



## **Episode 702: The Media Says There's Nothing to See in the 28 Pages; Here's What They're Not Telling You**

**Guest: Larisa Alexandrovna**

**WOODS:** I'm so glad you did this, because I talked to Brian McGlinchey of 28Pages.org about the 28 pages about a week before they released them, so of course I took for credit for the release of the 28 pages. And then when they came out I was reading the news; I wanted to see, well, I've built this up to my listeners, so what are the big bombshells in it. And as you know, the conventional wisdom was, eh, you know, this was a big flop. Nothing really there, so it just goes to show all you people should be more trusting of the government when they tell you you don't need to know certain things.

And then I heard — I saw on Facebook, because we're friends, and I saw that you were writing something, and you were saying these people have got it so wrong. And I thought, yeah, baby, yeah. I'm going to have you on to explain what's going on in the 28 pages. I'm going to link at [TomWoods.com/702](http://TomWoods.com/702) to the article you wrote on this laying the whole thing out. Now, there are so many names in this that it would be difficult for a lot of people to keep straight, so give me the one-minute bird's eye view of at least what questions are raised by the 28 pages, and then we'll get into the weeds.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Okay, so basically I would say the most damning link to the 9/11 hijackers is that of Prince Bandar, who was the Saudi ambassador to the United States and then went on to become the head of Saudi intelligence, and he's one of the most prominent Saudi royals. He's also affectionately called by the Bush family "Bandar Bush," because he's so close to the Bush family. His connections not only to 9/11 but to other terrorist activities make him absolutely a suspect, and the fact that others are not saying that is astounding to me.

But there's more. There's a lot more. There's at least four Saudi intelligence officers who were helping the hijackers, and they were working under official government cover, Saudi government cover, in various different Saudi government departments. So to say that there's no connection is ridiculous. You've got one of the highest ranking Saudi government officials and royal family members, as well as four intelligence officers. That is a connection. So I would say that's the bird's eye view.

**WOODS:** So this is then what we didn't — so there were suspicions before, but you're telling me that the 28 pages actually lends meat to the case?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, let me put it this way. It's been 14 years since this document was classified. In that time there's been a lot of investigations, and a lot was leaked to the press. So yes, we did know a lot of this going in; however, it doesn't make the allegations any less credible that we knew them ahead of time. The other issue is that there is new information, and it also provides context. So to answer your question, yes, we knew some of this going in. Yes.

**WOODS:** All right, so now let's get into some more specifics. I mean, other than Bandar, I'm pretty much not — well, I guess bin Laden's brother, but there aren't a whole lot of names that are going to be household names, or even that I myself recognize. So who are the most important people in the 28 pages?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Aside from Bandar, you mean?

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** There's three. Probably the most important is a man by the name of Omar al-Bayoumi — and just call him Bayoumi — who has multiple ties to the Saudi government. For example, he was an accountant at the Saudi Civil Aviation Administration from 1975 to 1993. He frequently was in contact with the Ministry of Defense and Aviation and their traffic control department while he lived in San Diego. And it is because of his activities in San Diego that he is so interesting. While he lived in San Diego, two of the hijackers arrived — I refer to them as the San Diego cell, al-Mihdhar and al-Hazmi. They arrived, and he went directly and met them, brought them home to his apartment. Then he went and got them their own apartment and cosigned for it. He gave them money. He drove them around. He took them to Social Security offices; he took them to get their drivers licenses. He took them to the grocery store. He took them to flight schools, where they learned how to fly. He basically did everything for these men. This is important. Why isn't this person a suspect, correct?

But more importantly than that, while he was doing these things he was — as I mentioned before, he was an accountant for the Saudi Civil Aviation Administration, but while he was living in San Diego and supporting the hijackers in every conceivable way, he was also collecting a paycheck from the Saudi Department of Defense. And — and this is kind of complicated, but he was also getting money from Prince Bandar through Bandar's wife through another guy's wife to his wife. So there were a lot of wives involved. But anyway, he was getting funding from the Saudi government while he was babysitting and really doing everything for the San Diego cell hijackers. So I would say he is the most important person here, and he's tied in so many ways to the Saudi government.

