huge dividend, and overnight the Western Yukos shareholders were thrilled. Now Khodorkovsky is the best guy in the world.

Well, you have to go back to what the real idea of privatization was. The US had set it up so that the old nomenklatura cooperated for the nomenklatura to get the assets – criminals and speculators. They did that intentionally because their idea was that these thieves, "Let them steal all they can because they will never be able to manage those huge enterprises and they will want to cash out and they will sell to us cheap." That was the idea. That is one of the reasons we supported all these nefarious people. The powers that be assumed that they were eventually going to get those assets.

Well, they never got them. The boys held on. Mr. Khodorkovsky, the most successful of them, in the end ironically is now their asset.

The thing that the Western shareholders didn't understand was: Who's the biggest shareholder of Yukos? Mikail Khodorkovsky. Of course he was paying those huge dividends. It was simply a way for him to get the money out of Yukos into his own pocket. Then he started playing politics with that money.

“These guys who participated in Loans for Shares made a fortune investing the government money and those bonds. They never paid for the asset.”



He was literally trying to buy the entire Duma. Then he entered into discussions to sell somewhere between 40-50% of the firm to Exxon Mobile and Chevron who were the bidders. This was never ever going to happen. There is nobody – no Russian leader – who could have sat in the Kremlin and allowed an asset that was never paid for and is truly part of the Russian people’s legacy to be sold to the West and the profits go into a single individual’s pocket. It just never was going to happen.

Of course, Mr. Putin had warned those guys, “If you get into politics, you’re out.” That’s what happened to Mr. Khodorkovsky, but by then the West considered him their greatest success. That is a large reason as to why there has been so much positive publicity about the guy and Putin has been so denigrated for the prosecution of Khodorkovsky.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: So, Anne, given the judgment in the Hague, is there any way that he can literally enforce that judgment in Russia?

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I don’t think he can enforce it really, but what he can do – which is just as bad – is dog Russia in every court in the land. Any time they have an asset he can file a claim.

Now whether the national court of a certain country will entertain that claim I cannot say now, but certainly the US is going to be there encouraging them to do so.

They can just complicate life for the Russians more in every nation on earth essentially.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: So let me ask you: Why is Europe going along with this? You say we’re bringing fracking technology to the Ukraine and we’re bringing fracking technology to Europe. Presumably the deposits off of Israel will go to Europe. Why is Europe going along with this?

ANNE WILLIAMSON: That is really the question. I think the Fed was pumping so much money that was going ultimately to Europe after 2008. We really don’t have a clear idea of what agreements were made for those dollars. The answer could lie there, but I keep having a very



uncomfortable feeling – and Paul Craig Roberts has said this. He’s actually stated several times in his work that the individual leaders have been picked off with compromising information and threats to them.

You notice today Christine Lagarde of the IMF is in some hot water in France.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes. That investigation, they raided her apartment about six or twelve months ago. They’ve waived that flag before at her. I’m just wondering what that is about.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I mean, that is pretty a long story. She’s been dealing with that problem for at least several years. She hasn’t been able to quiet the situation and you don’t hear anything about it. Then suddenly here it’s flaring up.

Her predecessor who was falsely accused – he wasn’t rue. This business with the New York City hotel maids were to shut up, but they got rid of him and he was talking back. They didn’t like that.

I know that Angela Merkel was their choice for German Chancellor, and they worked very hard to make sure that Gerhard Schroder lost that election in, I think, 2004. He was just a little too interested in Germany’s interest to suit the Americans.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: That may be possible because it’s clear from the sanctions that they’ve tried to exercise in Russia that between control files and NSA-type systems doing surveillance and being able to implement different negative media and negative legal and financial actions individually against people without any authority and without having an indictment or anything else, the techniques of control have reached a new extraordinary level. I think that’s what Ambrose Pritchard-Evans was talking about.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: In the \$50 billion judgment for Yukos, I think this is part of the story. Who would have real insight into those relationships in the Kremlin who is now considered a Western asset? Mr. Khodorkovsky.



That's invaluable information for them. If he could possibly get that \$50 billion, even though he's not a shareholder but I would not be fooled by that legal status, he signed his shares over to Platonov who's in Israel. I'm sure there's a private agreement about that. But if Khodorkovsky can get that kind of money back in his pocket, then it would certainly increase his chances of taking out Putin.

I think they actually have the idea that with enough time they can pull the same stunt in Moscow that they pulled off in Kiev with these new information sources and their financial technology.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I don't know. It's funny. I don't know the Russians well; you do. But you know the story of the Russian, a Putin advisor, who tried to recruit me in 2005.

