

# **THE ROGER STONE INDICTMENT PROVES BARR'S MEMO UNDERSTATES TRUMP FLUNKIES' COMPLICITY**

I've made this point implicitly a few times, but it bears making explicitly. We have proof that Bill Barr's memo spins the known contents of the Mueller Report to minimize the complicity of Trump's flunkies. That's because we can compare what we know about Roger Stone's efforts to optimize the release of the emails Russia stole with the language used in the memo.

As alleged in sworn statements and his indictment, Stone's actions include at least the following:

- Around July 19, 2016: Fresh off dining with some Brexiteers, Stone calls Trump and tells him, "within a couple of days, there would be a massive dump of emails that would damage Hillary Clinton's campaign," to which Trump responds, "wouldn't that be great."
- After July 22: A senior Trump campaign official "was directed" (the indictment doesn't say by whom) to figure out from Stone what else would be coming
- July 25: Stone emails Jerome Corsi and asks him to "get the pending WikiLeaks

emails”

- August 2: Corsi writes back and reflects knowledge that the emails would include Podesta ones and there would be two email drops, one shortly after he returned and one in October
- October 4: After Assange has a press conference but doesn't release any emails, Steve Bannon emails Stone and asks what happened, and Stone replies that WikiLeaks will release “a load every week going forward”
- October 7: As the Podesta emails start to come out right after the Access Hollywood video – timing that Jerome Corsi has claimed Stone helped ensure – a Bannon associate texts Stone and says, “well done”

Now, none of that was itself charged as a crime. Stone was not charged with conspiring with WikiLeaks. But then, short of making an argument that WikiLeaks is a known agent of Russia – which the US government has never done – optimizing the WikiLeaks release is not a crime. But assuming that Corsi is correct that Stone got WikiLeaks to hold the Podesta release to dampen the impact of the Access Hollywood video, it is absolutely coordination. And even according to Stone – who believed Trump needed to avoid alienating women to win – dampening the release of the video influenced the election.

Now consider how this behavior falls into Barr's supposed exoneration of Trump campaign

involvement in the hack-and-leak.

First, there's Barr's truncated citation of a Mueller Report sentence. [my emphasis throughout]

As the report states: "[T]he investigation did not establish that **members of the Trump Campaign** conspired or **coordinated** with **the Russian government** in its election interference activities."

Then a footnote defining what the word "coordinated" means in that sentence.

In assessing potential conspiracy charges, the Special Counsel also considered whether **members of the Trump campaign** "coordinated" with Russian election interference activities. The Special Counsel defined "coordinated" as an "agreement—tacit or express—**between the Trump Campaign and the Russian government** on election interference."

Finally, there's Barr's own version.

The second element involved the Russian government's efforts to conduct computer hacking operations designed to gather and disseminate information to influence the election. The Special Counsel found that Russian government actors successfully hacked into computers and obtained emails from persons affiliated with the Clinton campaign and Democratic Party organizations, and publicly disseminated those materials through various intermediaries, **including WikiLeaks**. Based on these activities, the **Special Counsel brought criminal charges** against a number of Russian military officers for conspiring to hack into computers in the United States **for purposes of influencing the election**. But as noted above, the Special Counsel

did not find that the Trump campaign, or anyone associated with it, conspired or **coordinated with the Russian government** in these efforts, despite multiple offers from Russian-affiliated individuals to assist the Trump campaign.

The exoneration for coordination in Mueller's language, at least, extends only to the Trump campaign, not to rat-fuckers working on the side (one of the things Mueller reportedly asked a lot of witnesses was precisely when and why Stone left the campaign). And at least according to this language, Mueller's assessment of coordination extended only to coordination with the Russian government. So even if Mueller and the US government are getting close to labeling WikiLeaks a Russian entity, it still wouldn't count for this assessment. Unsurprisingly, Barr relies on that language to give the Trump campaign a clean bill of health on the hack-and-leak side.

Most cynically, though, even after Barr acknowledges that the Russians used WikiLeaks to disseminate the stolen emails, the very next sentence doesn't mention the charges Mueller brought against Stone for hiding his own (and through him, the campaign's, including Donald Trump's) coordination of the releases "for purposes of influencing the election."

But we know Stone's indictment has to be in the report. That's because the report, by regulation, must list all Mueller's prosecutorial decisions. So not only would Mueller describe *that* he indicted Stone, but he probably also explains why he didn't include a conspiracy charge in Stone's indictment (which probably relates primarily to First Amendment concerns, and not any illusions about WikiLeaks' willing service for Russia on this operation). So it must be in the report. But Barr doesn't mention that, indeed, the Trump campaign, through their associated rat-fucker, did actually coordinate on the hack-and-leak and did

actually influence the election by doing so, they just didn't coordinate directly with the Russian government.

On this matter, it's crystal clear that Barr cynically limited his discussion of the report to obscure that Mueller had, indeed, found that the campaign "coordinated" on the hack-and-leak for purposes of influencing the election.

Barr has already demonstrated bad faith in his representation of Mueller's findings. Which is why it is so alarming that – according to an uncharacteristically alarmed Peter Baker – DOJ plans to write a summary of Mueller's report for Congress, not send over a redacted version of it.

Mueller's full report has yet to be released, and it remained unclear if it ever would be. House Democrats have demanded that it be sent to them by next Tuesday, but the Justice Department outlined a longer schedule, saying that it will have its own summary ready to send to lawmakers within weeks, though not months.

Barr has already failed the test of whether he can summarize Mueller's results in good faith.

*As I disclosed last 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.*