



## **Former CIA Officer: How Hillary personally oversaw one of Russiagate's biggest fakes**

*This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.*

**Max Blumenthal (MB):** First, we're going to talk about the explosive revelations of Hillary Clinton's direct involvement in spinning out one of the biggest lies of Russiagate. And, of course, Russiagate was the intelligence scandal or intelligence scam that helped drive the United States into a proxy war that's currently being waged in Ukraine. So it's important to examine all these lies. We're also going to discuss the demise of Nina Jankowics, former DHS Minister of Truth, weird Nina Jankowics- no offence to Weird Al Yankovic- and her board of disinformation. And we're going to discuss the proxy war itself in Ukraine, along with the support of the progressive Squad and Bernie Sanders. But first, let me toss to you, Aaron. You've been covering this story pretty extensively, the prosecution of former Clinton lawyer Donald [Micheal] Sussman, the involvement of Fusion GPS; help us sort out the players here and understand why this is such an explosive scandal.

**Aaron Maté (AM):** So Michael Sussman, who's on trial right now, is an attorney with Perkins Coie, and that is the attorney used by Hillary Clinton and the DNC during the 2016 campaign. And Sussman and Perkins Coie essentially managed the Russiagate disinformation campaign. They hired Fusion GPS. And Fusion GPS produced the Steele dossier, which was fed by the Clinton campaign and Fusion GPS to both the FBI and the media to try to drum up an investigation and media hype about a sweeping Trump-Russia conspiracy. And we all know how that ended up. And they also, Sussman particularly, hired a firm called CrowdStrike. And CrowdStrike is a private cyber firm that was the first entity to publicly accuse Russia of hacking the DNC, which is the allegation at the heart of Russiagate. And later on, we learned and we'll talk to Ray about this, that under oath, the head of CrowdStrike, Shawn Henry, privately admitted that, in fact, while they were claiming publicly that Russian hackers had infiltrated the DNC and stolen DNC emails, that in fact, they had no evidence at all of that allegation. That's something they admitted under oath in December 2017. And we, the public, didn't find that out until only three years later, in May 2020, long after the Mueller

investigation had shut down. So Michael Sussman, the Clinton attorney, is on trial right now for one narrow aspect of that scam. And that relates to Alfa Bank, which is just one plank of the various Trump Russia conspiracy theories that the Clinton campaign invented; this idea of a secret covert communications channel between the Trump campaign and Russia. And as a part of that, Sussman and some allies gave some data to the FBI, which they said was possibly evidence of a covert communications channel between Trump and Russia. And they gave them, like, papers out detailing this theory and even some technical data that they said was proof of it or evidence of it. The FBI investigated this and as we're learning now from the trial quickly realised this was all bunk, that there was nothing to this. And it looks like, although this has not been proven conclusively yet, it looks like this was a deliberate fabrication; that actually the computer researchers that were hired to put out this allegation actually were a part of a fraud to make it look deceptively as if there was something covert going on between a Trump server and Russia. If there was any contact at all, it looks like it was just basically marketing emails being sent from one entity to another, which we can talk more about. It doesn't really matter. The point is though that Sussman went to the FBI and this is what he's charged for: He's accused of lying to the FBI. When he told them that he was not there on behalf of any client. So even though he was working for the Hillary Clinton campaign and billing them for his time and billing them for, you know, even for the hard drives that he used to give to the FBI till back down to the last detail. Even though he was doing all that, he went to the FBI and said, basically, I'm just here as a concerned citizen. I'm not here on behalf of the campaign I'm working for. And I'm going to withhold from you the fact that we've actually been concocting this plot behind the scenes. That's basically what Sussman is on trial for. So it's a narrow charge of perjury and basically misleading the FBI on who he was working for. But it has really brought implications because it raises a very obvious question. If this aspect of the Trump Russia narrative was a fraud and was based on deceit, then what else was based on fraud and deceit? And what else was the FBI either misled about or given false information about? And that's the question that is basically playing out in this courtroom right now. And so as a part of that, Robby Mook, who was Clinton's campaign manager, has admitted that Hillary Clinton personally approved of making these allegations public. Because basically the point of going to the FBI was to give the Clinton campaign an excuse to drop an October surprise so that they could say that the FBI was investigating this. And that's what Hillary Clinton did. Max showed that tweet before where Hillary Clinton in late October made public that there's suspicions of a covert Trump Russia communications channel. And hiding the fact that it was actually her campaign that came up with that plot. So that's what's coming on right now in this trial. And Ray, as someone who has been debunking Russiagate from the very, very start, especially on the core allegation that Russia hacked the DNC, what is your reaction to the trial so far?