**WOODS:** I guess what's most interesting to me about all this, and there's a tremendous amount in your article, but yet the conclusion where you're asking all these questions,

because these are the questions that would occur to people after looking at your evidence.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right.

**WOODS:** How did we get to a point where the Saudi royal family is untouchable? And more broadly speaking, the role of Saudi Arabia, the government in general, Saudi Arabia being an ally so therefore you can't look into them — where does this come from?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, there's been a hands-off policy with regard to the Saudi royal family/government for years under different presidents. But what's interesting is that when Bush came into office, that policy became much more expanded and aggressive. And FBI agents were not allowed to really investigate the Saudis or anyone associated with the Saudis, and the State Department allowed people who were just traveling with Saudis or who worked for Saudi commercial airline services to just come in and out without any investigation or background checks. And as to why, I don't know why. I mean, we can speculate, but I really can't support — there's no evidence for any one conclusive theory, you know? Certainly I would think that oil and its ties to our economy might be an issue, but I can't answer the whys, which is why I ask the whys.

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah, that's right. I was wondering that myself. I got the sense that these are questions that we can't know the answer to, but I wondered if in some cases you were asking them because in a way you kind of did and were asking us to try to connect the dots. But okay, let's keep talking.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Okay, well, I mean, I can — look, if you want my personal opinion, I think that there are two issues here. One is that Saudi oil is tied to our currency, and so yeah, protect the Saudis at all costs. The other issue is I think for years there have been embarrassing, incriminating, maybe not entirely legal, questionable business activities that our companies and certain of our public officials were engaged in with Saudi government officials and Saudi companies, the most notorious of which was the BCCI scandal. And I'll let your listeners Google that, because it's far too complicated to get into on this show. But that could be a reason too, possible embarrassing connections involving questionable business dealings. So there's two avenues, I suspect, but I don't know if we can prove either.

**WOODS:** Well, speaking of proof, some people will say, where is the so-called smoking gun in the 28 pages? Where do we clearly see a Saudi government official saying, "Hey, go hijack some airplanes and fly them into some buildings?" And you address that.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, I mean, if that's what people think they're going to get ever about anything, then they're ridiculous, because you're not going to get a picture of Prince Bandar in a room with Mohammed Atta. That's not going to happen. That's not how intelligence works. It works through cutouts, through middlemen, and while each

incident listed in the 28 pages or each piece of evidence alone may not be the full smoking gun, collectively it is quite the smoking gun.

For example, Prince Bandar's wife wrote 31 checks to an associate of Omar al-Bayoumi, the one we talked about earlier who basically babysat the hijackers. That associate's name is Omar Bassnan. He's another operative of Saudi intelligence with a cover in the Saudi government, and three of those checks that were written to his wife, Bayoumi's wife attempted to cash. There is no explanation for why 31 checks came from Bandar's wife to these people and how they coincided with the arrival of the hijackers. There's just no explanation. People have tried the charity explanation. The problem is that Prince Bandar and his wife, Haifa, have a lot of charities. These checks didn't come from a charity; they came from their bank accounts. And the timing of the checks is questionable, because it coincides with the arrival of the hijackers.

So if that's not a smoking gun, why don't we look at, for example, the phonebook of Abu Zubaida, which is also in the 28 pages? And this is new. I don't know if — do you recall what my piece said about this?

**WOODS:** Tell me again.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Okay, so Abu Zubaida's a suspected al Qaeda member. He's still at Guantanamo. A pretty high up official in al Qaeda. And he's picked up in Pakistan, and in his phonebook investigators find the number of an Aspen establishment of some sort. When they look into it, it turns out that it is a ghost company. In other words, it doesn't exist on paper, and its only purpose is to manage the private estate of Prince Bandar.

