Edward Snowden: But then we got the September 11th attacks and this intelligence community complex, right, all the spy agencies that had felt very sore for these 20 years, 20 plus years, had created a secret wish list of all of the changes to law that they would have wanted if they could have passed them. But they knew that they never would have passed with popular support in the United States because they violated the Fourth Amendment of our Constitution, which is the prohibition against not just the unreasonable searching of your home, your electronic communications, where people are listening to your phone calls, where they're breaking into your house, placing cameras, but the seising of your personal things or your communications, the first place, you couldn't just pull things off the line without a warrant from a court. Well, this was sort of a secret plan that was sitting with the Department of Justice has been negotiated with the intelligence agencies. When September 11th happened, it came off the shelf. They called it the Patriot Act. And in that moment of national crisis where everybody had been terrorised quite successfully by an extraordinary attack. And in this moment of vulnerability, these agencies exploited that moment of national trauma to pass this. There was almost no dissent. There was, I think, a single dissenting vote in the House from an extraordinary, brave woman. But these things swept into power overnight. But there were individuals who were working in these agencies who saw this happening from the other side. And although the government publicly at the time was saying, look, this isn't going to affect Americans, it's not going to affect your rights, is not going to affect our allies, this is only about al-Qaida. This is only about terrorists. This is only about bad people, far away people, the enemy. Don't worry about it. There's nothing to fear. Individuals like Thomas Drake, Bill Binney, Kirk Wiebe, Ed Loomis, these individuals were sitting at the NSA and they went, well, if this is the case, why are we ordering huge amounts of electronic
equipment and putting them inside the United States at telecommunications providers that aren't monitoring foreign communications, they're monitoring wholly domestic communications. And they went through proper channels. They went to the NSA's inspector general. This is sort of an internal watchdog, right? It's supposed to be a relic of this nineteen seventy eight era reform of the church committee that says, look, when there's problems in classified areas, you go to this watchdog in the government, you tell them what's going on and they'll fix it. They'll investigate. They'll find all these activities unlawful. Are they unconstitutional or are they contrary to the values of the nation? Are they waste, fraud or abuse of the government's authorities? And when they did this when they went internally, this one individual, particularly Thomas Drake, is the one the government came after the hardest, the NSA's number two lawyer, they've got about a hundred lawyers, this guy was the number two, he talked to Thomas Drake personally. Thomas Drake said, look, I understand the mission. I understand we're in a moment of national crisis. But what you're doing is a violation of the Constitution, a fact which, by the way, was not affirmed by the courts in a meaningful way until more than ten years later, passed twenty thirteen. But the programme was eventually amended because of the kind of things that he brought forward in 2006. There were some amendments to the programme as well. But the NSA's internal process, this watchdog that was supposed to be protecting the constitution, that was supposed to be waiting for men like Thomas Drake to stand up and say, whoa, somebody is breaking the rules here. He responded like this.

**Vito Potenza:** If he came to me, someone who was not read into the programme and told me that we were running amok essentially and violating the Constitution, there's no doubt in my mind I would have told him, you know, go talk to your management. Don't bother me with this. I mean, you know, you did... The minute he said, if he did say, you're using this to violate the Constitution, I mean, I probably would have stopped the conversation at that point, quite frankly. So I mean, if that's what he said, then anything after that, I probably wasn't listening to anyway.

**Edward Snowden:** This new wave of whistleblowers, the Thomas Drake's, the Bill Binney's, the Kirk Wiebe's, the Ed Loomis's, even the John Kiriakou's, the Chelsea Manning's, if it had not been for them and their examples, I might have replicated their mistakes. Thomas Drake, for going through these proper channels, was hounded by the US government. He was charged under the Espionage Act, the same laws they accused me of violating. This is a law that does not provide a fair trial. You are literally prohibited by law from presenting your defence to the jury. You can't tell them why you did what you did and have them decide if that was basically a relevant enough threat to the operation of the system that your acts made sense. The same way that in the United States, even a murderer can say, look, this person was threatening my life and the jury can consider maybe this was self-defence is denied to whistleblowers in the United States who reveal information to journalists. Under US law it doesn't matter. These men did it anyway. They did everything right. They even went to Congress. Going to journalists was an act of last resort. And for that, the US government
destroyed their lives.

**Julian Assange:** Today, we release over two hundred and eighty seven files documenting the reality of the international surveillance industry, an industry which now sells equipment to dictators and democracies alike in order to intercept entire populations. That statement sounds like it's something from Hollywood. That statement sounds like it would only be science fiction, but the reality is... That this industry has grown up over the last 10 years from being a covert, very secretive, small industry. To a transnational industry with its own industry conferences, over 160 companies involved in over 25 countries, there is an international corporatized mass surveillance industry. So embarking on the development of our new whistleblowing source protection platform. We undertook a research effort to see what really is the state of the art in international surveillance systems. And the findings are really quite remarkable, 9/11 has provided a license for European countries, for The United States, Australia, Canada, South Africa and others who develop spying systems that affect all of us. So who here has an iPhone? Who here has a Blackberry? Who here uses Gmail? Well, you’re all screwed. The reality is, Intelligence contractors are selling, right now to countries across the world, mass surveillance systems for all those products.

**William Binney:** It takes a bigger budget, it takes a bigger story you have to buy, first of all, you got to buy the access to it and then you have to buy equipment to collect it. Then you have to buy all the communications to transport it, and then you have to buy all the place to store it, then you have to buy all the programmes to analyse it, then you have to buy all the analysts. Look at it. See, it's a big industrial production here, that's building an empire, an intelligence empire, and that's what they've got. And the point is that by doing that and then by doubling down on the collection, by taking everything that now makes it such, I call this now a data bank failure. Like Paris was a data bank failure?! Boston was a data bulk failure?! So was Times Square, the Times Square bomber?! So is Fort Hood?! All of them, everything that's happened has been a data bank failure. And what they've done, you see, is what it does, it gives them a lot of data on everybody so they can retroactively analyse what they did. That's a forensics approach. That's policing.

**END**