

Speaker 1: [00:02:07](#) [inaudible] [inaudible] [inaudible] [inaudible] [inaudible]
[inaudible].

Dan Porterfield: [00:09:14](#) Good afternoon everyone. Good afternoon. Thank you for being here. I'm Dan Porterfield, the president and CEO of the Aston Institute. It's my pleasure to welcome you to the closing session of the 2019 Aspen security forum. Please take a moment to join me in thanking all who have made this forum possible. First, thank you to all who prepared the venues, transported the travelers, put up the tents, cook the meals, and so much more. Thank you.

Speaker 1: [00:09:50](#) [inaudible].

Dan Porterfield: [00:09:50](#) Thank you to the trustees of the Aspen Institute, many of whom are here, especially our distinguished former secretaries of state, Madeline Albright and

Speaker 1: [00:09:59](#) Lisa Rice. [inaudible].

Dan Porterfield: [00:10:06](#) Thank you to all of our corporate underwriters for their vital support. American Airlines, the censure, Deloitte, Lockheed Martin, Microsoft, McKinsey and Company, Mitra, oracle, Symantec, Symantec, and United launch alliance. Thank you all for your

Speaker 1: [00:10:25](#) [inaudible].

Dan Porterfield: [00:10:25](#) Of course. Thank you to the Aspen Strategy Group. It's the executive director, Nick Burns, co-chairs, Joe Nye, Condoleezza Rice, as well as critical team members. Jonathan Price, Leah Petunias, Deb Cunningham, and John Hogan. Thank you all so much.

Speaker 1: [00:10:44](#) [inaudible]

Dan Porterfield: [00:10:44](#) led by the extraordinary ambassador burned. This has been our first year in which the ASG has hosted this remarkable forum dedicated to bringing together people to discuss critical issues and questions regarding national and global security. I'll ask you to recognize in particular Nick's leadership in making this year and future years

Speaker 1: [00:11:10](#) [inaudible].

Dan Porterfield: [00:11:11](#) I would like to take a moment to recognize one other particular couple who has attended many of our sessions this week and

they have a very special role here at the Aspen Institute, the extraordinary public servants, Major General John Hurling and his wife Marlene and where our general, okay, there they are. So

Speaker 1: [00:11:32](#) [inaudible]

Dan Porterfield: [00:11:33](#) I have to just take another moment about general hurling. And Marlene, a John was a member of the hundred first airborne, served two tours of duty in Vietnam. Later held many command positions all across the United States and in Europe, including serving as chief of staff to General John Galvin when he was the NATO Supreme Allied in Europe. Later general hurling was a director of the American battle monuments commission who was the leader in the creation on the mall in Washington, D c of the World War II memorial. Um, but also that special role is that they are my inlaws.

Dan Porterfield: [00:12:17](#) So in an era, as we've discussed this week when we face rising nationalism, refugee crises, cyber war, trade wars, nuclear threats, and emboldened adversaries, the world calls out for solutions at the Aspen Institute and in America and among our global allies, we believe it is networks of values driven leaders working together who promote the peace and who ensure prosperity. It has always been that way. That's why I was so inspired at the beginning of this convening by the words of NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg and that opening plenary as he discussed the vital importance of NATO today. He said, and I quote all for one and one for all, we can stand up to any adversary as long as we are together. The secretary general's comments delivered here in this valley beneath these mountains reminded me that the Aspen Institute and NATO were founded in the same year 1949 twin responses to the horrors of World War II.

Dan Porterfield: [00:13:24](#) The shocking fact of genocide and the postwar rise of the totalitarian Soviet Union. On the one hand in April of 1949 the leaders of the great nations of the West came together amidst America's monuments in Washington DC to sign a treaty pledging that they would stand and if need be, fight together to protect our freedoms and our way of life. And on the other hand, that same year, leaders in business and academia came together beneath the splendor of the Aspen Sky to create an institute through which people would stand and serve together to promote those same freedoms and way of life. There is greatness in the fact that we could come together in this way at this forum, 10 years running and talk freely and openly about global security, respecting disagreement, respecting the

freedom of the press, respecting the real complexity of the issues before us, respecting pluralism, respecting the role and rule of law.

- Dan Porterfield: [00:14:30](#) What we do here is both the essence of American democracy and the proof that our values in way of life require collective willpower to sustain. In other words, what the secretary general of NATO said concerning global security is just as true for domestic tranquility and domestic prosperity. Quote all for one and one for all. We can stand up to any adversary as long as we stand together. That is why the Aspen security forum matters so much. Thank you for being here. It's now my pleasure to welcome Gus hunt managing director and cyber strategy lead a center security who will introduce our closing conversation. Gus
- Speaker 1: [00:15:20](#) [inaudible].
- Speaker 3: [00:15:24](#) Okay. So, uh, as I said, I've got sun. I'm a medical director and a actually the cyber strategists for Accenture federal security. It's actually my great honor to introduce this final session. I want to shout out my thanks to all of the hardy souls who have stood with us to the bitter end here. I think there's going to be an absolutely terrific conversation about a topic that's actually near and dear to my heart. I spent 28 years in the intelligence community, uh, in CIA. It's, uh, you know, the ability for us to look ahead and think about how we defend the United States against future foreign adversaries is something that we've always tried to keep an eye on and keep focus, sort of look out over the horizon to understand what might be coming at us and see where things are going. And so without further ado, I'll introduce Kristen Walker and congressman Adam Schiff to come up and get us started on this great conversation. Thank you.
- Speaker 1: [00:16:12](#) [inaudible]
- Kristen Welker: [00:16:24](#) thank you so much. I just want to echo those remarks to all of you for hanging in for this final session and panel and chairman, thank you so much for joining us for this closing panel. There's obviously so much to discuss and I will,
- Speaker 3: [00:16:40](#) what is that? What we, are we the bitter end?
- Kristen Welker: [00:16:44](#) They saved the best for last. That's how I like to think about it. And so we're really pleased that you could be here. Um, I want to frame this conversation by really thinking about some of the key themes that have emerged over this past week here at Aspen, including the rise of authoritarian regime. Something

that you and your committee, uh, have spent a lot of time thinking about and working on multinationalism versus unilateralism and of course the rise of the United States adversaries and competitors. And we're going to touch on all of those different topics, but I do want to start with that third one because there has of course been breaking news as it relates to Iran and pressing news over the past 48 hours, we learned that Iran seized a British tanker. Um, the UK is vowing to respond. Uh, they are holding meetings as we speak. Um, and I wonder how you see that action. Do you see that action by Iran as an escalation or do you see it as a tit for tat given the fact that British recently seized an Iranian ship?