**Ray McGovern (RMG):** Well, Aaron, I just have to comment that I'm shocked. I'm shocked that the FBI would become involved in this kind of thing. Because when push comes to shove, you know the story; it wasn't just Perkins Coie, it was the FBI itself. How did James Comey and all his lieutenants think that they should risk this kind of a clear interference in a

presidential campaign? I think people need to know that right off the bat and that is simply I will take a little quote from a book that James Comey wrote. He said, You know, I, Jim Comey, was proceeding under the assumption that Hillary Clinton was a shoo-in to become our next president of the United States... Well, end-quote. Now, if you're sure that one candidate is going to win, you're going to do everything you can to help. But particularly when the other one is so widely despised and when you know you're not going to ever be held accountable, you're going to get plaudits; you're not going to get prison. And so this whole thing was orchestrated by our security services, FBI and CIA, in particular parts of the Justice Department. So here they go with this concocted story about ties between the Trump Organisation and Alfa Bank, that Russian bank. We know now from emails that it was completely made out of a whole cloth. We know that the techie said, My God, what's going to happen when people take a quick look at this? This will never, never work. And yet, Robby Mook and Jake Sullivan and John Podesta and Jennifer Palmieri, the PR person for Hillary Clinton, so this would be really good and let's do it. Let's do it September, October, and then let's make sure that Jake leaks his little message saying, Hmm, this could be the most direct link between Donald Trump and Moscow... and Jake Sullivan claimed, we can only assume that the federal authorities now will explore the direct connection between Trump and Russia. Oh, not not only that. We had Hillary Clinton one week before the election saying, tweeted quote: Computer scientists have apparently uncovered a covert server linking the Trump organisation to a Russian based bank. So this was early on, we're talking before the election here. This is how hard they tried to blacken Trump. Of course, he is extremely black in a bowl, if you will. I should make it clear that my wife always says, Ray, make sure you know how you feel about Donald Trump. And the way I feel about Donald Trump is simply that he is the worst president the United States ever had. But he can be right about certain things. He is right about- he calls it a hoax. That's because he's from Manhattan. I'm from the Bronx. I call it a crock. It was a crock from the beginning. And when wonder of wonders, it didn't win the election for them it was a crock. Ever since for months and months and years and years. And the only thing that I'll take exception with, with respect to what you said, Aaron, is that you said that the head of CrowdStrike testified in December of 2017- okay, so Mueller is just getting started with his Russia investigation- the head of CrowdStrike testified there was no technical evidence that Russia hacked into those DNC emails, or anybody hacked into those DNC. There was no technical evidence. And that was our job, James Comey gave it to us to do that forensics. Then you said, Aaron- and this, of course, people need to know- you said that in May of 2020 we learned that this was all, his testimony under oath, he had to come clean. They said, No, the Russian hacking is a hoax or a crock. The only problem is you said, we know that, well Aaron, you and Max and I know that, but that information forcibly released from Adam Schiff, the head of the House Intelligence Committee on the 7th of May 2020, has not been replayed in a Washington Post or The New York Times or any of the mainstream media. So we know that. But 90% of Americans have no idea of that, because that major story, i.e., that the Russian hacking was a crock, has been deep-sixed by The New York Times for two years and running. Okay, so this thing, if I seem a little exasperated by this thing, it's that the media still has a hold on all this stuff. And if you want to talk about

interference in elections, well, you got interference in the elections, Alfa Bank is a prime example. But so is Hunter's laptop. I couldn't believe that Glenn Greenwald was the only one with the guts to say, wait a second, a month before the 2020 election and he had to leave this press outfit that he had founded, for God's sake.

