



Episode 774: What Have We Learned from Wikileaks?

Guest: Tracey Diaz

WOODS: As you and I are talking, it is November 2nd, 2016. This is going to run on November 3rd. Anything can happen with Wikileaks in 24 hours, we all know. I've been sort of hoping there was one last giant bombshell coming, and they keep hinting at it, like we've got something on Tim Kaine. But you know what? They better hurry up, because the election's coming up, and a lot of people have already voted.

DIAZ: Yes, and interestingly enough, Donald Trump released a tweet yesterday saying there are six states where you can change your early vote, so knowing what you know now, get to work.

WOODS: Yeah, I heard about that. Is that really true? I didn't realize that you could change an early vote. I don't even know how you would do that. Is that really true?

DIAZ: It is, and I think that they'll figure it out if they are so inclined.

WOODS: Okay, yeah, that's really interesting. Well, anyway, let's talk about Wikileaks. I wanted to talk to you, because I think like a lot of people I felt overwhelmed by this huge dump of stuff that we got, and it just came at a bad time for me; I just couldn't sift through it. I had to rely on what the media picked out of it. So I don't really know all that much about what's so important about what's in there, let's say. I don't see – I mean, it seems like we've gotten some stuff that under normal conditions if we were dealing with people not in government people would be outraged, but for some reason it's like the public is very ho hum when it's government officials. They expect the corruption, so it's like it takes bigger and bigger doses of it to absolutely jolt them.

DIAZ: That's absolutely true, and as a matter of fact, I mentioned the other day even for me – and I think it's become even more of an obsession at this point for me, kind of a sick obsession, to be honest. But reading through these thousands and thousands and thousands of emails, you almost become numb to the level of corruption that's contained within these emails. It's almost like, Oh, media collusion? Okay, no big deal. Let's move on to something juicy. I mean, it's really crazy. That's why I think it's important the way they actually released these, was done I feel very purposefully, and with some information that's come out yesterday and now more today, we're seeing a bigger picture of why this was done the way it was done.

WOODS: All right, so let's talk about that. That's what I've really found interesting, is the way you've identified a pattern in the information that was released. It's not

haphazard. There's a method to it. So I've got in front of me a series of categories, let's say, that we can classify these different documents into. So "show collusion with media" is the first one, that you can see what we already sort of know, is that the media is not just some impartial spectator that's merely reporting the news to us innocently. There's a little bit more to it.

DIAZ: There's actually a lot more to it, and in Podesta dumps 24, I believe, Brent Budowsky, who has written for several established publications, writes a scathing critique of the Clinton campaign. This was back in I believe September of 2015, and throughout these leaks he's been the one who's kind of been waving the flag saying, Hello, you guys are crazy. What are you doing? This is not going to work, specifically pointing towards the fact that they kind of held Bill Clinton off from campaigning until very late in the fall, saying nobody trusts Hillary Clinton, she's got no personality. I mean, it was scathing. And you see all the time, we're going to send this story to our friendly journalist here in *The New York Times*. So basically Wikileaks first released evidence of ridiculous amounts of media collusion, so that now the people know you guys can't trust most of the media, if not 95% of the media. That was first set – after the DNC leaks, of course.

WOODS: And it's funny to hear so many of these people today saying that the FBI director is threatening our democracy, as if these people have the slightest concern for the – So-called democracy means their person wins.

DIAZ: Not to segue too much, but what you said makes me think of what happened yesterday. Steve Piczenik, who is a very well connected former and maybe even current member of the intelligence community, came out with a video yesterday, where he basically said, It's November 1st; I'm making this video to announce to you that there is currently a coup going on inside the US government. The intelligence community is responsible for leaking this information to Julian Assange so that we can stop the Clintons from taking office. And he basically – it's four minutes long – goes on to say that we're in the middle of a second American Revolution, albeit a peaceful one in terms of guns and weapons, and that there is going to be a lot more coming out. And I think that was the November 1 surprise. And you know, incidentally the FBI also tweeted out the first batch, they call 1, of the Clinton Foundation investigation that they began ten years ago. So this all ties together, and it all starts to make a lot more sense when you look at it from that perspective.

WOODS: Well, you've got here as categories, you've got "show collusion with media," then "release low-level corruption and demonstrate media collusion," then "begin to introduce emails to make them fight amongst themselves" – that I've really enjoyed. Then "introduce Obama," then "introduce financial power brokers making shadow decisions," and then "prove Obama knew about the email server." Now, that is absolutely clear beyond a shadow of a doubt at this point, because you can see his people desperately trying to cover his tracks about that.