Adam Schiff:

[00:17:52](#)

Well, I see it really as a bit of both. I mean, clearly the Iranians feel that this is a way for them to respond. This is a way for them to flex their muscles. This is a way for them to do payback, uh, against the seizure of one of their ships. Of course the differences, one was illegal seizure and one was not. And that distinction is of great consequence. Uh, and we do need to band together with our allies to protect shipping in the Strait of Hormuz. Um, and we have to be mindful of just what Iran is doing and why they're doing it. I mean, they are raising the temperature in an effort to divide us from our allies as a way of getting our allies to place pressure on us to relieve the sanctions. That's their goal. And I think our goal has to be maintaining our unity with our allies.

Adam Schiff:

[00:18:46](#)

Uh, discouraging these exculpatory and provocative acts that may lead us into conflict, uh, and somehow getting back to a diplomatic path with Iran. Uh, and of course all of that is enormously difficult. I'm reminded of a conversation that the democratic caucus in Congress had with Tom Friedman at the height of the Iraq war. Uh, when Tom was asked by one of the members of our, our, uh, caucus, what would you do about the war in Iraq? And he said, well, you know, to paraphrase the New York street cop who's asked directions by a tourist to begin with, I wouldn't start from here. Um, and I wouldn't start from here. Uh, I, I, you know, I was struck when the first ships were attacked in the strait and then the next ships were attacked in the street. Uh, and of course we look at it from the Intel perspective and the Intel was very clear. The Iranians were responsible and yet we couldn't get our allies to make attribution. We couldn't get them to join us.

Kristen Welker:

[00:19:49](#)

So let me follow up with you on that point because one of the first points you raise is about building a multinational capacity in the Gulf. How can the United States, how can the Trump

administration, which is signaling that's exactly what they want to do, build up that multinational alliance.

Adam Schiff: [00:20:08](#) This is why it's so problematic to begin from here because the reason why our allies, it will be more diff, far more difficult than it should be to get them to join a coalition to protect shipping. Uh, I mean, ultimately I think we'll be successful because our allies are going to have to join us because their shipping is at risk. But the reason this is much more difficult than it should be. And, and the reason why our allies, so many of them failed to be willing to make attribution, not withstanding the clear evidence of Iranian attacks on shipping is that what is taking place today was eminently predictable. Indeed. Not only did we in our intelligence agencies predict this would be the Iranian response, but so did our allies. And so from the allies point of view, um, you know, they have every right to say this is exactly what we thought would happen if, and resident pulled out of your [inaudible] pulled out of the JCP pla. So now what? You want us to lock arms with you and go to war with Iran when this is exactly what we warned would take place. Uh, and so that, that, that's a pretty tough place to stay.

Kristen Welker: [00:21:15](#) And Chairman, I take that point, but given that we are here, that the United States is your, where should the Trump administration go from here? And I, I asked you that against the backdrop of a Iran's foreign minister just this week signaling that Iran is in fact open to coming back to the negotiating table or Ron saying, look, if you scale back some of those key sanctions, uh, we will let in more robust inspectors. Is that a path that the United States should pursue?

Adam Schiff: [00:21:44](#) I think it is a path that we should pursue. Um, and in terms of where we go from here, uh, I, I think first and foremost we're going to have to, uh, try to line up that, uh, protection for shipping and the freedom of navigation. But I also think we need to make diplomatic outreach. We need to find a way to at least take steps to deescalate, to get back to a diplomatic path. Um, you know, that's going to be difficult because we left an agreement that the Iranians were complying with. Uh, and so reaching some new agreement, uh, and somehow doing so when we now have the additional burden of proving that well even if you could have re reach an agreement, what is to protect, prevent the next administration deciding it doesn't like the deal. Um, but I think the administration ought to look at signs that even amongst some of the hardliners in Iran, there is unprecedented talk about tox. Maybe that's, that's a window into a different path.

Kristen Welker: [00:22:49](#) And just to be very clear, would you support in fact lifting some of those sanctions that were reimposed when the president pulled out of the Iran nuclear deal in order to go back to the negotiating table?

Adam Schiff: [00:23:00](#) I would certainly support a, if we can get a, a small incremental agreement that around would adopt the additional protocols, uh, ahead of schedule, uh, if we would agree to the relaxation of some of the sanctions that have been imposed. Um, when we went through an affirmed agreement that Iran was compliant with. So there is room within those parameters I think to, to have confidence building steps. My, my biggest concern though is the negotiations over the JC POA took years, uh, and reaching some agreement with Iran is not going to happen overnight, particularly given the far worst circumstances that we're in at the moment. Uh, that's going to require a, um, a degree of planning, professionalism, uh, coordination just within the administration, let alone with our allies that we have not seen demonstrated, um, in any other area of foreign policy. So, um, I would love to see that happen. I will, would urge them to try to make that happen. Uh, but they would have to depart from past practice to make that happen.

Kristen Welker: [00:24:11](#) Well and given that you have been able to see some of the intelligence, do you have any sense and and given the fact that Iran is talking about negotiations, that the maximum pressure campaign, which is what the Trump administration calls their strategy is in fact working, I mean, if Iran is talking about negotiating, is it possible that this could ultimately work to bring them back to the negotiating table?

Adam Schiff: [00:24:34](#) Well, anything is of course possible. Uh, in theory. Um, I do think that, uh, the sanctions imposed by the administration have been, um, extraordinarily biting, uh, and have been more biting that might've been expected given the lack of international support for them. Um, there was a question about how effective our sanctions would be when our allies weren't really, uh, with us on it. Uh, and you know, one of the real worrisome, uh, consequences that many of us have feared, uh, have in part materialized and that is the Europeans, Chinese and others have made further progress in exploring a trading and banking, um, and exchange process that no longer relies on the United States. Uh, and sanctions are one of the few really powerful tools we have to move other nations short of going to war with them. Uh, and to the degree that other nations build work around the u s sanctions, that really is a problem longterm.

Adam Schiff: [00:25:39](#) But nonetheless, the sanctions that we have imposed quite unilaterally have been very effective in crippling the Iranian economy. It's certainly gotten their attention, uh, whether they've been, whether they're ultimately going to be effective in terms of stimulating diplomacy, um, would require us to think that they will lead to a process in which we will not only get back to square one where we were with the JC POA that is on Iran that, um, is complying and allowing inspections and not exceeding allowable amounts of an richer radium and not reopening their arec reactor. But we'll go beyond that in fact, address other issues like their malevolence in the region, their missile program. I would love to believe that's possible. That is a very tall order, but they should pursue it.

Kristen Welker: [00:26:28](#) [inaudible] and what do you make of this mixed messaging that we're getting from Iran? On some level you see new provocations. On the other hand, you have this signals from the top that yes, we may be willing to negotiate. Is there a division within Iran where you have some hardliners who are saying, look, let's go to war. Whereas others are saying, no, we need to deescalate. I mean, is that what's happening here? And I guess the broader question is how close is the United States to an armed conflict with Iran?