**MB:** The Intercept.

**RMG:** Yeah, The Intercept. So, you know, it is really, really sad. You and I, and we can try to reach as many people as we can, and we need to keep doing that. But even, you know, even if this has been you know, I haven't... I saw this in The Washington Examiner, in The Gazette, I mean, as long as people rely on The Washington Post and The New York Times for this information, they're going to be kept in the dark. Even I dare say, if they take this scapegoat, Michael Sussman, and put him in jail for three days, nobody's going to ask why because they won't be fully informed about it. Maybe I'm too pessimistic about that. Maybe now that it's in the courts, it'll work. Maybe the truth will come out. I'm from Missouri on that.

**MB:** It really does seem like a deliberate oversight here. It's such a massive story. We've already seen Hillary get a kind of slap on the wrist for lying about the role of the law firm Perkins Coie in the Steele dossier, which is one of the greatest intelligence hoaxes of our time. I mean, you would think there would be a much more serious penalty there. But this is all being downplayed. And as far as the way that The New York Times and Washington Post have played this, I think there's a metaphor there. I saw Ralph Nader complaining two days ago that The New York Times sports section no longer prints box scores of baseball games and that they instead devoted their coverage to kind of human interest stories about European soccer clubs. And it really speaks to the kind of audience that The New York Times is catering to. They're not appealing to regular New Yorkers who want to just know the facts, at least as far as The New York Times can compile them as the newspaper of record. It is essentially an organ of elite liberal propaganda, along with The Washington Post. So naturally, this kind of gigantic corruption scandal wouldn't be fit to print. Let me just play a clip. I just pulled it up, of how this story played out in 2018 when Russiagate was in full flight. This is from Rachel Maddow, who Aaron exposed at the time as basically devoting the majority of her coverage to Russiagate and hyping up just hatred of Russia as the number one enemy of America, which, you know, has really paid off.

**RMG:** Do I have to listen?

**MB:** Let's just, I feel like it's important to remember for 45 seconds how this was taken seriously and is now exposed as a complete fraud.

**Rachel Maddow in Video:** There have been specific questions raised as to whether Alfa Bank might have been involved in surreptitious contacts between the Trump campaign and Russia while the attack was underway. You might remember that ultimately....

**MB:** "the attack"...

**Rachel Maddow in Video:**...baffling reporting about unexplained communications during the election between computer servers in Russia linked to Alfa Bank and a computer server in Trump Tower linked to the Trump organisation. Very interesting reporting. Ultimately, it's open ended. We don't have any idea what that server communication was about, but it raised questions. Alfa Bank and its founders are also mentioned prominently in the Christopher Steele dossier. Which of course outlines allegations of a conspiracy between the Trump campaign and the Russian interference in our election.

**MB:** So that references the article in Slate magazine, which is sort of credited for launching Russiagate. It was by Franklin Foer in 2016. Any comments, Aaron or Ray?

**AM:** Well, first of all, Franklin has been rewarded for his servitude to Russiagate by being promoted to The Atlantic magazine, run by former Israeli prison guard Jeffrey Goldberg. So that's the reward he's gotten for taking part in the Russiagate disinformation campaign. And what's interesting about this case, with Michael Sussman, one of the things that have come out about it is the communications between Michael Sussman and Fusion GPS and their media lackeys like Franklin Foer. And basically the emails that have come out show Fusion GPS, in particular, Glenn Simpson, who was one of the co-owners of Fusion GPS, again, which is working for the Clinton campaign, produced the Steele dossier, basically telling Franklin Foer when to publish his story; like now is the time, buddy, get on it. That's essentially what the emails that have come out show. And so this is a case that undermines just the integral link between people who call themselves journalists, that's their job title, but really what they're doing in practise is acting as stenographers for people like the Clinton campaign and their allies inside the national security state and then people like Rachel Maddow, it's their job then to promote the fabrications that they came up with and basically keep this going for more than two years. I mean, this story about the Alfa Bank, it endured for a long time. And every once in a while, Maddow would come along to raise new questions about it, when the whole time it was just a straight up front.