DIAZ: Yes, and they did this almost like a soap opera. What they did was really interesting. They released one email in a thread, and then in a later dump they released the other subsequent emails in the thread. So you got the beginning of the picture, and then later on you start to grab more of the pieces. What I found really interesting about these shadow governments and the power brokers was that when

they released the first seven of Barack Obama's emails, what it showed was basically that these folks knew in as early as August of 2008 that Barack Obama would be our next president. Members of Citigroup were making decisions on cabinet positions and speaking amongst one another with Podesta about how they would influence Obama to choose the person that they wanted him to choose. So Obama is now tied to these things. The email came out that he absolutely knew about the server, even though he told everyone he found out on the media. And as you see in the news the past couple days, he's now starting to very clearly distance himself from Hillary Clinton.

WOODS: Okay, now I actually haven't seen that. How's he doing that?

DIAZ: The President of the United States, the POTUS Twitter account as well as Michelle Obama's Twitter accounts yesterday deleted all references to Hillary Clinton on both of their accounts, as well as the spokesperson for the White House coming out and saying that they respect James Comey's decision to continue the investigation into Hillary Clinton and her emails.

WOODS: Wow, there is such an interesting dynamic between the Obamas and the Clintons. I mean, we don't know the half of it.

DIAZ: Absolutely, and going back to that email from Brent Budowsky, which inside of that email he says in no uncertain terms that the Obamas have a literal contempt for the Clintons. They despise them. There is no love there whatsoever.

WOODS: And yet at the same time, up until maybe very recently, Obama has to feel like if people vote for Trump that's a repudiation of him, so he has to at some level want Clinton to win, but only because she's a member of the team, certainly not because he has much affection for her. In fact, I'll never forget this classic line back from when Clinton and Obama were running against each other back in 2008, and she was obviously demoralized by the fact that he's getting these big, enthusiastic crowds, and people seem to love him. And he actually said to her at one point, People like you well enough. (laughing) Just absolutely devastating, like slitting her throat to say something like that.

DIAZ: There is absolutely a severe hatred that the public doesn't see that's going on there, and especially because President Obama is very egotistical, he's worked very hard to maintain a reputation, and this is threatening to derail his presidency and his legacy, I mean, ten scores over. So it's a very tumultuous time, and I think it's too late – to be honest, I think everyone would agree that the people are pretty much awoken to the fact that this is one big club, and nothing the media says or does at this point is going to make a difference to change that. And you can see the media going nuts yesterday with all of their stories about Donald Trump tied to the Russians and the server and the email server, going back and forth with the Russian bank. And at the same time, *The New York Times* is releasing a story as they're reporting on this, that there's nothing to see here; the FBI has cleared Donald Trump of any connection to the Russians whatsoever.

WOODS: Yeah, that obviously was the emergency, panicked spin attempt by the Democrats in the situation, because obviously they don't know what to do. They don't know what's coming. I wish I knew what was coming. I've very much enjoyed watching

this unfold. If you had to say these are the three or four things that came out of this dump that are the most significant or that are the most shocking or the most newsworthy, what would they be?

DIAZ: I think at the top of the list would be the email about the Obamacare Supreme Court case, where Neera Tanden, who is now with CAP, Center for American Progress, formerly run by John Podesta, is speaking to the Clinton team and Podesta and references how they've put very serious pressure – in what ways we're not sure – on Justice, I'm going to say Thomas, to pass Obamacare and rule it constitutional. Collusion against a Supreme Court judge on a Supreme Court decision.

WOODS: It might have been John –

DIAZ: Roberts.

WOODS: John Roberts, yeah.

DIAZ: Yes.

WOODS: That seems more likely to me. Clarence Thomas would be like the Ron Paul of the Supreme Court. They ain't ever going to change his mind.

DIAZ: Yeah, it's definitely Roberts.

WOODS: Geez, I am so out of it. People aren't going to listen to me anymore if they hear how out of it I am that I wasn't even aware of that.

DIAZ: It's hard. It's thousands, it's 30,000 emails. I mean, you know, with a busy life it's not something that's easy to get through.

WOODS: But geez, these are things that if the shoe were on the other foot it would be impossible for me not to know about it, because it would be all over the news. It would be absolutely everywhere.

DIAZ: Yes.

WOODS: And instead this stuff is buried, and I have to dig around for anybody who even knows what's going on.

DIAZ: Yeah, which is why they released the media collusion first. So it's up to independent journalists at this point. *The Wall Street Journal* did pick up on that story, by the way. They do have that as a story on their website.

WOODS: Well, that was long suspected by people, that there was something fishy about that decision by Roberts. But of course you have no hard evidence. You can speculate all you like, but you have no hard evidence. And then something like this comes out. Good grief. You have in here – I like the category "emails that make them fight amongst themselves." That to me is fantastic. And of course – Well, let me ask you this: have we learned from this, not from other sources, but from the Wikileaks in

particular, is this where we've learned about some of the dirty tricks that were used on Bernie Sanders?