Adam Schiff: [00:27:00](#) I don't think the, the Iranian regime is any more monolithic than our own administration. Um, I mean you, you look at, you know, where the president is and where Bolton is and where pump peo is and where people, other people on the NSC and where the State Department, other people in the State Department are. Um, and it's easy to be confused about, okay, where is the administration really going here? Um, and particularly in light of the attack that that never was. Uh, you can see there's a division of opinion within our administration. There's always been a division of opinion with Iran. Now it's obviously within certain confines. What's, what's most interesting to me about the, um, not to scent but, but the discussion about having discussions is that you do see it coming from some very unlikely sources like occupy Dina shot. Um, and I think we should exploit those opportunities and see and test them and see if they're real and if they're not real, try to make them real. So there may be a window of opportunity and there's always the possibility, uh, off promoted by this administration that they're completely to be charitable, Unorthodox, um, style of foreign policy could lead to a potentially unorthodox solution. Uh, so far in North Korea that has not panned out, not withstanding the love affair, um, and the love letters and the walks in the park in the handholding. Um, North Korea still is building bombs and

making missiles. Uh, but you know, maybe we have a breakthrough with Iran.

Kristen Welker: [00:28:40](#) And, and just to be very clear cause I then want to follow up with you on these divisions within the administration, but how concerned are you that we may be on the brink of an armed conflict with Iran?

Adam Schiff: [00:28:50](#) Well, I'm deeply concerned about it. I mean we seem to be on the verge of it, um, just a few weeks ago and we might be fully there, had the attack, not been called off. Um, I am less concerned, I guess about the earlier component of your question. And that is, are there people in Iran who willfully want war with the United States? I don't think for the most part, Iran wants war, the United States. And I think for the most part the president doesn't want war with Iran. Um, the big, the bigger risk is that we blender our way into war. Uh, I think that's the bigger risk, frankly, of conflict, not just with Iran but with other countries as well, including the Russians that we blender our way into conflict, um, than it being a premeditated decision that there, there's political or military benefit of going to war.

Kristen Welker: [00:29:44](#) You chairman had a unique look inside the decision making process at the White House as the president was trying to determine what to do about Iran striking down that unmanned drone. And, and for you, it's sort of laid bare some of these divisions that you're talking about. Can you take us inside that moment when you spoke to the president about how he was going to respond to Iran striking down that drone?

Adam Schiff: [00:30:09](#) Well, it was, it was deeply fascinating. Um, we were invited to the White House, uh, the leadership of the House and Senate, um, as well as the Intel committees in house and Senate. Uh, and armed services committee as well. So there were, uh, bout I guess eight or 10 of us from the congress. Um, and then the sort of panoply of representatives, administration, including the president. And, um, the first thing was quite notable to me, uh, because we were seated one side of the table, uh, when the president came in and sat on the other side of the table was his surprise to see me. And he must've been aware that the Intel chair was invited, but I don't know whether he thought I wasn't gonna come or he didn't put two and two together. But, uh, nonetheless there was a moment of, and, uh, what did he say to you? He said, I'm glad that you're here. And, uh, I said, I'm glad that I'm here too. And, um, it was, uh, anyway, it was, it was, it was fascinating to watch the body language on the other side of the table. But

Kristen Welker: [00:31:17](#) what do you mean by that? The body language on the other side of the table?

Adam Schiff: [00:31:20](#) Well, I, I, you know, I had the [inaudible] impression on, and I don't want to get into any of the conversations that we had, but I have the impression that the president, um, wanted to hear from people outside of his bubble. Um, he obviously knew where Pompei was coming from. He knew where Bolton was coming from. Um, and I had the impression he wanted to hear other voices, uh, which I appreciate it. Um, I think, you know, on the way over many of us were wondering, okay, why are we having this meeting? What does the administration want to get from this? Is this a photo opportunity? Is this, um, an opportunity later to say that they conferred with Congress whether we had any impact on decision making or not. Um, but I, I had the impression from our meeting, he was actually interested in our perspective. And the, the point that I emphasized, um, throughout the meeting was the Iranian objective here is to divide us from our allies. Let's think of a response that brings us together with our allies. And let's also think about something that deescalates rather than escalates. Um, and my final point was we have not authorized you to use force. Um, and you need to understand that at least from the democratic point of view in Congress, don't count on the two and one or the 2002 authorizations to use force. They don't cover anything you might be contemplating.

Kristen Welker: [00:32:45](#) Okay. And just finally, um, two pronged question before we move on from Iran. How might those divisions, the president's been very clear, Bolton is hawkish when it comes to some of these foreign policy conflicts, how might that impact how the Trump administration, um, moves forward? The fact that there are these divisions, um, and then also the AUMF. Is there any chance that that gets revived or passed again, given the fact that we're in an election cycle?

Adam Schiff: [00:33:14](#) Well, I would say that the greatest risk of, uh, a miscalculation, um, would come at any number of different ways. It might be an Iranian backed militia in Iraq, um, that is not given the green light to attack US forces, but has some hothead, commander who decides to do so anyway. Uh, and Americans get killed. Um, and then who knows where we go from there. Um, or it might be that the Iranians think they're shooting down another Un, um, man vehicle and it turns out, no, it's an aircraft, uh, with pilots, um, or they place more minds on ships, but they place it in the wrong place and someone gets killed. Um, who knows where any of that leads and, and the fact that like any other country, um, but particularly countries like Iran, the chain of

command is not a perfectly functioning chain, uh, in which you have people down the chain who may make decisions, uh, that are not approved up the chain that can lead to war.

Adam Schiff: [00:34:26](#) So those to me are the, the most, uh, significant risks. Um, and we need to do whatever we can to take the temperature down to minimize the chance of those things taking place. Uh, in terms of if we actually got there, um, beyond any immediate response to protect our troops, which I think that the president could initiate under article two of was truly to protect our people. Um, then an authorization is required and the fact that we have utilized these old ones for so long and not just under this president but under the last gives them an all to colorable claim. Um, that well by congressional acquiescence, these authorizations cover all kinds of things they were never attended to cover. Will that be enough of a stimulus to Congress to actually do its job and pass a new authorization? Um, I am working on it.

Adam Schiff: [00:35:28](#) I am trying, I'm talking to both progressive and more conservative members of Congress to try to figure out is there a sweet spot. It's not enough simply to repeal the existing authorization or authorizations or even sunseting them. I've, because the sunset will come due and there's still a need to be able to use force against al Qaeda and Isis. So what does a new authorization look like? That has always been the challenge. Um, I think there are ways of meeting that challenge that both don't hamstring the president such that it Republicans could never support it, but are also, are no blank check such that Democrats could not support it. Um, that's a difficult challenge. In the best of times. We're not in the best of times. Um, we are in fact at the bitter end.