**MB:** Yeah, I actually grew up with Franklin Foer in D.C., I went to elementary school with him. I knew his little brother, who was in my class, the famous author, Jonathan Safran Foer. And Franklin Foer, his role was to convey an aura of seriousness, to provide a patina of seriousness to this bunk story, because he had the pedigree of someone from D.C. who had written for The New Republic. He was in Slate, which is the online publication of the liberal *bien pensance* who like to explore ideas. Of course, if you look at a Slate article, it has really tacky like click bait ads at the bottom, it's actually gone to complete crap. But then it, you know, it goes to Maddow and becomes an article of faith. Ray, Aaron raised the question before of if this is being exposed as fake, then what else is fake? And we now know the Steele dossier, pretty much everything original, that former MI6 agent and mercenary con

man's Christopher Steele put in that document has been proven to be false. What else do you think needs to be exposed that hasn't been fully exposed and what else bears investigation about the origins of Russiagate.

**RMG:** Well, actually, I'm tempted to answer what else you need?! Like, the whole thing is crumbling. But I would like to add a couple of salient facts that not many people have really seen or realised. There was a Russian intelligence analysis report saying that Hillary Clinton approved using Russiagate for lots of reasons to help her campaign on the 26th of July 2016. Now, why do I mention that? Well, this was just about the time of the Democratic National Committee meeting. And there were other reports that this is what she decided to do. Why is it important? Well, because a crimes report was filed. This was a US intelligence report saying Russian analysts believe that Hillary Clinton approved, quote, blame Russia and, quote, plan, and that was on July 26th that she did this. Now, why is this interesting? Well, John Brennan briefed President Obama on this. Not only that, but as I mentioned before, a crimes report was filed on September 7th, 2016. What's a crimes report? A crimes report is when the agency or some other security service realises that there's been a leak, that there has been a sort of unauthorised disclosure. Well, if it's important enough, you need to file with the Justice Department a crimes report. So put yourself in the position of Brennan, who's deep into all this stuff, the Justice Department, many of whom are deep into all this stuff, and the president might think he was probably well informed of all this stuff because he and Brennan were like this [makes a hand gesture for closeness]. Now, what does this mean? This means that somebody leaked. Somebody leaked a Russian analysis that said Hillary Clinton approved to get Russia plan on 26th of July 2016 and that it was going around in intelligence service circles and it would come to the attention of people and we need to report this to the president, make sure he knows about this and to the FBI. Now, when they report it to James Comey, I can imagine John Brennan is saying, Hey, Jim, guess what? We have a Russian report now. That Hillary approved this get Russia plan on the 26th July and Comey says, I'm shocked, I'm shocked. Okay, well, what was the outcome of all this? Well, it went forward as a crimes report. There was never any information to the degree that the Justice Department followed up on this leak. And it fit in very, very, very tightly with the narrative as it evolved as early as July, August, September, October of 2017. Footnote: Who's the favourite recipient of CIA information in The New York Times? You got it. David Sanger. He filed a report. It's the same day. It's the same day as the Russian analysts say Hillary approved this campaign. And it says American Intelligence Agencies have told the White House that they have, quote, high confidence, unquote, that the Russian government was behind the theft of emails and documents from the Democratic National Committee, according to federal officials who have been briefed on the evidence. Well, you know there are lots of coincidences in the world. If David Sanger didn't have the reputation that he so appropriately deserves, having been next only to Judy Miller on WMD, weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, if he didn't have this reputation, well, it was a coincidence; the Russians learnt that she decided this. Here is a dateline; same date by David Sanger. So the whole thing is, you know, if further proof were needed, you have these guys smirking, Brennan, going through the motions to brief the

