

Russian hacking & Hillary Clinton's hypocrisy

The Wikileaks' releases of Hillary Clinton-related emails helped establish the existence of an extensive breach of national security and of malfeasance at the DNC to further Clinton's presidential ambitions. For her own convenience and to avoid Freedom of Information requests, Clinton violated State Department regulations and illegally moved all of her State Department correspondence, including all of her classified correspondence, to her private servers and devices. For that, she should have been prosecuted, as many others have been, and she should have served jail time. Instead, thanks to the erroneous legal position of FBI Director James Comey, she is free. To secure her party's nomination and to exercise undue influence over the media, she worked with the DNC to derail the presidential ambitions of Bernie Sanders and to plant questions for the presidential debates.

Given that dishonorable history, Hillary Clinton now proceeds with considerable hubris when she contends without the slightest evidence that Donald Trump collaborated with the Russian government or was otherwise benefited by the Russian government in securing his electoral college victory over her. Nothing could be further from the truth, but the hypocrisy is palpable. On the one hand, Hillary Clinton directly placed the national security at risk by intentional acts in gross dereliction of her duty, of the law, and of the interests of our country and its intelligence operatives. On the other hand, without the slightest shame, she points the finger at Donald Trump and accuses him of complicity in Russian influence in the election.

The first problem with Clinton and Podesta's argument is that it is factually bereft. While Russia, and indeed many of our nation's enemies, endeavor through direct action and indirect

influence to interfere with the American electoral process, there is no proof that they did so specifically to favor Trump's election. Even were some foreign or domestic hackers aiming to do that very thing, there is no proof that they influenced the casting of a single vote. Indeed, with the two candidates blasting one another and liberal and conservative talking heads filling the airwaves and the net with their views, it is impossible to prove that anyone voted for Donald Trump because of what any enemy of the United States said.

Indeed, even were there proof of such efforts, how can we know whether individuals in reaction to it, if they suspected it favored Trump, would not vote against Trump for that reason? Indeed, before the election, the Clinton camp along with supportive media, crowed loudly that the Russians were working with Trump to influence the outcome of the election. That was not provably true then, as it is not provably true now, but they made that irresponsible claim which was broadcast across the media and on the web. So, to be sure, we would probably be more apt to find folks who say they voted against Trump because of that accusation than we would to find folks who could even identify what is a story planted by Russian agents, let alone say it was that story (rather than a host of other factors) that caused them to vote for Trump.

Clinton, Podesta, Democratic leaders, and even some misguided Republicans want to spend millions of tax dollars chasing this fantasy. While I do not begrudge any of sincere efforts to improve protection of the polls and to call out any instance of actual foreign government efforts to influence the conduct of elections, the former is a state function and the latter is best left to the media (if the mainstream media could ever restore its investigative reporting function to one without political bias). A federal government effort through the CIA, such as Obama has authorized, is a fiasco, costing millions and likely to produce no clear evidence of votes being cast in reliance on efforts to influence the election by Russia.

Finally, of the two candidates, without question Hillary Clinton would be the best choice for Russia if its objective were destruction of the United States. The American military has been weakened substantially during the Obama years; Hillary Clinton's reset with Russia and efforts to alter the dynamic in the Middle East to favor the U.S. failed miserably to the great benefit of Russia and its ally Iran.

On the personal front, the Clinton Foundation took money from Russian proxies and worked deals through the State Department that benefited those proxies. Consequently, Putin could well perceive that as an opportunity to "buy" influence from a Clinton presidency. Continuation of the dire Obama policies would redound to the benefit of Russia.

Trump, by contrast, is unpredictable except in one factor most important to an assessment of him: He loves America and he is committed to nailing Iran, restoring American economic primacy, and, most importantly, rapidly restoring American military prowess and pursuing the war against radical Islamic terrorism. If anything, Trump is the far greater threat to Putin's geopolitical ambitions, not Hillary Clinton. Indeed, General James Mattis (DOD), General Mike Flynn (NDI), and General John Kelly (DHS) are not the picks of a man predisposed to lessen defense of America's vital interests, and none of those distinguished and proven American patriots would ever sacrifice those interests to appease the Russians, the Iranians, or any other foreign power. President Trump and those Generals are invested in reversing that disgraceful legacy of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton.

© 2016 Jonathan W. Emord – All Rights Reserved