**WOODS:** Yes, okay, I had this in my notes.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Now, explain that to me (laughing). I mean, maybe alone that's not the smoking gun. Okay, fine. But on the one hand you've got 31 checks that are going directly to the handlers of the two hijackers in San Diego. Then you've got Abu Zubaida having this number that is unlisted and that isn't a real company. Or how about this? There's this Virginia man that the FBI went to investigate, because his phone number was found in Osama bin Laden's safehouse in Pakistan. So the FBI goes to investigate this guy, and he says, I don't know; I've never been there; I don't know how this could have gotten there. And they ask him, well, what do you do for a living. Oh, well, I work for the assistants of Prince Bandar. What are the odds? I mean, how many coincidences does it take before all of this collectively is a smoking gun?

**WOODS:** Yeah, exactly. That's the thing. When you look at each one of these, and then you look at them cumulatively, what are you looking at here? You're either looking at, as you say, one of the great coincidences in the history of the world or something deeper is happening. And it's creepy — I mean, that thing about the ghost property management company is extremely creepy here. And then for them to say, well, there really isn't anything; there's no need for you people to be looking into this —

**ALEXANDROVNA:** I know. It's hilarious, because the Saudis have been saying let's declassify this for years. And I'm thinking, why would they say that? I mean, do they know what's in it? And if they know what's in it, why would they want to declassify it? (laughing) I mean, I don't understand. But you know what? They're right, because it's been declassified, and no one care (laughing).

**WOODS:** You know, honest to goodness, I think that's probably their — because they figure as long as it's not declassified there's this cloud of suspicion over us. Let's get it out there, and we know the American public. They're choosing between Clinton and Trump; they obviously don't care about any of it.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right. Well, and here's just another coincidence that I think is hilarious, because it really reads like a Terry Gilliam movie. You've got this guy named Hussayen, who's an official with the Saudi Ministry of the Interior. So the day before the 9/11 attacks he stays in a hotel with three of the San Diego hijackers. So the FBI goes to question him, and he fakes a seizure. He's rushed to the hospital, where he's miraculously found to not be ill. He escapes to Saudi Arabia and is promoted to the President of the Holy Sites, one of the most senior government religious positions. Is that a coincidence?

**WOODS:** Yeah, right, right.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** So I mean, you could go on and on. There are so many people listed. And there's so much activity around the Saudi embassy, which Bandar was the head of. And the money laundering. I mean, so you need a cheat sheet if you don't understand, but once you understand you can't say there's nothing there.

**WOODS:** Yeah, let's say something about the embassy. I can't believe, reading your article, how naive I was in not realizing what you explain about how an embassy works, that at an embassy you have a lot of normal people, you have the ambassador and people who staff the embassy.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right.

**WOODS:** And then you have some spooks —

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Yes.

**WOODS:** — and everybody sort of knows that there are spooks in the embassy, and they don't quite know who's who, but it's just sort of an understanding that everybody has at the different embassies. I'm sorry I didn't realize that.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, yeah. I mean, for example, the spies we've had, like Hanssen and whatever, were run out of the Russian embassy. Generally how it's structured is that an embassy is a foreign government's own territory in another nation, and official intelligence officers, meaning acknowledged — if they were ever caught, they would be acknowledged, and they travel with official documents and diplomatic cover

— are placed inside various departments of the embassy. That's called a station, an intelligence station. So like, we have CIA stations all over the world. You know, Rome, Paris, wherever. And there's a head of that station. And then everyone under that person and everyone those people handle, all of the assets, report to that station chief. And those are all of the official cover intelligence officers. So they'll work at the embassy in whatever position and doing their day job, but they also moonlight as spies. And that's the same for Saudi Arabia; it's the same in the United States; it's the same for Russia. It's pretty similar across the board.

So to say that the chief of station for Saudi intelligence would not be in contact with five Saudi intelligence operatives receiving funding from the Saudi government is ridiculous (laughing). And the fact that he's working out of the same embassy that is overtly having contact in any case with these people is also — you can't deny these connections, right? I mean, it's just not possible.