Speaker 6: [00:36:16](#) Uh, but, uh,

Adam Schiff: [00:36:18](#) but we must try and it should be within our capacity to do that.

Kristen Welker: [00:36:23](#) All right. Let's talk about your very busy week ahead. Uh, we, our exhibit is it busy? We're expecting a busy week in the news media. Let's put it that way. And I just want to start off. We're expecting, of course, a former special counsel, Robert Mueller to testify on Wednesday on Capitol Hill. Before we start this conversation, this testimony has been delayed once before. Can you guarantee that Robert Mueller is in fact going to testify on Wednesday?

Speaker 6: [00:36:52](#) Well, uh,

Adam Schiff: [00:36:55](#) I would, I would, uh, I don't know if I could give a guarantee, but I would say barring, um, some emergency, um, coming more from Bob Mueller, then from the congress, I see no reason to expect anything other than his appearance.

Kristen Welker: [00:37:11](#) You're not anticipating any headwinds at this point. You've all systems go at this point.

Adam Schiff: [00:37:16](#) All systems are go in terms of mother's testimony. I mean there's still fights that we are having every day with the Justice Department, which don't want his age to testify. They are, I mean bar doesn't want Muller to testify. I think that's quite clear. Um, earlier on he expressed to, you know, agnosticism about Mueller testifying. I think, um, both believing that he couldn't stop it, uh, because of public pressure. Um, and what's more, he might get lucky and neighbor Muller wouldn't want to do it and for a while it looked like he might get lucky. Um, but Congress has insisted, uh, and I don't think, I don't expect it this late date barr is going to try to stop it. Um, so, uh, I fully have every expectation it will go forward.

Kristen Welker: [00:38:02](#) Okay. Given that Mueller is of course a former federal prosecutor, we would expect that he is practicing and preparing. You are a former federal prosecutor. Have you been practicing?

Speaker 6: [00:38:16](#) Alright.

Adam Schiff: [00:38:16](#) I certainly have been doing everything I can to prepare, have our committee members as well.

Kristen Welker: [00:38:22](#) [inaudible] what does that look like? Have there been mock sessions?

Adam Schiff: [00:38:27](#) Uh, I, you know, I don't want to get into the specifics of our preparation, um, or precisely what we're, we have in mind to, to ask him. Um, but I can't say that we are certainly being very diligent. We understand the stakes. Um, at the same time, I, you know, I have to say I am very realistic in my expectations. He is clearly, deeply reluctant to testify. Um, he has a reticent witness. Even under the best of circumstances. He will be even more reticent. Um, he has made it clear that he doesn't want to go beyond the report. Uh, and I wanna make it clear that is a choice that Bob Mueller is making that is not required by law, that is not required by regulation. Um, it is not required even by DOJ policy, although the DOJ says otherwise, that is a choice. Um, it is certainly not a policy that bill barr is observing in any

way. Uh, he goes well beyond the report and he misrepresents the report. Um, but is the choice that Bob Mueller is, is making, uh, it's not one that we have to observe, but we will have to decide how much of our time we want to spend fighting with him to discuss things outside the report when there is an awful lot of material within the report that the American people are not familiar with, which they really need to be.

Kristen Welker: [00:39:47](#)

Well, and you bring me to my next question. How do you get Robert Mueller to veer off of the report when he says he's not going to, is that something that you are going to try to have happen during the testimony?

Adam Schiff: [00:40:01](#)

Uh, well, uh, you know, I think there were certain things certainly that we would like to explore that go beyond the report such as, well, I, you know, I don't want to get into those specifics. Um, and you know, some of these areas we are getting answers to. Prior to his testimony, we did spend about five hours with one of his staff, um, of our particular interest in the intelligence committee are the counter-intelligence findings. Um, and that is, this investigation began not as a criminal probe. It began as a counterintelligence investigation that most Americans don't know what that term means. A counterintelligence investigation is one that looks into whether, um, people are acting as witting or unwitting agents of foreign power, of foreign power, whether they're under the influence of foreign agents operating the United States. And the investigation is to determine what is the national security risk. How do those risks get mitigated? The Mueller report is a report about prosecutorial decision making. We charge these people. We didn't charge these people for these reasons. What happened to the counterintelligence investigation?

Kristen Welker: [00:41:16](#)

Didn't the Trump administration just block your requests for some of the counterintelligence findings by Mueller similar

Adam Schiff: [00:41:22](#)

the, the Justice Department and initially obstructed our ability to find out about what happened to the counterintelligence investigation that is not included in the Mueller. Um, they have relented, uh, under fear of enforcement, um, to some degree, but as is the case with the Bush, with the, um, Trump administration, there's a Freudian slip, um, by the way, I pine for the Bush administration. Um, so I don't, I don't know what would of, I don't know what would have possessed me to make that slip. But, um, we, uh, we are getting the same kind of rolling production and obstruction followed by more rolling production fall by more obstruction in an effort to delay, delay, delay. Um, and we are fighting it as expeditiously as we can.

Kristen Welker: [00:42:18](#) Okay. And getting back to Muller's testimony, and I know you don't want to give specifics. If you could characterize, if you knew that the former special counsel would answer one question thoroughly, no holds barred, what would your question be to him?

Speaker 6: [00:42:38](#) Well,

Adam Schiff: [00:42:40](#) I suppose the question would be, um, you felt bound by the OLC opinion, not to indict the sitting president. Should he be in data once he leaves office? He is not going to answer that question. Um, I, I, you know, we have a far better chance of the love affair and North Korea working out, um, then we do up getting him to answer that question. Um, but nonetheless, there are other ways of asking that question.

Speaker 6: [00:43:09](#) Um,

Adam Schiff: [00:43:11](#) Bob Muller found the evidence of conspiracy and sufficient to charge the present with the crime of conspiracy. Um, he made notes such determination on obstruction of justice that tells us something,

Speaker 6: [00:43:27](#) um, [inaudible]

Adam Schiff: [00:43:28](#) but what he can talk about, what he will talk about is a foreign adversary systemically interfered in our election. This wasn't reported by the Trump campaign. When they made outreach to the campaign, it was invited, it was welcomed, it was made use of, it was built into the campaign plan and strategy and that it was lied about and then the investigation into it was obstructed. I mean, all of those are unquestioned facts that he can go through and we will go through with him. Um, that ought to be damning enough and that doesn't require us even to go beyond the report. So those facts are most important. There are great many facts that are also important. I mean, I would certainly like to know whether there was any pressure put on him not to subpoena the president's testimony. I would like to know whether decisions about the scope of his investigation were made by him or Rod Rosenstein when it came to issues like financial compromise or money laundering. Um, he may or may not answer questions along those lines. We may or may not ask him questions along those lines. Um, we will be doing our hearing after the judiciary committee so we will get some sense of how worthwhile it is to fight with him over areas outside the report. And the end of the day we have five hours, about five hours with him between the two committees. That may seem

like a long time, but that is a very short time to cover a 448 page report.

