OFFERING JOHN PODESTA EMAILS WHILE SELLING DELETED HILLARY EMAILS

Back in April 2017, I noted something problematic with Democratic theories about the advance knowledge of Roger Stone — and by association, the Trump camp — of Russia's hack and leak plans: Democrats have largely focused on Stone's warning, on August 21, 2016, that "it would soon be the Podesta's time in the barrel," arguing it reflected foreknowledge of the October 2016 dump of John Podesta's emails. Stone has said he was talking about blaming Tony Podesta for his corruption, and while that does appear to be a projection-focused defense of Paul Manafort as his own corruption posed problems for the Trump campaign, none of that explains how Stone implicated John in his brother's sleaze.

That one comment aside, virtually every time Stone predicted a WikiLeaks October Surprise, he implied it would be Clinton Foundation documents or other ones she deleted from her home server, not Podesta emails. That is, while Stone appears to have known the general timing of the October dump, Stone *didn't* predict the Podesta emails. He predicted emails deleted from Hillary's home server, emails that never got published. Here's how it looks in a timeline (partly lifted from this CNN timeline).

> August 12, 2016: Roger Stone says, "I believe Julian Assange — who I think is a hero, fighting the police state — has all of the emails that Huma and Cheryl Mills, the two Clinton aides thought that they had erased. Now, if there's nothing damning or problematic in those emails, I assure you the Clintonites wouldn't have erased them and taken the public heat for doing so. When the case

> is I don't think they are erased. I think Assange has them. I know he has them. And I believe he will expose the American people to this information you know in the next 90 days."
>
> August 15, 2016: Stone tells WorldNetDaily that, "'In the next series of emails Assange plans to release, I have reason to believe the Clinton Foundation scandals will surface to keep Bill and Hillary from returning to the White House,' … The next batch, Stone said, include Clinton's communications with State Department aides Cheryl Mills and Huma Abedin."
>
> August 26, 2016: Stone tells Breitbart Radio that "I'm almost confident Mr. Assange has virtually every one of the emails that the Clinton henchwomen, Huma Abedin and Cheryl Mills, thought that they had deleted, and I suspect that he's going to drop them at strategic times in the run up to this race."
>
> August 29, 2016: Stone suggests Clinton Foundation information might lead to prison. "Perhaps he has the smoking gun that will make this handcuff time."
>
> September 16, 2016: Stone says that "a payload of new documents" that Wikileaks will drop "on a weekly basis fairly soon … will answer the question of exactly what was erased on that email server."
>
> September 18, 2016 and following: Stone asks Randy Credico to get from Assange any emails pertaining to disrupting a peace deal in Libya, making it clear he believes Assange has emails that WikiLeaks has not yet released.
>
> > In a Sept. 18, 2016, message, Mr. Stone urged an acquaintance who knew Mr. Assange to ask the WikiLeaks founder for emails related to Mrs. Clinton's

> > alleged role in disrupting a purported Libyan peace deal in 2011 when she was secretary of state, referring to her by her initials.
>
> “Please ask Assange for any State or HRC e-mail from August 10 to August 30—particularly on August 20, 2011,” Mr. Stone wrote to Randy Credico, a New York radio personality who had interviewed Mr. Assange several weeks earlier. Mr. Stone, a longtime confidant of Donald Trump, had no formal role in his campaign at the time.
>
> Mr. Credico initially responded to Mr. Stone that what he was requesting would be on WikiLeaks’ website if it existed, according to an email reviewed by the Journal. Mr. Stone, the emails show, replied: “Why do we assume WikiLeaks has released everything they have ???”
>
> In another email, Mr. Credico then asked Mr. Stone to give him a “little bit of time,” saying he thought Mr. Assange might appear on his radio show the next day. A few hours later, Mr. Credico wrote: “That batch probably coming out in the next drop…I can’t ask them favors every other day .I asked one of his lawyers…they have major legal headaches riggt now..relax.”

As I further noted, when WikiLeaks started dumping Podesta emails in October (including excerpts of Hillary’s private speeches), Stone

focused more on accusing Bill Clinton of rape, another projection-based defense of Donald Trump (especially in light of the Access Hollywood tape) than he focused on the Podesta emails.

In other words, Stone may not have exhibited foreknowledge of the Podesta dump. By all appearances, he seemed to expect that WikiLeaks would publish emails obtained via the Peter Smith efforts — efforts that involved soliciting Russian hackers for assistance. That actually makes Stone's foreknowledge *more damning*, as it suggests he was part of the conspiracy to pay Russian hackers for emails they had purportedly already hacked from Hillary's server and that he expected WikiLeaks would be an outlet for the emails, as opposed to just learning that Podesta's emails had been hacked some months after they had been.

It was Guccifer 2.0, not Assange, who claimed anyone had Clinton server documents (including in a tweet responding to my observation he was falsely billing documents as Clinton Foundation ones).