**WOODS:** Yeah, now I'm looking at — I'm at the end. I didn't realize this either. The FBI is still withholding more than 80,000 classified pages related to the Saudis and the attacks of 9/11? So why were we so concerned about these 28?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, mostly because what's been leaked about them and investigated and provided to journalists. For example, in 2008 I got FOIA documents from the FBI that were surveillance documents of Bayoumi, the man I mentioned as the key — the one who babysat the hijackers, like spoon-fed them basically —

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** — that show that he got them an apartment, that he drove them here, he drove them there. So all of these things that were alleged to be in this document have been leaking over the years. So this document became the focus. There are other documents, but not much is leaked from them — not a lot, anyway — and so it's hard to make the kind of argument we can make for the 28 pages, because we knew it was centered around the Saudis. We knew it named Bandar as funding the San Diego cell. We knew there were people listed in there who worked for the Saudi government who escaped without any consequences and who were directly tied to the hijackers. We knew that about this document. We don't know that about the other documents.

**WOODS:** By the way, what is the significance of the San Diego cell?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** They're the ones that flew into the Pentagon.

**WOODS:** Okay, I didn't realize that. Okay, I got it now.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** And the reason I call it the San Diego cell is because this document deals — okay, there were several flights on 9/11 with several people assigned to each flight. So the San Diego group was assigned to the Pentagon flight. Okay, that was American Airlines Flight 77. So what I've always assumed is that each team was

assigned to a target, and so you can call them the San Diego cell or the Flight 77 cell, but I thought it would be easier to do geography than flight numbers, which could get confusing.

**WOODS:** Right.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** So I call them the San Diego cell, and there was a lot of — this document deals very extensively with that one group of hijackers that were the ones that crashed into the Pentagon. It remains to be seen if there are other documents that deal with the other cells, like the Atta cell or the Florida cell. You know what I mean? So at least three of the hijackers from San Diego that crashed into the Pentagon were in contact with Bayoumi and, indirectly, Bandar.

**WOODS:** Maybe this is the biggest dumb-guy question in the history of the world, and if so, I'm sorry, but I know somebody else must have it. What interest would the Saudi government have in launching a major attack on the U.S.? I can think of a couple of ways, but I'd like to hear your thoughts.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, you know, I've been asked this — and again, I can only speculate. I don't have an answer. If I had an answer then I would know all of this. If we're looking at Bandar, it could be ambition, because he wanted to be seen as more legitimate. He was a product of rape. His father, by the way, was the head of — and this is important, that we haven't discussed yet. His father, Prince Sultan, was the head of the Ministry of Defense, which was paying Bayoumi, the babysitter of the hijackers as well as Bandar, so I think that's important to know. But Bandar's the product of a rape of a maid, and I think he's always seen himself as illegitimate, and he wanted to show that maybe he was important. It can't be a coincidence that in 2005 both his father and he are promoted. His father, Prince Sultan, who was the head of the Ministry of Defense during 9/11, become second in line to the throne. He's named the crowned prince. And Bandar is promoted to Head of Intelligence. So maybe there was this, they had to prove something. I don't know.

The other possible explanation is that it's about money. And who knows? I mean, I know they have a lot of money, but maybe they want more. Honestly, I can't give you a reason. I'm just throwing out possibilities.

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah, of course. But yet, you know, when I look again at your concluding questions, it seems like these are questions that if we lived in a normal time and at a normal place everybody would be asking. So you mentioned the 80,000 classified pages. You then say, "The Bush administration allowed for the unprecedented evacuation of Saudi nationals, including persons of interest to investigators, in the days after 9/11." I think Michael Moore actually emphasized that in —

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Yeah, unfortunately, yeah (laughing).

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** He made it radioactive. But yes, he's not wrong. Yes, that happened.

