

He Questions the Premise of Russiagate? Off With His Head!

by Barbara Boyd

June 21—The filing by four Assistant United States Attorneys in the name of the United States on June 20, seeks, once again, to force Roger Stone, or anyone outraged by the circumstances of his case, to shut up, lest Stone be immediately jailed. The triggering episode this time, was Stone's challenge to the main premise of the entire Russiagate myth—that truthful documents published by WikiLeaks concerning the efforts by the Democratic National Committee to sabotage Bernie Sanders' 2016 primary campaign against Hillary Clinton, and exposing Mrs. Clinton's craven ties to Wall Street, were the direct result of illegal Russian military hacks of the Democratic National Committee (DNC).

Stone stands charged with lying to Congress and obstruction of justice concerning the Russiagate hoax. After almost two years of investigations in Congress and through Special Counsel Robert Mueller, the Mueller Report demonstrates that there was no conspiracy or collusion between the Trump Campaign and Russia. Special Counsel Robert Mueller and other investigators of the mythical conspiracy-and-collusion narrative, tried to pin Stone as the non-existent link between WikiLeaks and the Trump Campaign.

In pursuit of this objective, Stone was called to testify before the House Select Committee on Intelligence, and, according to prosecutors, lied about his email correspondence with WikiLeaks and raged at a Mueller witness, Randy Credico, who, according to Stone, had provided information to Stone about the timing of WikiLeaks' various disclosures. Stone was subjected to

EDITORIAL



Roger Stone

several search warrants by the Mueller team, many of his associates were called before Mueller's Washington, D.C. Grand Jury, and he was arrested unarmed and in his pajamas via a televised, armed SWAT-type assault on his Florida home.

Stone has challenged the search warrants in the case, many of which appear to rely on the premise that the WikiLeaks DNC publications resulted from a Russian military operation. Stone submitted affidavits from former NSA Technical Director Bill Binney and computer security expert Peter Clay, demonstrating that it is

likely that the WikiLeaks DNC files were accessed internally at the DNC by someone with access to the DNC computer system and provided to WikiLeaks on a thumb drive. This expert forensic analysis is based on the metadata associated with the actual WikiLeaks files.

If there was no Russian military operation that provided the WikiLeaks DNC files, then the entire dangerous and false Russiagate narrative fails, and evidence produced from search warrants based on that falsity must be suppressed. In support of that suppression

and other motions, Stone's attorneys sought unredacted versions of the computer forensics of the DNC computers produced by the NATO-associated, private DNC vendor, CrowdStrike, upon which the intelligence community relied for its assertion of a Russian hack.

No CrowdStrike DNC Forensics? No Problem!

Shockingly, it turns out the United States government does not possess unredacted and final versions of

CrowdStrike's DNC forensics report—upon which it relied in its January 2017 assessment that the Russians hacked the DNC and John Podesta, and then arranged the WikiLeaks publication in order to swing the election to Donald Trump.

According to the prosecutor's filing seeking a modification of Stone's conditions of release on bail pending trial, Stone posted on his Instagram account the simple fact that CrowdStrike's unredacted reports were not available to the United States. Other individuals and journalists who have been disputing the entire fake Russiagate narrative also noted this astounding fact. According to the prosecutors, Stone's postings and the other news coverage concerning the redacted and incomplete CrowdStrike reports produced to Stone's defense team and the government, fans the flames of potential prejudice against the prosecutors' case against Roger Stone.

This contention has absolutely no basis in reality. Stone will face a jury pool in Washington, D.C. that has been pounded by the Russiagate narrative and is extraordinarily anti-Trump and hostile to anyone associated with him. Stone is already under a gag order which bans him from any effective attempt to reverse this prejudice. There is not exactly an onslaught of coverage in the press available to the jury pool about the govern-

ment's non-possession of unredacted reports from the DNC's computer security vendor. Under Stone's extant gag order, anything Judge Amy Berman Jackson determines to be derogatory or prejudicial to the prosecution, authored by Stone or people she deems to be associated with him, lands Stone in jail pretrial.

The real motivation for this new threat is, in all probability, a damage control effort aimed at Attorney General Bill Barr and an audience outside the Beltway, which has yet to imbibe the Russiagate Kool-Aid.

In addition to the threat to jail Stone, prosecutors were allowed to file an additional opposition to his motion to suppress. In that filing, the prosecutors swear that the indictment of 12 Russian GRU officers for the so-called Russian hack and influence campaign was based on some independent investigation by Mueller that did not rely on CrowdStrike.

Since no one but CrowdStrike ever examined the alleged crime scene at the DNC, and the FBI itself was relying on CrowdStrike's forensics, it is difficult to ascertain what that investigation might have been. The government's supplemental filing contains nothing but a conclusory two-sentence assurance that they did something, other than to rely on the discredited DNC computer security vendor. True to form, they aren't saying what the something was.