Barney Frank	Citigroup	$7,500.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Barney Frank	Fifth Third	$2,000.00	$3,408,000,000.00
Barney Frank	Goldman Sachs	$10,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00
Barney Frank	Huntington Bancshares	$1,000.00	$1,398,071,000.00
Barney Frank	JP Morgan	$10,000.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Barney Frank	KeyCorp	$2,500.00	$2,500,000,000.00
Barney Frank	Merril Lynch	$2,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00
Barney Frank	Morgan Stanley	$10,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00
Barney Frank	Wells Fargo	$7,000.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	Bank of America	$10,000.00	$15,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	Bank of New York Mellon	$2,500.00	$3,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	Citigroup	$3,500.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	Goldman Sachs	$7,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	JP Morgan	$10,000.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	Merril Lynch	$2,500.00	$10,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	Morgan Stanley	$5,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00
Carolyn Maloney	Wells Fargo	$5,000.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Chris Van Hollen	Bank of America	$3,000.00	$15,000,000,000.00
Chris Van Hollen	Citigroup	$5,500.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Chris Van Hollen	Goldman Sachs	$5,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00
Chris Van Hollen	JP Morgan	$1,000.00	$25,000,000,000.00
Chris Van Hollen	Morgan Stanley	$1,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00
DCCC	Bank of America	$5,000.00	$15,000,000,000.00
DCCC	Capital One	$25,000.00	$3,555,199,000.00
DCCC	Citigroup	$22,500.00	$25,000,000,000.00
DCCC	Comerica Inc PAC	$1,000.00	$2,250,000,000.00
DCCC	Goldman Sachs	$30,000.00	$10,000,000,000.00

And Guccifer 2.0 was (according to Politico, not WSJ) in the loop of this effort, so may have been trying to pressure WikiLeaks to publish sets of files already sent, as he had tried to do with DCCC files earlier in August.

> [Chuck] Johnson said he and [Peter] Smith stayed in touch, discussing "tactics and research" regularly throughout the presidential campaign, and that Smith sought his help tracking down Clinton's emails. "He wanted me to introduce to him to Bannon, to a few others, and I sort of demurred on some of that," Johnson said. "I didn't think his operation was as sophisticated as it needed to be, and I thought it was good

> to keep the campaign as insulated as possible."
>
> Instead, Johnson said, he put the word out to a "hidden oppo network" of right-leaning opposition researchers to notify them of the effort. Johnson declined to provide the names of any of the members of this "network," but he praised Smith's ambition.
>
> "The magnitude of what he was trying to do was kind of impressive," Johnson said. "He had people running around Europe, had people talking to Guccifer." (U.S. intelligence agencies have linked the materials provided by "Guccifer 2.0"—an alias that has taken credit for hacking the Democratic National Committee and communicated with Republican operatives, including Trump confidant Roger Stone—to Russian government hackers.)
>
> Johnson said he also suggested that Smith get in touch with Andrew Auernheimer, a hacker who goes by the alias "Weev" and has collaborated with Johnson in the past. Auernheimer—who was released from federal prison in 2014 after having a conviction for fraud and hacking offenses vacated and subsequently moved to Ukraine—declined to say whether Smith contacted him, citing conditions of his employment that bar him from speaking to the press.

Two interesting issues of timing arise out of that, then.

First, to the extent that Stone's tweets during the week of October 7 (the ones that exhibited foreknowledge of timing, if not content) predicted the timing of the next leak, they would seem to reflect an expectation that deleted emails were coming, not necessarily that Podesta ones were.

> [O]n Saturday October 1 (or early morning on October 2 in GMT; the Twitter times in this post have been calculated off the unix time in the source code), Stone said that on Wednesday (October 5), Hillary Clinton is done.

> Fewer of these timelines note that Wikileaks didn't release anything that Wednesday. It did, however, call out Guccifer 2.0's purported release of Clinton Foundation documents (though the documents were real, they were almost certainly mislabeled Democratic Party documents) on October 5. The fact that Guccifer 2.0 chose to mislabel those documents is worth further consideration, especially given public focus on the Foundation documents rather than other Democratic ones. I'll come back to that.
>
> Throughout the week — both before and after the Guccifer 2.0 release — Stone kept tweeting that he trusted the Wikileaks dump was still coming.
>
> Monday, October 3:

> Wednesday, October 5 (though this would have been middle of the night ET):

> Thursday, October 6 (again, this would have been nighttime ET, after it was clear Wikileaks had not released on Wednesday):
>
> 
>

But it also makes the October 11 email — which was shared with still unidentified recipients via foldering, not sent — reported by WSJ the other day all the more interesting. The email seems to suggest that on October 11, the "students" who were really pleased with email releases they had seen so far were talking about the Podesta emails.

> "[A]n email in the 'Robert Tyler' [foldering] account [showing] Mr. Smith obtained $100,000 from at least four financiers as well as a $50,000 contribution from Mr. Smith himself." The email was dated October 11, 2016 and has the subject line, "Wire Instructions–Clinton Email Reconnaissance Initiative." It came from someone calling himself "ROB," describing the funding as supporting "the Washington Scholarship Fund for the Russian students." The email also notes, "The students are very pleased with the email releases they have seen, and are thrilled with their educational advancement opportunities."

In a follow-up, WSJ confirmed the identities of three of the four alleged donors (they're still trying to track down the real ID of the fourth).

> He reached out to businessmen as financial backers, including Maine real-estate developer Michael Liberty, Florida-based investor John "Jack" Purcell and Chicago financier Patrick Haynes. They were named in an email reviewed by the Journal as among a group of people who pledged to contribute $100,000 to the effort, along with $50,000 of Mr. Smith's own money.

If the Smith conspirators were referring to the Podesta emails stolen by GRU in the same breath as a funding solicitation for Clinton Foundation ones, it suggests that whoever Smith's co-conspirators were, as late as October 11, they were referring to the Podesta emails in the same breath as the Clinton server ones they were still hunting for.

As I said in July, I provided information to the FBI on issues related to the Mueller investigation, so I'm going to include disclosure statements on Mueller investigation posts from here on out. I will include the disclosure whether or not the stuff I shared with the FBI pertains to the subject of the post.