**WOODS:** No, yeah. Sure, that doesn't make it — yeah, absolutely.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** And who organized that? That was organized by Prince Bandar? And there were two people on that flight of interest, actually. One of them was Abdullah bin Laden. Like I said, it — well, you're asking several different questions. You're asking why was this covered up at our lower levels of government, which I think can be explained by the edict issued by our higher officials, which was, "Back off." Then the second question is why did the Saudis do this, and there can be any number of explanations. I don't know the answer. And then the third question is why did our senior government officials say, "Back off?"

**WOODS:** Right.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** And we've already speculated as to the reasons, you know?

**WOODS:** Well, then you're talking about — you say, "All attempts to detain, question or investigate (and in some cases, attempts to charge) Saudi nationals with connections to the 9/11 attacks were shut down by the White House of the Bush Administration...All attempts to conduct a formal public investigation into the 9/11 attacks were thwarted by the Bush administration, who finally conceded after public pressure and even then, would only allot a pittance for the funding...All attempts to bury the Saudi role and the documents related to it as well as to whitewash the findings by the Bush and Obama administration" — this is just something that comes out of this. We have all these attempts; why were there all these attempts by both Bush and Obama? And then, "The US naming the government of Saudi Arabia as an ally on the war on terror and then attacking Iraq, which had no ties to 9/11 or al Qaeda," in your words "was diabolical given what we now know. Why did this happen?" Now, it's true,

**ALEXANDROVNA:** To me it's astounding the fact that these are our allies — well, not only Saudi Arabia. Pakistan, too, which Saudi Arabia launders a lot of terrorist money through, and there's a lot of diehard Osama bin Laden supporters and where Osama bin Laden was eventually found. These are our allies against a country who never attacked us. So to me, there's a darkness here that makes my skin crawl.

**WOODS:** Yeah, that is exactly how I feel, and so even though — it's true, of course we don't have and can't have all the answers to these questions, the only way to have any hope of ever getting them is to ask them.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, and I've asked them. I've asked them a lot. I've asked them for years and years and years (laughing).



**WOODS:** But the White House — just the other night, I've moved and I'm unpacking boxes, and I had some YouTube on; you know how these days once a YouTube video finishes it starts up another one that it thinks you might like?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** So somehow I got the White House Correspondents' Dinner with some guy doing an impression of the president, and all these supposedly adversarial journalists are cackling and laughing and yucking it up at their fancy dinner. And not one of these people will ask these questions.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right, well, but this is not a surprise. I mean, if you go back to the start of the Iraq War, there were very few journalists who were doing the work. The journalists of Knight Ridder, Landay and Strobel, that team was probably the only team in town asking, "Why are we going to war with Iraq?" There's a problem here. The Fourth Estate is not doing any public service. And it hasn't for a long time. Well, that portion of the Fourth Estate. Then there's the independent journalists, and we've been asking these questions. Why is Saudi Arabia our ally? I want to know. I mean, I really want to know. And I can't get an answer. So even in — and this is astonishing — even in the face of this, where you see that Bandar is sending hijackers checks — *31 checks* — still, the entire establishment says, well, psh, there's nothing indicating a connection to Saudi Arabia here.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** If this — I was talking to an intelligence officer, and we were laughing about this — kind of sad laughing, not funny laughing — because he said to me, you know, there's a lot more evidence here than there was to go to war with Iraq.

**WOODS:** Well, of course. If Saddam had sent those checks to these people that would have been front and center. That would have been the smoking gun we would never have heard the end of.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** If the Iraqi ambassador was writing checks and then it turned out that he was writing checks to these guys, exactly, and that the handler —

**WOODS:** Yeah, that would be the parallel, right.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right, and that the handler was working for the Iraqi Ministry of Defense, then we would have been, like, let's nuke them.

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah (laughing). It's insane.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** But that doesn't even account for all the other players that we now know — and all the — if the Iraqi ambassador's phone number was found in the hands of Abu Zubaida, we would be nuking his house, his family, everybody, right? But this

is Saudi Arabia, so there's nothing here to see. Let's look away. Look away; look over there.

