

Comment 1

Faceplant...Wrong again, Ecommunist.

Excerpt John Hindraker:

'The report titled "Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections" is the declassified version of a longer report that was delivered to President Obama, President-Elect Trump, and indirectly to the Washington Post and other news organs friendly to the Democratic Party. The report constitutes, allegedly, the long-awaited proof that Russia (specifically, Vladimir Putin) meddled in the 2016 presidential election by, most notably, hacking into email accounts of the Democratic National Committee and Hillary Clinton campaign manager John Podesta and distributing emails from those accounts to Wikileaks and others. Does the report prove that claim? No, it merely states it. There is zero evidence in the report tying the Russian government (or anyone else) to the crude spearfishing effort or to the generic, out-of-date malware that invaded the DNC's and Podesta's email systems. Weirdly, today's report never mentions the one the same agencies (apparently) released eight days ago. That report did purport to contain evidence of Russia's involvement in the email intrusions, but, as we and many others pointed out, that supposed evidence was essentially meaningless. Anyone could have carried out the simple attack described in last week's report, and neither the malware used nor the IP addresses implicated—contrary to the conclusory claims of the report—tied the intrusion to Russia's government.

That first report stands as the only publicly available evidence that Russia had anything to do with hacking the DNC account, or John Podesta's (which was not addressed at all in that first report). Today's report adds nothing. It is purely ipse dixit—take our word for it. If the agencies have any responses to the many critiques of their first report, they are keeping those responses to themselves.'

I am reminded of the many and severe instances where the CIA and company got the intel spectacularly wrong:

- Soviet Nuclear Test
- The Bay of Pigs
- The Tet Offensive
- The Yom Kippur War
- The Iranian Revolution
- The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan
- The Collapse of the Soviet Union
- India Nuclear Test
- 9/11
- Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq
- North Korea Nuclear Test
- The Rise of ISIS

Finally, I am also old enough to remember two cases where DNI James Clapper LIED to Congress and the public; at least once when he was UNDER OATH. On March 12th, 2013, during a United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence hearing, Senator Ron Wyden asked Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper the following question: "Does the NSA collect any type of data at all on millions or hundreds of millions of Americans?"

Director Clapper responded under oath, "No, sir." Incredulously, Senator Wyden asked "It does not?" Director Clapper responded "Not wittingly. There are cases where they could inadvertently perhaps collect,

but not wittingly." So that he would be prepared to answer, Senator Wyden gave these questions to Director Clapper's office a day in advance of the hearing. Upon the hearing's completion, he also gave the Director a chance to amend his answer. He opted not to do so. On June 6th, 2013, whistleblower Edward Snowden revealed to the world that the NSA was engaged in a secret program to collect tens of millions of Americans' phone call records. Further revelations would unveil NSA programs collecting Americans' web browsing histories, chat logs, email usage and even their physical locations. The NSA had been collecting data on hundreds of millions of innocent Americans, and continues to do so.

Finally forced to acknowledge his remarks as "erroneous", Director Clapper claimed that he "misunderstood" the question (which he had been sent a day in advance) and that he had simply "forgotten" the relevant section of the Patriot Act.

Clapper also cut specific references to "al Qaeda" and "terrorism" from the unclassified talking points given to Ambassador Susan Rice on the Benghazi consulate attack – with the agreement of the CIA and FBI. The White House or State Department did not make those changes.

Bottom line: There is no reason in the world we should take the highly politicized and mendacious leadership of the intelligence community at its word. Show us the evidence and we will decide for ourselves!

Comment 2

To any TE readers left sitting on the edge of this story looking in, not necessarily taking ideological sides, but just trying to gather info and figure out what the hell went on and if you actually have the mental resources left at this point to care; This is actually a pretty big deal.

This is a declassified document proving unequivocally that a federal investigative body (comprised from the efforts of three separate intelligence agencies) has determined that the president elect was aided by a former international adversary, in an attempt to adulterate our election process.

To my knowledge this is the first time in American history this scenario has played out. It's not very often that you get to say something along those lines.

Comment 3

The United States "hacked" foreign elections for decades during the Cold War. Whether it was Arbenz in Guatemala or Mossadegh in Iran, the CIA interfered mightily in domestic politics of nations all over the world for the better part of a half-century. It did this through funding pro-American politicians and foreign journals. When that didn't work, it intervened with deadly force -- the attempts to kill Castro are now well-known.

One does not have to be a Trumpista to be scornful of the CIA and other DC intelligence gathering operations. Trump's sarcastic comment on how CIA foolishness helped bring about the Iraq disaster (WMD) is entirely valid.

If the charges by the intelligence community are true (and that is a big "if") then Russia hacked the Democratic National Committee, aided in its task by an incredibly inept cyber-security system on the part of the Dems. Russia, it is maintained, then released embarrassing information so gained to the media.

So, what?

None of this had a thing to do with Donald Trump. He did not hack the DNC and he did not release the information. In the event his campaign benefited from the Russian efforts, this was entirely serendipitous.

Trump is angry about what he calls a "witch-hunt" because he sees it for what it is: media hysteria designed to delegitimize his presidency. The truly egregious John Podesta lobbied to present evidence of Russian involvement in the presidential campaign to the Electoral College. In other words, if anyone sought to benefit from nefarious Russian activities it was the Democratic leadership and not Trump.

Both Clinton and Obama seem to want to re-start the Cold War. Trump does not. I lived through all of that ghastly business, every minute of it, and the world was constantly on edge. Russia has a nuclear arsenal fully as powerful as our own. Is this a nation we want as an enemy?

If evidence is adduced that Mr. Trump colluded with the Russians in order to defeat Mrs. Clinton then that would be a very serious matter indeed. So far as I know, nothing suggests such a thing.

Russia simply did what the USA has done countless times -- attempted to sway the domestic politics of another nation. Mr. Trump, unless otherwise proven, had no part in this. He is angry, I suspect, about the "witch-hunt" because he understands that it is not aimed at Russia -- it is aimed at him.

We need not like Mr. Putin to understand that it is in the interest of the entire world that the USA and Russia do not harden into an adversarial relationship. I believe that Trump understands this. Just as I believe that a desperate Democratic Party is willing to restart the Cold War to hurt the president-elect.