president and going through the motions to send it through Comey to the Department of Justice- isn't that interesting...Like this was news to them. They're part of the plot, for God's sake. And I'll just say one more time, they thought they'd get away with it. They thought they'd get promoted or lauded, applauded all around; not prison by doing this hoax or crock, as I call it, because Clinton was sure to win. Now, the supreme irony, of course, is she didn't win. And what does that mean? That meant they had to cover their tracks. And that explains why Russiagate not only did go away, but thrived for four more years, for God's sake. And why it's still thriving and why all my good friends in New York who are highly educated and read The New York Times back to back every morning, they just think McGovern's gone off his rocker because it couldn't be that bad. And it is that bad. And the sooner they realise that, the better for all of us.

**AM:** Yeah, they needed the Mueller investigation because the problem for them was they had relied so much on the Steele dossier at that point. They had relied on it for investigative leads, they had relied on it even to wiretap Carter Page, who was a low level Trump campaign volunteer. And they realised quickly that the Steele dossier was a scam and came from the Clinton campaign. So the purpose of the Mueller investigation was basically to act as content creators, to come up with anything else that didn't go back to Steele that could be used to make this investigation look credible. Because, you raise a very important point about the warning from Brennan to Obama in late July 2016. That is before the FBI investigation into Trump-Russia collusion officially opens. That investigation opens up on July 31st, Brennan gives that warning to Obama on July 26th, 27th. Right? And so the FBI opened up this Trump-Russia collusion investigation, even after being warned by Brennan that essentially there was a plot by the Hillary campaign to concoct a fake Trump-Russia collusion controversy. And at that point, already, they say that had nothing to do with Christopher Steele. But I've written about this; in the month before the FBI opened up their investigation the Steele dossier was given to FBI agents, it was passed around. Victoria Nuland, who is a major figure in all of this and she was the key point person in Ukraine back when the US backed a coup in 2014, Victoria Nuland personally approved, gave personal approval to the this FBI agent who was based in Rome to, in early July, way before the investigation opened, to personally go and meet with Christopher Steele and receive the dossier. The approval for that came from Victoria Nuland and Nuland herself got the Steele dossier later that month and said, This has to go to the FBI. But yet they still want us to believe that opening up the investigation had nothing to do with Christopher Steele. And that's partly why they needed Mueller to make the original decision, which was based on Steele and based on fraud, look somehow credible.

**RMG:** Yeah. A footnote about the Mueller investigation. It's all pretty incestuous, okay. The head of CrowdStrike, Shawn Henry, worked for 11 years for Bob Mueller at the FBI. Oh, wow. It was his chief techie okay. So they had a really close relationship. Now as we've already established Shawn Henry, under oath had to confess, Oh, we didn't find any technical evidence that Russia or anybody else hacked those DNC emails. Why did he do that?