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah, it's crazy — and you know what also creeps me out is how much really disturbing stuff is actually sitting right out there just waiting for somebody to notice it. I mean, if you look at so much of the history of U.S. wars, for instance, we know that at the time of the Spanish American War, Spain was basically prepared to make every concession that McKinley was asking for, and no matter what they did he would ask for more and ask for more, because obviously he just wanted to go war. It didn't matter. And we all know that, and yet everybody in school is just still taught to stand up and salute and everything. Every one of these. No matter what — I mean, the 1990s, they're demanding this and that from the Serbs; so okay, they keep getting concessions, and then the concessions don't ever matter, and the bombs just keep falling. All this stuff is just sitting right out there.

Now we have the 28 pages. They come out; they're sitting right out there. People are told don't bother reading them because there's nothing there, and everybody complies. I mean, as an independent journalist you must feel like at times exhilarated by what you're doing, but at the same time you must feel like, who the heck are these boobs I'm trying to reach anyway. Why don't they listen?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, this is why I primarily had to take a break for a couple of years, because this is what I've been dealing with my entire career. No matter what I publish. So hey guys, there's a black site in Poland where we're torturing people at. Here, I'm going to name it for you; I'm going to tell you the airport; I'm going to — in fact, I'm going to get a Polish intelligence officer to byline the article with me so you'll notice it even more. And nothing (laughing). And then like 15 years later or whatever there's an investigation in Poland now, and these people are being indicted and whatever. But it took — at the time I wrote this nobody cared. And they still don't — really they don't care, because — remember when Bush said, well, don't forget Poland. It gives a whole new kind of context to his statement. I've been banging my head against the wall for years. This is primarily why I took a break, because my sanity was at stake.

But yeah, I get exhilarated writing this thing, thinking, okay, now people will — look at what I did; look at what I found; come on, guys, this is important. And then crickets. And then I'm like, you know what? I can't. I just need to go do something else.

**WOODS:** Yeah, that's frustrating, and I mean, I'm not a journalist; I'm certainly not digging up information that people don't know, but I do broadcast information from my guests every day that people don't know, and I'm glad that my audience is growing and on and on. And then when I step out of the bubble that I live in, where I spend my time talking to people like you all the time, and then I step out of my bubble and I turn on the Republican convention or, heaven help me, the Democratic convention, and I just feel — and I see all these people cheering for the exact opposite of everything I just said, it is hard for that not to be demoralizing. But what else can I do? That's basically what it boils down to. What else can I do?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, I've told people, look, just bypass everything. When I was working for *Raw Story* as their investigative news editor, basically there was this series of arrests and trials of prominent Democratic and actually Republican officials that were conducted by the Justice Department, but really on orders of the White House. And it was all very Soviet. And we couldn't get any of this information out from under the din of everything else. And so I told people, you know what? This is what you do. You post this everywhere. You print it out and keep copies in your car. And you go to the gas station that day? Leave some there. You go to the grocery store? Leave some there. Email randomly. Leave comments in mainstream articles linking to things. That's bound to reach some people. But that's the only thing I can think of. I really don't know what else to tell you. My part of it is done. I don't know what else can be done beyond what I've done, other than to try to just disseminate this information. And so maybe like guerrilla tactics. If we could rent a plane and just throw paper out the door, like the CIA does in foreign countries when they're trying to overthrow a government.

**WOODS:** Right, right, right.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** They'll throw leaflets out of planes to try to reach the people. I mean, anybody have a plane? We could try this.