Kristen Welker: [00:45:11](#) Is there a benefit in your mind of having him read some of those salient parts, what you would view to be salient of the report out loud? Uh, for the portion of the American public that may not have read that 448 page report?

Adam Schiff: [00:45:28](#) I do think there's value, um, in particular passages in the report, uh, to have the special counsel literally speak it in his own words. Um, but I, I think, uh, and maybe this is a the former prosecutor in me, what is most powerful is not an isolated fact here or an isolated fact there, but how the facts look together. Um, how, and in fact, one of the things that was so striking to me, I've been rereading the report as you might imagine in anticipation of his testimony and even though it's not the subject of our hearing, which is in our committee gonna Focus on volume one. This is a subject of volume two. Mueller himself makes the point in the report that you look at, we've looked at each of these, you know, 10 or 12 scenarios where the president was obstructing justice. Those are obviously my words, not molars, but you'd not only look at the discrete acts of obstruction, you look at the pattern, um, and the pattern both in volume one and volume two is what is most devastating.

Adam Schiff: [00:46:44](#) The pattern in volume one is a pattern of Trump campaign contacts. With the Russians that were concealed, that involve the foreign power meddling in our on election, our election election decided by a handful of votes and then a million lies about it. Uh, and, and then efforts to obstruct the investigation into it. This systemic sweep of that, uh, is as broad as the Russian intervention itself. Uh, and that's not something that's necessarily summarized in the passage. You can ask the council to read. Uh, the challenge is with a reticent witness who was reluctant to go beyond the wording of the report to be able to have him bring the systemic nature of how that campaign was compromised. Um, how

Speaker 6: [00:47:37](#) the [inaudible]

Adam Schiff: [00:47:39](#) there was a, uh, broad effort to compromise our ability to even identify what the Russians did. Um, that's, that's the challenge.

Kristen Welker: [00:47:51](#) And your committee is obviously still investigating the Russia matter. Have you been able to connect the dots where Robert Mueller has said, look, there is nothing that is chargeable as it relates to conspiracy here?

Adam Schiff: [00:48:05](#) Uh, I mean there, there is, um, I think little to be gained in trying to dispute the prosecutorial judgment that he made, um, you could easily make a case and indeed a, I think a great many prosecutors have that the Trump tower meeting, um, is all the proof of conspiracy that you need. You have all of the elements of conspiracy in the Trump tower meeting. Um, you have a Russian offer of assistance in the election. You have literally in writing the Russians offering dirt on Hillary Clinton as part of what is described as the Russian government's effort to help Donald Trump. And you have the Trump campaign in writing, accepting the offer. If it's what you say it is, that is a Russian government effort to help us with dirt on our opponent. We love it.

Speaker 6: [00:49:03](#) Um, [inaudible]

Adam Schiff: [00:49:04](#) best timing for us late summer. Um, and then a conspiracy charge also requires an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy. They have a meeting at Trump tower that has all the overt act required of a conspiracy. Uh, so we could take issue with that. But what's the point?

Speaker 6: [00:49:22](#) Um,

Adam Schiff: [00:49:24](#) well you're going to focus on obstruction. Does Muller does point out, um, their failure to establish a fact like conspiracy does not mean the absence of evidence of that fact, I e conspiracy. Um, and it will be very important for us to go through that evidence of conspiracy, that evidence of collusion, um, because it is damning whether it can be prosecuted or not. Um, and that will be our focus. I mean, in the judiciary committee, their focus will be on obstruction of justice and the Intel Committee, our focus will be on, uh, all of the acts of collusion, whether they could be charged criminally or not.

Kristen Welker: [00:50:07](#) Given that the root of this was an attack on the United States democracy. Have you been working with Republicans as you prepare

Adam Schiff: [00:50:16](#) as we prepare for the Mueller hearing? Yes. As you prepare for that? That's the been your easiest question so far. No. Um, but I do want to point out, uh, have you tried to, I, I do it on this, on this hearing, you know, shout to them, uh, on this hearing. No. And I mean, we are such a world apart on Russia that it would be fruitless. But, but I will say this, which I think is a, if I can toot our intel horn for a moment, um, notable and that is in an ordinary world in which there was no Russia investigation and we had a normal administration. The Intel committee's bread

and budget is oversight of all of our agencies, uh, Eh, which is rolled into the annual intelligence authorization act. Uh, that is the work product of our year of Intel work every year during the Trump administration.

Adam Schiff:

[00:51:12](#)

And notwithstanding the most profound disagreements we've had on Russia. We have produced on a bipartisan bill a basis our intelligence authorization act. Um, that bill passed last week with 397 votes. You rarely can name a post office with 397 votes in a congress. This divided. And yet we were able on the committee and in the congress as a whole to pass a sweeping bill that sets the funding levels that sets the priorities, that sets new privacy protections and civil liberties protections. We were able to do all of those things in area, which is ordinarily very controversial. And that is involving surveillance on a very bipartisan basis. A prompting me to point out to all my colleagues, you should follow the superb bipartisan example of Mr Schiff and Mr. Nunez. Um, okay. I don't recommend that anybody but, but in that area, um,

Kristen Welker:

[00:52:14](#)

let, let me, let me ask you broadly, um, do you have a date by which your investigation needs to be finished given that a lot of Democrats are saying, look, in order for us to make a determination about impeachment, we need to know the final results. And obviously the Mueller testimony is going to be critical to that as well. But some Democrats saying they're looking for the results of this investigation.

Adam Schiff:

[00:52:38](#)

Well, you know, I guess there are two questions which, which is, you know, when will you be done in terms of a judgment on impeachment? Uh, and then, you know, the, the, the broader question is when will you be done investigating the constellation of issues around the Russian interference in the election? And let me start with the second first. And that is will be done when we've satisfied ourselves, that we have mitigated any risk to the country. Um, we still do not know, although we are starting to get answers. What happened to the counterintelligence investigation? The results of a counterintelligence investigation are, here's how we need to mitigate the risk. Here's the steps that we need to take. If you look at, for example, Michael Flynn's conduct, as Sally Yates testified in open session, the Justice Department became concerned when people like Mike Pence were speaking publicly and saying that there was no conversation with the Russian ambassador about sanctions when we knew that wasn't true, the Russians knew that wasn't true.