December 5th, 2017. Was Mueller investigating already? Well, as you just put it, he had begun investigating. Did Shawn Henry tell his old boss, Bob Mueller: "Hey Bob, guess what? The Russian hacking is a crock." Well, either he did and Mueller went ahead anyway or he didn't. I mean, hello, talk about incest. Now, when Mueller got started, he already knew that a lot of stuff was made up. Why was it that he continued, continued, continued?! I made a major speech out in Seattle and the title of it was: Can You Handle the Truth About Russiagate? And I depicted a scenario much like what we're seeing now. And then I said, You know, I can't really figure out why Mueller keeps going when all these revelations are already clear, at least to somebody who's looking for them. And then I realised months later the whole idea was to keep it going through the midterm elections. You know, I mean, you had Trump and all the Republics under a deep, deep cloud. Bob Mueller, you know, integrity personified was bulldogging this thing. He was going to get Trump and as long as he kept going through the midterms, the Democrats were likely to win big. And guess what happened? The Democrats won really big. What amongst other things, did that mean? That meant that Adam Schiff would become head of the House Intelligence Committee. That means that he could suppress Shawn Henry's testimony for about two more years. So between shifts in The New York Times, two and a half years for Schiff from the House Intelligence Committee, two more years from The Times and 80% of the American people still believe that the Russians hacked those emails from the DNC. Part of that hurts my good friend Julian Assange because, well let me put it this way, I show my political prejudices here: if I were to accuse somebody or some entity of doing the most heinous thing I could imagine, I would say that they were responsible for four years of Donald Trump. So, to accuse and to say, look, the Russians, the Russians, without the Russian interference, without Rachel Maddow, we wouldn't have had Donald Trump. It's pretty heavy stuff, okay. I say that only a little jocularly, okay. And so that's what they pinned on him. And it went for five years now because it's still going, it will be interesting. It'll be really interesting if The Times and The Post can continue to avoid reporting what's going on in the court right now. And one of the neat things, if you're looking for a silver lining, is that John Durham, my God, John Durham is being allowed to do his job. That surprises me. And it's a nice surprise to have because there aren't so many like it.

**AM:** I wonder, though, if Durham is being allowed to continue and we can wrap after this, because I think we've covered this topic sufficiently. But I wonder if Durham is being allowed to continue only insofar as he stays within certain bounds. So, for example, right now the theory of this case is that Michael Sussman and the Clinton campaign tricked the FBI. Not that the FBI was complicit in this scam, which the evidence makes pretty clear that they were. And what if Durham also goes after the CrowdStrike issue and, you know, makes that an issue of defrauding the US government? Because, again, Michael Sussman, who's now on trial for lying to the FBI, was the Clinton campaign's point person in hiring CrowdStrike and making its allegation of the Russian hacking public. The contract between CrowdStrike and Perkins Coie is signed by Michael Sussman. And immediately when CrowdStrike came to the conclusion that Russia had hacked the DNC, it was Sussman who went to the FBI with



CrowdStrike's supposed findings and said, You need to make this public. He was very aggressive about that. That's what's come out in the reporting. And the FBI, one of the things the FBI said initially was, Well, you haven't given us any evidence. We need to see your forensics. And that took a long time. And actually, if you read reports that have come out from the Senate Intelligence Committee, they buried this, of course, but they acknowledged that people in the FBI were frustrated that what they were getting from Sussman and CrowdStrike was heavily scrubbed and redacted and it was slow. They didn't get very much information during that same summer period that Michael Sussman was telling the FBI to go public and just repeat our claims, forget the evidence; that's what was going on. And finally, when they did get stuff from CrowdStrike, it was CrowdStrike's forensics of the server that they got. The FBI didn't do its own investigation, which is a mystery that has never been sufficiently explained. Why did the FBI let the victim of a supposed crime conduct its own investigation? Why didn't the FBI send its own team in there? And then we also learnt this from the Roger Stone case. Roger Stone's lawyers got the government to admit that the reports from CrowdStrike that they got were redacted by Michael Sussman. So even the information that Michael Sussman and CrowdStrike shared with the government was redacted by Michael Sussman, and the FBI accepted it.