I was up at the Gold Conference in the Yukon.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Oh yes?

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes. There was a national security advisor to Putin who was there and he tried to recruit me. It was quite extraordinary. I'll never forget saying to him, "You know, nobody likes a traitor." I don't like my current leadership, but I haven't given up on my people. So, the answer is no.

But his speech to me, which was very intelligent, was very compelling. "Basically what you need to understand about us is that we're part of the Russian Orthodox Church, and this is about values and what your values are and what's going to be true for 1,000 years. We think in 1,000-year increments. What we believe is that your culture is perverted, and we don't want to be perverted. We want to be part of something that is strategic and is excellent and can go for thousands of years. We think in a whole different way than you do."

Now, it was a very good recruiting speech. Whether it was true or not I leave to you.



ANNE WILLIAMSON: Wow!

C. AUSTIN FITTS: No, I was very impressed, too. And you got the feeling that you were dealing with a group of people who were truly formidable because you watch at how much attention Putin gives to the law whenever he talks about things and whenever he does things. It was as though they had a great understanding of the need to command moral authority. It's what the Chinese call the Mandate of Heaven. They gave serious attention to building the Mandate of Heaven.

I've seen a series of speeches by one of his economic advisors, which I've been posting on the blog. The interesting thing is that their short guy with dark hair – I can't remember his name.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Sergey Glazyev.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: What he does a very good job of describing is that we're going to have to all be part of creating new rules, and what we and the other nations that Putin is coordinating with – pretty much the bricks – we're all struggling with the issues of, "Okay, how do we create alternatives?" To me, that is the work that needs to be done. That's what is happening.

I have to tell you what I see is Putin getting help from different groups in the United States, and I think it's part of a variety of interests wanting to see those new arrangements made and the global economy becoming less fragile.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It's interesting because Glazyev was at one time one of the eager young reformers, but he actually was vying his government position as a protest against corruption. In 1992, I think, he was involved in trade somehow. He's an interesting man. I've known him for years, and he visited New York back at the time I wrote those *WorldNet*

“It was as though they had a great understanding of the need to command moral authority ... They gave serious attention to building the Mandate of Heaven.”



Daily articles. The nation had a reception for him and a meeting at a conference beforehand, and they invited me.

I brought the last copies I had of that magazine – the two issues – and gave them to him. I said, “It’s probably a waste because both the nation people looked horrified when I handed it to him.” I thought that was why I’d been invited, but they wanted me to be there for some other reason. I can’t remember what.

I thought, “Well, there went my last copies. They’ll get them away from him,” but I think maybe they forgot and he actually read them.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I think he’s a very sound fellow. I like a lot of what he says.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: He works a lot with Michael Hudson, who is quite a good economist.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Oh good. I can see that. They fit.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I wanted to respond to your remarks about Putin because that is one thing I see so clearly in this particular confrontation. I mean, I’m really impressed with how the Russians are handling it. They are so professional.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I have to tell you that if you look at how they’re handling the leadership or handling the sanctions, I cannot imagine a group of Americans handling it as well.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It’s impossible to imagine. Even that Ministry of Defense press conference they had after the Malaysian airliner was shot down on a Thursday, and they had it on a Monday, in response to the wild charges the West started making against them, that was the most beautifully organized presentation. It was so crisp and so clear. They had their evidence all in order and their questions for the US. It was just magnificently well-prepared.

Of course, Mr. Putin is constantly referencing the law and custom. I



think the Americans are just kind of falling all over themselves with these ridiculous charges. You know, you've got to have some evidence before you accuse people of being murderers, and they don't have any. Of course, the story died.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Ten years ago you could get spin to stick. I think just the global population has become more intelligent, and Putin seems to be very clever about understanding that the facts and the law matter if you are willing to not let the spin get under your skin. He seems to be able to do that.

I think two things: they've watched this media – the really perverted media game – for long enough and dealt with it long enough that a lot of people are getting smart. But there is something else. I think they know that if you live through what they lived through in the 90's, I think they know that the stakes are as high as they get. They have to win.

It's a little bit like their boats are burned. You can't go back. They understand that if you don't stand up against this what is going to happen to them. The 90's were genteel compared to what's going to happen this time.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: The 90's were just a particularly horrifying trailer for the future and well-being.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, what you're watching in the Ukraine – if I'm right – is wholesale depopulation.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Yes. I'm just waiting for when the Ukrainian people are going to understand what they have done – the position they've put themselves in by going along with this Maidan business. It's a disaster for them. It's kind of a race. The Russians are sitting back trying to keep everybody calm and sustain those poor people in the East who are being attacked the best they can. Eventually these agreements they made with the IMF, the Ukraine government, the coup government – though it's not a coup government anymore since the guy was elected – are really going to hurt.