Adam Schiff: [00:53:38](#) Uh, and that meant that Mike Flynn was compromised. Um, and that was a risk to our security. Well, that's the kind of concerned that animates the counter intelligence investigation. Now, that concern was that risk was mitigated when he was fired. Uh, he was in a much less position to compromise national security. The restrooms were less position to use that knowledge as black male. Um, by by analogy, Donald Trump was saying he had no business dealings with Russia. Okay. That was false. It was not only false, but the Russians knew it was false because they were on the other end of the transaction. Uh, and indeed a year after it became public, a year later when it became public that Michael Cohen had lied about how long the Trump deal negotiations were going on. In fact, they went on up through the middle of the campaign up until at least June. Um, it was revealed that there were emails from the Trump organization to the Kremlin seeking the creme itself to make the deal happen because it was the view of the Trump organization, um, and Cohen and, and, uh, I think unquestionably Donald Trump that without Putin's approval.

Adam Schiff: [00:54:51](#) And certainly, um, in the absence of a, of a, uh, or in the presence of Putin's opposition, there was no way they were going to consummate that deal. Um, what it became public that made outreach to the Kremlin, the Kremlin, Dimitri Pescov issued a statement saying, we never responded to that outreach, and that was a lie. So here you have the Kremlin participating in a cover up on behalf of the president of the United States. Um, it's hard to imagine more compromising circumstances and so we don't know what else was found that ought to concern us in terms of compromise. So we won't be done until we are satisfied that we have, uh, on the impeachment question. Um, you know, I don't know whether we reach a tipping point where we say, regardless of what would happen in the Senate, the man needs to be impeached in the house.

Adam Schiff: [00:55:49](#) Um, I don't know what that will take and you're not there yet. I'm not there. I'm not there yet. I'm not there yet. Uh, I am concerned about the message it sends that a president can engage in conduct like this and not be impeached in the house. Um, I think about that a lot. Um, but I am also concerned with the message of a Senate acquittal. Uh, what does it mean to have an adjudication that this conduct is not an impeachable offense? And what do you say to your colleagues who say in and of itself

Kristen Welker: [00:56:24](#) is a political calculation that that we should take that off the table, what the Senate's going to do.

Adam Schiff: [00:56:29](#) I don't view that as a political calculation. I view political calculations along the lines of what helps us best win the election in 2020 [inaudible]. To me that's a political calculation. Thinking about what precedent we're setting, what message we are delivering to future precedents, seems to me a very important constitutional and policy question. Um, and I think that's the way we need to look at this, honestly. Um,

Speaker 7: [00:56:54](#) yeah,

Adam Schiff: [00:56:55](#) I don't know what the political answer is. There are good arguments to be made about the political answer and whose base is more energized by an impeachment. I don't know the answer. I just don't think it's the right question.

Kristen Welker: [00:57:06](#) Let me ask you the broader backdrop to all of this, about the attack on the United States democracy. How confident are you today that the United States is ready to protect the 2020 election from interference from a foreign government government, whether it be Russia or another government?

Adam Schiff: [00:57:26](#) Well, I'm, I'm not particularly confident. Um, you know, I think back a year ago to this conference, uh, when one of the representatives of Microsoft was on a panel and revealed that, um, two or three senate campaigns had been the, um, target of spear phishing attempts by an actor that appeared to be the same fancy bear, uh, actor, the same Russian Gru unit that brought us the intervention in the 2016 election. Well, that was the first time I was hearing that that should not be the first time the intelligence. Your chair is hearing that. Um, and I went back to DC and I talked to my contacts at NSA and CIA and I said, did you know this? Um, and they did not. And I said, this should not be the first time you're hearing this. Um, and that told me as a matter of quality control, that something is broken here.

Adam Schiff: [00:58:21](#) Um, either it didn't get communicated to the right place by Microsoft or it did, uh, and it was stove piped or whatever. But we need to find out what happened. Um, some of those stove pipes I think had been broken down. I'm not completely confident though. Um, and I have two other concerns. Um, the first is the message coming from the very top. Every time the president says this is a hoax. Every time he talks to Putin and says this is a hoax, he is essentially telling the perpetrator of the last attack that they're invited to do it. Again, as long as it's on his side, he will not call them out. Um, and that undermines every other effort at deterrence. Um, but I'm also concerned about new technologies and in particular the ability for Russians

to use a technology like deep fake technology to uh, intervene in a enormously disruptive way.

Kristen Welker: [00:59:18](#) Well, on that point, and given that the language as you are mapping out is not likely to change, what can congress do and what should congress do to make sure that the United States is protected by the time Americans go to the polls in November of 2020.

Adam Schiff: [00:59:35](#) Right. I think at the, you know, at the agency head level and at the mid level of the agencies, there was a lot of good work being done to try to protect our elections. Um, it's not the top down, you know, whole of government approach that would have to be driven by a president because it's not going to be driven by this president. But nonetheless, I think the agencies acting on their own initiative are focused on the problem or working on the problem. We in Congress are doing our best to oversee that. Then make sure they have the resources that they need, that they're bringing the focus to it, that they're talking to each other. From our vantage point in Intel, we continually ask, what are we learning about Russian plants and intentions for 2020. Um, and on the Armed Services Committee, I have to imagine they are pressing the Defense Department.

Adam Schiff: [01:00:34](#) Have you prepared a proportionate response for what you will do if the Russians merely continue their social media campaign or if there's another hacking and dumping operation or they insert a deep fake fraudulent video of a major candidate saying something they never said, um, are you developing? Are you firing shots across the Russian bow to let them know the consequences? Uh, and in the foreign affairs committee, they're probing the State Department. Uh, are you telegraphing to your Russian counterparts the sanctions we will impose like nothing before if they screw with us again. Um, so we are doing our best, but it, it's, it's a inadequate substitute for a president who is pressing each of his secretaries along the same lines.

Kristen Welker: [01:01:22](#) And chairman, we're going to open it up for questions in just a moment or two. I do want to end sort of where we began, which is the rise of authoritarian regimes. Unilateralism versus multi-lateralism. On that first point, this was obviously the first hearing that your committee held. Um, the president himself has been accused of embracing some of these very autocrats that you called out. He would argue, look, I need to work with these other leaders in order to navigate crises like Iran and North Korea and other hotspots. But what do you think the impact of that is? And more broadly, what have you learned since you held that first hearing about how the United States

can protect itself and protect its democracy when you do have a, the rise of authoritarianism in these various different countries around the world?