**RMG:** Well, you know, it depends on who in the FBI. You know, James Baker, the general counsel of the FBI, I mean, he's of a piece with James Comey and Andrew McCabe and all these other folks. My grandmother would call them the muckety mucks that ran the institution. Now, do you think that when Michael Sussman said, now, Jim, my God, I got this information that I, as a very responsible citizen, not working for anybody, want to give you Jim. And here it is. I mean, these guys are criminal, but they're not stupid, you know? So do you think there's any chance that James Baker, who left under something of a cloud himself, said, My God, Michael. What might it be? And you're not working, you're just being a really good citizen?! I mean, so what I'm saying is it's really dirty, it's really smelly, and it involves the whole FBI. And your point is well taken. Because, you know, these are the guys that could come up under indictment themselves, call me in in particular. And how far are they going to go? How far will they risk going? And that's a real question. Now, with respect to outside like overseers, you know, people who are supposed to be exercising overseership properly; well, actually, they're not. Take what's his name, that 105 year old guy from Iowa, Chuck Grassley. Now, he's just been re-elected and he said in a Grassley tweet, he said, you know, when they let this little lawyer off for falsifying a FISA application, sort of a felony, and he didn't get any jail, well, that's typical of the "Department of Just-us" [Justice]. It's in his email. Grassley, it is typical of the "Department of Just-us [Justice]", we will cover for one another. Now, what does it mean? Well, I mean, coming from Maté or McGovern that doesn't mean anything. Coming from the guy who's supposed to be and has been for decades overseeing, really overlooking the work of the FBI, doesn't that say it all?! The "Department of Just- us [Justice]", and they will cover for each other. So it's an open question. I agree with you, Aaron. It's an open question as to how far he will be allowed to go. And I guess that depends in part on the stamina or the strength or the courage of the current attorney general.

And to me, he's just a cipher. I don't know. I'm surprised that he has let Durham do as much as he already has.

**MB:** Well, and on that note of kind of partisan factions burrowing within the institutions, CrowdStrike, as you said, was, I think, co-founded by Shawn Henry, who had previously been at the FBI, went on to be an analyst at NBC News, the parent company of MSNBC. And you have Dmitri Alperovitch there as well, who is now kind of running this top sort of private intelligence contracting firm in Washington. He was a co-founder of CrowdStrike, was a Russian emigre, very anti Putin, is providing lots of commentary, obviously, on the pro NATO side on the Ukraine proxy war and he had previously been hired to perform attribution on a supposed hack of Ukrainian artillery brigades. He, of course, attributed it to Russians GRU [Glawnoje Raswedywatelnoje Uprawlenije Nachrichtendienst], and it turned out to be totally false. The Ukrainian military actually came out and said that this was completely bogus.

**AM:** So did Voice of America, which in the case of the US state funded media doing a better, more responsible job than private corporate media; free media.

**RMG:** And I would say a word on.... Go ahead. Sorry.

**MB:** Go ahead, Ray.

**RMG:** No, I was going to say a word about Alperovitch. You'll recall that this whole story began on the 15th of June 2016 when Julian Assange said we have emails relating to Hillary Clinton, they are pending publication. What happened the next day? Alperovitch said, We have discovered Russian footprints or fingerprints on these emails, he and CrowdStrike, 16th, 17th June. So they were right on it. How did they get right on it? Well, they knew- we know when those DNC emails were leaked, were taken in a thumb drive or some other external storage device that was the end of May, I think it was May 23rd and May 25th, okay, we know. So if we know, they probably knew that something had been "prepared for exfiltration". Why do I say "prepared for exfiltration"? Because that shows up in Shawn Henry's testimony on the 5th of December 2017. So we saw nothing leave electronically from the DNC, but we did see emails prepared for exfiltration. Well, my technical colleagues, Bill Binney and others, say, Well it's pretty clear indicated that they were all put together. They were ready to be put onto this disk and put in a pocket and taken over across the Atlantic to wherever WikiLeaks put it out. But from the very beginning, the DNC kind of knew that something had gone wrong with their computers and some sensitive emails had been not downloaded, but copied, right?- copied is the word- and so they were ready when Julian said we have emails relating to Hillary Clinton and we're going to publish them soon. Alperovitch and CrowdStrike were right in there. Washington Post, look it up, 16th, 17th, 18th of June, following Julian's announcement on the 15th of June. So this is where it tracks back to and they had to decide what they're going to do. But, you know, I could see Hillary- I've said this