And all the money we've given them already has disappeared. We've already handed out about \$3 billion and it's gone. Nobody knows where it went.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I can guess.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Exactly.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: We saw IMF bailouts in the 1990's where I believe the money never left Wall Street. It just went from the JP Morgan account for the IMF to the JP Morgan account for the country to the JP Morgan accounts for Goldman Sachs. From this to that, it just literally went from account to account between JP Morgan Chase, and the money never left JP Morgan Chase.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: This is absolutely correct. I know that happened in the Mexican bailout. The money never left the country. I'm sure it happened many other times.

It's really a fantastic scam that has grown out of the Federal Reserve and the post-World War II world and the collapse of Bretton Woods. I mean, this is such a demented economic system we're now attempting to sustain.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, even though the Americans engineered Lagarde to the IMF, is it possible that it's getting so ugly and she won't go along with what they need to do next?

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I really don't know. She's an interesting woman, but she's definitely part of the status quo. They're pretty ambivalent at the IMF about anything and everything to tell you the truth. They just want to get their payments.

It's a really rich, comfortable plantation, so they don't want that disturbed. On the other hand, they are educated people and they have some understanding of the consequences of their policies. Their mission people have to live in and witness it in those countries.



I'd like to think there is some moral hesitation there, but I think such interests are now flying about that I don't see how you're going to keep all these Europeans in line. France is in a different position than Germany with the Russians, and the Dutch as well. I just think: What are all the politics there?

Now, for instance, Hungary is being targeted because Victor Ormand, the President of that country, is not going along with the program. He's not even going along with the EU program.

It could be that something else is causing this attack on Ms. Lagarde. It could be purely French domestic politics.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: You're right. It could.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It could be that her alleged violation was in favor of Sarkozy who was recently charged with corruption. It could be just that story and not an international one.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: But also if you want to step back and look at it in the long view, it could be that we're dealing with a system that is so lacking in integrity that at some point everybody starts fighting by tearing each other apart.

It's what Rick Perry said, "We can't have our political fights through indictments," but you see that going on all over the world.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It's very unsettling, and this ambition of the United States trying to force issues, I've finally come to the conclusion that it doesn't matter to them.

If you look at a nation like Ukraine, this is such a complicated country. It's been part of an Austrian-Hungarian empire, it's been part of Poland, it's been part of Russia. I mean, you've got at least 700 violent years of history and misfortune in that country.

"If you want to step back and look at it in the long view, it could be that we're dealing with a system that is so lacking in integrity that at some point everybody starts fighting by tearing each other apart."



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Then you had Chernobyl.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Back to World War II they aligned with the Germans and the fascists. There are just so many layers of groups that go back generations of beef against one another.

I'm sure the Russians at first were just astonished at what the United States did because they know perfectly well the US has no opportunity to really control that country or understand what they unleashed. But for the United States, I think our foreign policy can be boiled down to this: It doesn't matter. Just kick up the dust. Then we improvise.

When they first set off for Ukraine, I think they actually had the idea they were going to get Crimea and the port there, even though that was never going to happen. Well, Mr. Putin did resolve that issue very efficiently and quickly – thank God – because I hate to think of where we'd be right now if he had not done that and the West had persisted.

So, okay, they say, “We don't get Crimea, but we can get all these military agreements and just short of NATO membership. We can go that far.” Now that's their focus, and that's fine by them. They just sit and bide their time. We see it with the Islamic states with the crazy business of arming those rebels with our own equipment.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Sometimes I think what we have is a whole market cap worth of companies that need to keep their earnings growing, and they're just swirling around like a swarm of insects just looking for the next fix.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Yes. It's very hard for the American people to accept and understand, but a huge part of this economy is a war machine.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes. It's funny. There was an article posted of the number one search term in every country in the world. You saw a map and the word on every country that was the number one search term in that country. The number one search term in the United States was 'war'.



ANNE WILLIAMSON: Wow! Interesting. I do see the propaganda against Russia slowly succeeding with Americans, and that worries me because first it was largely rejected. Outside the United States I think it's rejected and people are getting even more upset by it because they can see that this is crazy. We're the ones who are going to suffer.

The media machine is so successful in the United States that they can orchestrate these crises so professionally now. It's truly terrifying. I mean, just imagine if we didn't have the internet and we were still relying on major newspapers alone. What if it were 20 years ago?