- Adam Schiff: [01:02:14](#) Um, when, when folks ask me what keeps me up at night [inaudible] you know, it used to be things like, um, uh, you know, the potential of another al-Qaida attack or what was going on with Isis. And those things still keep me up at night. But my broadest concern is the ideological struggle that we are in between democracy and authoritarianism. Um, we have seen a real rise of autocrat, uh, of autocracy around the world and this would normally be resisted by the full force of the president and presidency and the State Department. Um, and it's not, and there are new tools that are making it far easier for authoritarians to perpetuate their rule. Uh, China is developing a digital totalitarianism, uh, that is allowing it to through the use of ubiquitous CCTV cameras and big data analytics, um, keep an eye, sometimes a literal eye on each of its citizens. And it is exporting that technology to other regimes under the euphemistic or well and title of safe cities. Um, Russia is using its own malevolent interference to undermine democracies, but probably nothing is more worrisome than our own,
- Speaker 6: [01:03:40](#) um,
- Adam Schiff: [01:03:41](#) actions to undermine our own democracy. Uh, I've, I formed a caucus on freedom of the press 15 years ago with an backbencher from Indiana named Mike Pence. Um, and I now hear despots around the world quoting the u s president and calling what little free press they have left the enemy of the people,
- Speaker 6: [01:04:04](#) um,
- Adam Schiff: [01:04:05](#) and calling news that's critical of them, fake news and, and to see a display like we saw at the rally the other day, which is so antithetical to the very idea of America, so undermines our democracy,
- Speaker 6: [01:04:22](#) um,
- Adam Schiff: [01:04:23](#) in a way that no foreign adversary could. You're talking about the center back chant that happened? Yes, yes. In North Carolina. Um, you know, one of the most moving experiences I've had at a conference, like this was a, um, going to, uh, Munich with John McCain. Then, um, being at a dinner, the wonderful thing about being with John McCain is he can invite

anyone to dinner and they'll generally come. Um, and so we had dinner with Bill Gates and Bano, um, and which is not my usual dinner company. I need to tell you. And I [inaudible] the evening wore on and we were telling jokes and Bando told a joke about being Irish. And then he got very serious and said, I'm very proud to be Irish. We're very proud of Ireland, but Ireland, like most countries is just a country. America is also an idea. And I realized when he said it, that this was really was at risk. Um, and the ability that we have to champion democracy, um, around the world is inextricably tied with the idea of what America is and who we are. Uh, and so I think the actions at that rally were just as undermining of our leadership as a democratic power, um, as the actions of others around the world.

Kristen Welker: [01:05:46](#) And just finally, before we open it up to questions, are you concerned that we are slipping as a world power? Is China, for example, poised to outpace up the United States?

Adam Schiff: [01:05:57](#) There's no question that America's standing in the world has plummeted, um, under this administration. Much of that can I think, be remedied with a different president. Um, but some things can't. Um, the time we are losing, we will never get back. And as we self emulate, uh, China is on a steady rise. China is a very worthy rival in every domain. There are worthy arrival now diplomatically, which should be unthinkable. There are worthy rival in space. They're worthy rival militarily. Uh, there are worthy rival in development. They're a more than worthy rival in technology. It needs to force us to think a new about how we compete, uh, how we defend ourselves, how we maintain our position in the world if we do. So, I think we can, uh, ensure another century. And centuries of American leadership. If we don't, then there's no reason to expect that this will continue on autopilot.

Adam Schiff: [01:06:59](#) Um, we spend far more than China on our defense and yet you would think we were a popper nation compared to China. China spends its money differently in many ways. I think China spends its money more effectively, but there are other ways in which we are going to have to think of new to meet the China challenge. Uh, you know, when you look at 5g, it's a great test case of our ability to meet the Chinese challenge, um, both in Ghana and every facet in China's theft of technology and China's ability now to create its own innovation to technology, uh, in China's ability to devote its nation's resource behind a single company and outprice any competition to say you can lose money as long as you need, but we are gonna own 5g. How does an American company or any other company compete with that?

Adam Schiff: [01:07:49](#) We're going to have to find a way to compete. Does that mean we need to rethink these clear lines we have between industry and government? And if we do rethink them, what does that mean? How do we rethink them? Do we need to make the kind of investment to develop our supply chain? Um, domestically? Uh, if we can't trust components that are built in China, these are big questions that would big changes and we need to start thinking about them. Um, but I, I have great respect for what China has been able to do, um, and uh, and great fear over how they're using their technological might to, um, in prison a million weeks to um, constrict the lives of over a billion people, but also to export that model to other places. Uh, we are not going to survive as a lone democracy and an n at the same time. And I know this has been a running theme throughout the last two days and for very good reason, not withstanding China's rise and China's power and the danger of a declining, weakened, wounded animal that is Russia. Neither are any match for the United States combined with its allies. Um, neither are any [inaudible]

Speaker 1: [01:09:20](#) match for that.

Kristen Welker: [01:09:24](#) On that note, let's open it up to questions. Are there questions? Um, Charlie, let me start with you and just wait for a mic and make sure you introduce yourself.

Speaker 1: [01:09:37](#) Yeah.

Audience Member: [01:09:42](#) Hello Congress. Hello Congressman. Thank you very much. Charlie Dunlap from Duke Law School. Uh, what message would you have for young people interested in government that would resonate irrespective of their political views? Uh, is there something that advice that you would give people like me to, uh, to, to pass to them about, you know, serving in government, irrespective of what, uh, political party might be in power?

Speaker 1: [01:10:16](#) Okay,

Adam Schiff: [01:10:18](#) that's a, that's a great question and it's certainly one I think about a lot. Um, and when I talk to young people,

Speaker 1: [01:10:25](#) okay,

Adam Schiff: [01:10:27](#) I say, we need you, we need you to be involved. Um, our generation is doing a damn good job screwing everything up. Um, we need you. And I think the good news is that young people are becoming involved to a degree that I've never seen

before. Um, young people who would never politically active like older people who have never been politically active have found it a necessity. Um, and that's encouraging to me. Um, I've wondered, you know, I've worried for several years and I know that when I was growing up, I was, I was born in 1960 in Boston. I, I feel my kind of formulative years were the Kennedy years. I was just a child, but it was in the ether. The idea that public service was a noble calling that, you know, don't ask, you know, what your country can do for you. I mean, that was sort of in, in the air.