before- Hillary to her convenient counsel, Oh God what are we going to do? and you know, what are we going to do about these emails? You know, they show they stole the nomination from Bernie for God's sake and the convention seven weeks away. What are we going to do?... I imagine, it was Robby Mook or one of these, you know, sophomores like Jake Sullivan said, I got an idea. What's that? Well, blame it on the Russians. Anybody got a better idea? Okay. Go with it. Now how do I know it happened pretty much that way because Jennifer Palmieri, their PR person, I heard her in person, not one on one, but at a meeting at Hillary and Podesta's old "think tank", I heard her talk about what happened right after the convention. She said, even at the convention, she said, We were given this word that, you know, let me not paraphrase this; this is verbatim. I copied it down and then I checked it against the video that they did of this. She said: "It was a surreal experience for us what was going on in late summer, early fall of 2016. The idea that behind the stage the Trump campaign was coordinating with Russia to defeat Hillary Clinton was too fantastic for the press to process. But then when we got back to Brooklyn", this is still a quote, "we get back to Brooklyn and we heard mostly from sources were intelligence, with the press who work with intelligence and that's where we heard things and that's what we learnt about the dossier and other storylines", Alfa Bank, "that were swirling about and how to process?! How do we- and along the way the administration started confirming various pieces". Now I can go on here, but she said that right in front of me. I got to ask a question, you know, but who else was there? Jonathan Weiner. Look him up. Jennifer Palmieri.

**AM:** Weiner is a State Department guy who served under Obama. Now he's back under Biden.

**RMG:** But he was very much, very much a Hillary person, on Libya and on other things like that. Anyhow...

**MB:** He presented Bill Browder as well as a lawyer.

**RMG:** Got really good credentials, that guy. Anyhow that's what went on. And you know, to hear them all admit it, Jennifer I think actually believed that stuff. I mean, she seemed so sincere, but she, I guess they thought they were all amongst friends. Somebody asked me whether the head of the guy who did the dossier...

**AM:** Glenn Simpson or Chris Steele?

**RMG:**... Yeah. Yeah, somebody called me up and said, Ray, you were at that meeting, was Simpson there? I said, What does he look like? And they explained it. But I couldn't remember whether he was there or not. But now all this stuff was going on not only at the end of 2016, but the beginning of 2017. That quote was from early April when I lived in D.C. It was my privilege to attend meetings like that if I could wangle myself an invitation. And so I did. So to hear the PR person explain all this, how difficult it was, We went around on little

golf wagons to various outlets... It was hard for them to believe that the Russians would do this. But then we got back to Brooklyn and there it all fell together. And we got not only intelligence people, but the administration itself, Clapper and others confirmed this stuff. That's how incestuous, that's how they took advantage of naive people like Palmieri. I still think she probably believed this stuff. I wonder if she does now.

**MB:** Yeah. Soon after the election of Donald Trump, Jennifer Palmieri wrote in The New York Times that she drove around on her little golf cart, escorted by Jake Sullivan, who is then running Hillary Clinton's campaign, and is now the National Security Adviser overseeing the potential start of World War Three. And she wrote that she was urging all reporters and everyone around the Clinton camp to elevate the issue of Trump-Russia above all else. So above all else, meaning above- I don't know, inequality, above the war, the bloodbaths on American streets, mass shootings, above the opioid epidemic, above the loss of jobs to countries abroad, and so on. All the crises America is facing are superseded by Trump-Russia, according to Jake Sullivan and Jennifer Palmieri. And then we know that on the eve of Hillary's defeat, Robby Mook and company sat in a room with, like, discarded pizza boxes. It must have been, like, just the saddest scene. And they decided, let's blame Russia and WikiLeaks for this whole thing. The decision was made. And Robby Mook who helped fuel this now completely discredited hoax of Russiagate, was rewarded for his failure as Hillary's campaign manager; this data driven little Harvard wizard. Harvard gave him a defending digital democracy programme to fight disinformation. He was one of the first big time operatives to get a counter disinformation operation, and it was funded by all the usual billionaire Cut-Outs, when Robby Mook was one of the most prolific dispensers of disinformation, who went on to participate in the attempt to steal the Iowa caucuses from Bernie with the Digital Shadow app.

**END**