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I don't know. Speaking of which, have you seen the new Jack Ryan movie?

ANNE WILLIAMSON: No.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: It's Kevin Costner, and here's the plot. The plot is the Russians have organized a financial attack to destroy the dollar, and Kevin Costner is – are you ready for this? – the covert operations at Treasury. He recruits Jack Ryan to go in and save us from the Russians, and, of course, we outwit the Russians and their attack on the dollar is destroyed. It was all orchestrated to come out right at the right time.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Did you see the film, Catherine?

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes. It's a terrible movie. I mean, don't plan on going to it. Go there as an exercise in understanding the geo-politics. Do not go thinking you are going to be entertained, although I love Kevin Costner.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: If it's a bad film, that even more speaks to being part of an orchestration.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes, because if you look at how long it takes to finance and produce that, it took some time.

Before we close, just give us five minutes on Lok-N-Load and what you're up to and where it's going to go from here, and how we stay current and support your work.



ANNE WILLIAMSON: Well, thank you. I'm using Lok-N-Load as a vehicle to bring out *Contagion* and another book I've done on Switzerland. It's not quite finished yet, but it's called *Modern Switzerland: Shadow and Light*.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Oh, I'm dying to read that!

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It's a good one, and that's really Switzerland after the Cold War as well, and the taking over of a healthy culture through finance and banking, and why the small little mountainous Alpine country was such a focus of US foreign policy back in 1991 and 1992. So that's a very interesting story.

Then I have another one called *All the World's Politics* which is about the Island of Sark which is the last feudal kingdom in Europe. It is not a member of the EU and it is not subject to the British Parliament. The island and that community and policy exist on the basis of a lease signed with Elizabeth I. The only obligation is to the Crown and I think the annual rent. The Seigneur has to pay something like seven pounds sterling. It's just crazy.

Two billionaires – the Barclay brothers who are publishers of the *UK Telegraph* – have become involved. So you have this huge global money and this feisty little independent island loaded with British eccentrics. It's a great story.

But what do the three stories have in common – this huge nation of Russia the former empire, this Alpine country in Central Europe, and a Channel Island? The theme is really about decentralization which is, I think, the answer for people all over the world.

The nation-state is actually a killer. It's going to be killing us domestically if we don't look out. It's not that different from what you're doing at Solari – the idea – which is to revitalize these communities and truly reduce government. I'm an anarchist, so I'm happy to see the whole thing go down the tubes.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: And I thought you were an Austrian, not an anarchist.



ANNE WILLIAMSON: Well, I am an Austrian, too. I'm an anarcho-capitalist. I'm over there with Rothbard, the really radical people. I accept that I'm probably not going to see anything like that in my lifetime except in the conditions of total collapse, which I hope none of us see.

At any rate, it is an attempt to inform the citizens of the United States a little bit about the realities of Europe and the struggles there, and to get the information going the other way because Europeans are rather badly informed on the US.

We have to get some dialogue going. We hope to focus on local movements, local entrepreneurs, both in the United States and in Europe considering the high youth unemployment. The idea is these nanny states are forced to retreat. It doesn't necessarily mean that goods and services the government once provided are not needed or wanted; they are wanted and needed. But young people can build the small companies for communities that can deliver those services.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I agree.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: We're hoping to generate that conversation as well. Now with crowdfunding, is there really a place? It's happening. I think there is because people need to talk about and be inspired by what others have done or what others are thinking.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: You can't build a financial system until you first build a media. That's why they wanted to get the media first in Russia before they did the financial system. I agree with you.

If we're going to decentralize, it's what Putin's advisor says. If we're going to make up new rules, we ought to talk about it and we have to have a media that covers it.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: Right.

“I accept that I'm probably not going to see anything like that in my lifetime except in the conditions of total collapse, which I hope none of us see.”



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, I think what you are doing is so wonderful. We want to support it in every way.

Every time you are ready to publish or you are ready to market, let us know. I'll write a book review. We'll get it out there. I can't wait.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: I'm really looking forward to it. It has been very hard to watch this story unfold over the years and see how much of it was omitted and how that has distorted and made difficult for Americans to understand what really happened and what is the basis for the Russians' viewpoint of us. There really are reasons for it. It's not just an emotional reaction.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: So, I'm looking forward. I appreciate it. I know you've got a great membership there and a great following. I hope they'll take the time in the future to read the book once I've got it all done.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. Well, Anne, have a wonderful day. Again, thank you very much. It was wonderful having you on The Solari Report.

ANNE WILLIAMSON: It was my pleasure. Thank you, Catherine.

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.