- Adam Schiff: [01:11:28](#) We were breathing. Um, and, and the Kennedys were an inspiration. Uh, and I think for many young conservatives, Ronald Reagan was that same inspiration. And for a newer, younger generation, Obama was that inspiration. What are people inspired by now it's just an ugly mess. Uh, and so I, I've worried about that. Are we going to turn off a whole generation of people? But it doesn't seem to have had that in effect. Uh, instead I think it is mobilized a tremendous number of young people to be involved and, and that will be our savior. Um, I, I think that, you know, the next generation is not going to put up with this and thank, thank God they won't, uh, they're not gonna put up with what we're doing to our planet. Um, they're gonna demand, um, an end to the kind of, um, bigotry of their parents and grandparents generation and, and so I'm optimistic about the future if I wasn't, I couldn't get up in the morning. Um, so, and I think the young people are going to be the key to that change.
- Speaker 1: [01:12:42](#) Okay.
- Adam Schiff: [01:12:43](#) My colleague Ken Delaney, Ian
- Speaker 1: [01:12:53](#) [inaudible].
- Audience Member: [01:12:55](#) Thank you. Mr Chairman. The attorney general is appointed a former US attorney named John Durham to examine the origins of the Russia investigation. And one of the things that he's doing or planning to do is interviewing CIA officers and analysts about their assessment. Uh, in part that the Russian intervention campaign was designed to help Donald Trump. Do you have any concerns about that and as somebody who's reviewed that assessment in detail, presumably, do you have any doubts about it or questions about its efficacy?
- Speaker 1: [01:13:24](#) Yeah,

Adam Schiff: [01:13:24](#) I have grave concerns about it. Um, I have grave concerns with the attorney general using the incendiary rhetoric of spying the [inaudible] cavalierly dropping allegations that the Bama administration or the deep state was spying on the Trump campaign. Um, that an attorney general and, and not some novice, not some, someone who doesn't know what that word means and how highly charged it is, but someone who knows exactly how high, highly charged that word is. Um, that someone who is so willing to do the bidding of the president, um, would essentially open a counter investigation to help further a narrative that the president has wanted out there, which is we don't really know if the Russians intervened, but if they did, they didn't intervene to help me. Um, if there was any collusion, it was with Hillary. Um,

Speaker 1: [01:14:19](#) yeah,

Adam Schiff: [01:14:20](#) it was one thing when this was the fringe argument of even people on my committee or you know, the, even the fringe of some of the Fox late night. But the fact that now this is housed in the Department of Justice at the top is terrifying. Um, and there are always with any investigation, uh, problems you could find or things that could have been done better, but to, um, call into question, um, such well substantiated conclusions to essentially politicize the intelligence process and tell analysts that the work will be scrutinized with a political perspective if it runs contrary to the desires of the president. Um, that's a terrible, terrible precedent. Um, we've already, we headed down this road even before Bar's appointment, but he has made an infinitely worse. Uh, you know, I'll, I'll point to a Andy McCabe. Um, the president wanted Andy McCabe investigated. The president wanted any McCabe to lose his pension to be fired before his pension vested and Andy McCabe was investigated.

Adam Schiff: [01:15:34](#) Um, the deputy attorney general Rod Rosenstein, uh, referred the matter or someone did the inspector general. Um, and that was a, the, an initiation of a process because the pullet president wanted it politically. Once you go down that road, it leads to disaster. Um, now the inspector general found that McCabe was untruthful. Um, he may very well have been untruthful. I have no reason to question the inspector general's conclusion, but that investigation was put on a fast track. It was separated from a broader inspector general investigation, which is still ongoing. Why was that done? It was done so he could be fired to not get a pension. It was done to please the president when the initiation investigation is tainted. So are the results of that investigation. Um, and so this is tainted from the start

because it is motivated for a political end, uh, and the damage it will do in terms of a chilling impact is of deep concern, um, the damage it will do in terms of trying to cast doubt on things that are not in doubt. Uh, I mean beyond all of the intelligence is just the plain fact. The hacking of the Clinton campaign and the release of the Clinton emails only helps one side. Uh, and you really have to go through quite an extraordinary mental contortion to view it any differently. But that is not stopping the attorney general from trying to raise questions about it. We're just about out of time. Do we have time for one more question? One more question. Yes,

Audience Member: [01:17:10](#) please. Marilyn Opez concern citizen. Thank you. [inaudible] my question is because of the challenges that the Democrats face in the upcoming 20, 20 election, what would you suggest that they do in order to win?

Speaker 1: [01:17:28](#) It's a big project.

Adam Schiff: [01:17:30](#) Well, I'm glad to say the, a short, easy question for last.

Adam Schiff: [01:17:35](#) Uh, you know, there's a big debate going on within the Democratic Party about what's the best way to win a 20, 20 is to win over the people who voted for Obama and then voted for Trump. Is that the rust belt states or is it mobilizing the base? Um, and I think it's a false choice. We need to do both. Um, Barack Obama was able to do both and there's no reason I think why we need to sacrifice either aim. Um, Donald Trump spoke to people who had worked their entire life, who had, uh, been on the edge of their retirement, had had nothing put aside and their children's lives looked even more bleak. And they looked at that field of all those candidates and all of them look the same except the guy promising revolution, the guy promising to break everything. And when the guy promising the revolution wasn't an option anymore, they went with the guy promising to break everything.

Adam Schiff: [01:18:50](#) And he has, he's broken everything and their lives have been made worse, not better. Um, he's done nothing for them. Those that were struggling when he became president are still struggling. The economy has not lifted their ship. Uh, those voters are still up for grabs. Um, and you know, the kind of, um, progressive policies that would make sure that those folks can have a secure retirement, that their kids can afford college, that they don't have to mortgage their home to pay health care. Those progressive policies are attractive to those same folks. Um, at least they should be. And so I think there is a way to do both. I think there's a necessity of doing both. But I would say

the overarching imperative for the Democratic Party in 2020 is turning our people out. Um, you know, I know people, uh, in my party when they read the news and there was an article yesterday about the electoral college and how strong it advantages the president.

Adam Schiff:

[01:20:01](#)

The good thing about being a Democrat right now is we are in control of our own destiny. If we turn out democratically inclined voters, we win. If we don't, we lose. It's up to us. The other side has to hope. We don't turn out our people. There are not enough for them to turn out. Uh, and so we have it within our power to win. Um, and I think we should be spending all of our resources now as our democratic candidates are fighting amongst themselves on registering voters. Let's spend all of our money registering voters this year and let's spend all of our effort next year turning them out. That's my advice to my party. Um, and never worry. There's too much inter-party fighting. Certainly, um, you know, in a, in a, in some respects the Bernie Hillary divide was never closed. Um, you know, my, my view has always been the house is burning down around us. This is no time for us to be fighting amongst ourselves. Any difference between the most progressive and the most moderate of Democrats is nothing compared with all of our differences with this president. Um,

Speaker 1:

[01:21:18](#)

and so

Adam Schiff:

[01:21:23](#)

I am counting at the end of the day on Donald Trump being the great unifier of the Democratic Party

Speaker 1:

[01:21:29](#)

Chairman Adam Schiff. Thank you for a tremendous hour. Really appreciate.