**WOODS:** Oh, I remember Edward Atkinson at the time of the Philippine insurrection in the early 20th century, he was trying to ship leaflets through the mail that he would send to the troops to tell them, look, you're engaged in a terrible atrocity; lay down your arms and stop doing it. (laughing) And the post office stopped letting him send them.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Yeah, well I mean, look at the southern corps. We papered — oh, there was paper there from — every country in South America had papers from us falling from the sky. Every coup involved this type of activity. So I mean, maybe if we can't get a plane we just print it out and leave it wherever we go —

**WOODS:** Yeah, yeah.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** — and have people all over the place leave these. You know, you go to a doctor's office, there's magazines and stuff that's there. Just have them handy. I used to do that — God, I'm so sad to admit this. I used to stuff articles of interest in bookstores in various books, like especially of authors I didn't like but I knew people who wouldn't be privy to the real news would likely buy, like Ann Coulter's books. So I would just stuff articles in there (laughing).

**WOODS:** Ah, okay, smart, smart. Well, let me just — before I let you go, I bet people would be curious to know where does somebody like you go to try to get the real news. What do you read?

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, I mean, there is real news in the news. For example, I go by bylines. So Jonathan Landay, Warren Strobel. I would go to — *Al Jazeera's* very good.

Usually *Foreign Policy's* very good. I would go to a lot of the foreign press. *Guardian* is very good. *The Independent* can be good sometimes. But mostly I look at bylines. And really, if you go to my Facebook page, any of the journalists I'm friends with are the bylines I read. So my suggestion is look at the bylines, because even in the worst publication there's sometimes a really good reporter, even in *The New York Post*. So look at the bylines, look at the foreign publications, you know, that are English language; for example, *The Guardian*. And that's my suggestion. *The Alternative Press* — eh. I guess *The Intercept*, but they're falling down a lot lately. And *Raw Story* used to be good, and I hate to say this, but they have gone in the wrong direction. So really, for intelligence matters, *Intercept*, *Foreign Policy*. That's about it. Like I said, look at the bylines. I read the people that I'm friends with because I trust them.

**WOODS:** Yeah, well, in that way that's kind of why when something crazy goes on abroad, my first thought is, "What is Scott Horton's take on it?"

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right.

**WOODS:** That honestly is my first thought. What does Scott think? Or whatever the thing is, I know I know some expert who is reliable and who isn't bought, because most of the people I know are struggling to stay afloat precisely because they can't be bought, and that's why I want to know what they think.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right, and it's funny because when the 28 pages dropped, Scott and I were in different rooms reading it, and you can hear both of us screaming. Just like, "What?!? No!" You know, profanities —

**WOODS:** (laughing) I wish I could have been there.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** And running back and forth going from room to room, going, "Just — ? Can you — ? Ah!" And not even finishing sentences, just total reaction. And it was pretty intense.

**WOODS:** Oh, that would have been a great YouTube: "The 28 Pages Being Read in Scott and Larisa's Household."

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Well, it's like that with everything. When the Dallas shootings were happening, we were running back and forth — he's in his office, I'm in the living room, and we're just running back and forth, screaming to each other or texting each other from the next room. But it's hilarious around here. It's crazy business around here, because we get very passionate. And so I wonder what our neighbors think when they hear us at three o'clock in the morning going like, "Have you heard that there's a safehouse and there's a document in there?"

**WOODS:** You know, I remember, by the way, the very first time I ever had Scott as a guest, a lot of my listeners had never heard of him before, and the universal response

once he was done, because he knows so much, I was getting emails, "Who is this guy, and why have I never heard of him?"

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** And I said, yeah, it's one of the great outrages of the world that you haven't.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Right, right. And it works out, because we actually are able to have these arguments. You know, I've said to him we should have a YouTube channel where people tune in and watch us freak out. I think people would (laughing) —

**WOODS:** I would do it.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Yeah.

**WOODS:** Absolutely. All right, Larisa, thanks so much for talking to us and for that long article, linked to today at [TomWoods.com/702](http://TomWoods.com/702). And whenever the next outrage comes, I want to get a speaker, a recorder in your household to hear that response, have it exclusively on my show. People would tune in. Thanks again.

**ALEXANDROVNA:** Thank you.