DIAZ: Yes, absolutely in black and white. Yes. And as far as them fighting amongst themselves, I mean, you'll see emails in here where Chelsea Clinton, who uses two different nom de plumes, is kind of trying to say, Look, guys, there's something wrong here with the Clinton Foundation. I'm getting questions from this person and this person and this person. And they're calling her a spoiled brat, and they're saying that she's a backstabber just like her mother, and they're basically just talking about the Clintons behind their backs, expecting no one to ever know. And these things come out, and now everybody's pointing fingers probably behind the scenes at one another, like, How could you say this about me?

WOODS: Yeah, or they're saying that she has terrible judgment. These are her top people.

DIAZ: Yes, yes, absolutely.

WOODS: All right, let's get back to the top emails, the juiciest in the opinion of Tracey Diaz. What else have we got?

DIAZ: Another one that really struck me as very interesting was the one in which Podesta is speaking with a member of another organization, and they're talking about "wet works," which is a term used to describe assassination. And not two days later, Justice Scalia was found dead in Texas. It's really hard to pinpoint whether or not they're referencing Justice Scalia, but as you know, the circumstances surrounding his passing were very strange. That email was kind of picked up on, and since there's no hardcore proof and evidence in there, nobody really ran with it too far, but it's always something I've been looking for more of.

WOODS: Yeah, see, I feel like these people, as dopey as they are, even they wouldn't make a reference to that in anything in writing.

DIAZ: Yeah, you'd think not, but why say it at all? It just doesn't make any sense.

WOODS: All right, well, I'll grant you there's something odd about that. I'll grant you there's something odd about that. What else you got?

DIAZ: Another one was the interesting, how we are able to now intertwine and web together some things. So inside of these emails we have discussions about protests that will be happening at Donald Trump events. For example, the Culinary Union staged a protest at his hotel in Las Vegas, which Hillary Clinton actually spoke at. And there are other references to protests around the country, and the tone throughout all of this is we need to make Donald Trump look like a misogynistic, homophobic, bigoted, xenophobe, and we need to make his supporters look the same — in those words. There is no incorrectly judging what exactly was said and what they were trying to get at.

WOODS: Now, this is a case where the double standard is just overwhelming, because you could only imagine if it was discovered that Trump people were trying to either disrupt Clinton events or cast Clinton supporters in an especially unfavorable light. We would never hear the end of it. Trump would be asked about it from now until the end of time. Whereas Hillary is getting questions like, "How did it make you feel when Trump said you were a nasty woman?" She was actually asked that question by our impartial, penetrating media. "How did it make you feel?" Have they every asked Donald Trump, How did it make you feel when in the whole debate she kept calling you Donald when you were calling her Secretary Clinton? Did you feel that was disrespectful? Of course no one's going to ask him that. We all know that. That would never happen.

DIAZ: No, and you know, after the last debate – there's video of this if you want to go back. Clinton's press secretary is on his phone. He types in whatever he's typing, hands it to the reporter that's going to ask the question, the reporter reads it, and then asks the question and hands back his phone, right on live television in front of everybody.

WOODS: Yeah, yeah. Yeah, I saw the video.

DIAZ: (laughing) You can't make it up, Tom.

WOODS: Yeah.

DIAZ: You can't.

WOODS: It's totally crazy. And it's funny; I saw, I think it was on Twitter, somebody had a photo of the media on an airplane questioning Clinton, and they're looking at her with such adoring faces, and the caption was something like, "You've found true love if your love looks in your eyes the way the media looks at Hillary Clinton" (laughing).

DIAZ: It's just so ridiculous. It's almost – It's comical at this point, how ridiculous it is. I mean, I still don't understand how anybody could just blindly go through their daily life and not see what's happening, but there are people out there who don't see what's happening.

WOODS: Now, you know, maybe you could help me answer this. Wikileaks solicits donations, and yet I don't understand how that works. Aren't they doing stuff that if any of their people got identified, they could be executed for? How are they getting the donations? Where does the money go to? How can they have an operation going when everything they're doing would get them in trouble? You see what I mean?

DIAZ: Because they're not doing anything that gets them in trouble. Wikileaks is a publisher. They're journalists. Wikileaks is not obtaining this information on their own. They're not engaged in any of that. As a matter of fact, now that you mention that, the new pedophile lawsuit that's being brought up against Julian Assange is inside of the Wikileaks how they're going to pull that off, who's connected to who. They're journalists. They post information, plain and simple. They have an unflawed, ten-year track record of posting nothing but legitimate information. So they're not hackers; they are simply relaying information.

WOODS: Okay, I think people don't quite get that, you know?

DIAZ: Yeah, it could be – yeah.

WOODS: I think it's the sort of thing like, in the same way that George W. Bush never came out and expressly said Saddam brought the 9/11 towers down, he certainly let you think it. And I think the same thing with Wikileaks. I think Hillary gives the impression that there's espionage going on here, there's something untoward, but actually, who knows at what level this is actually taking place. The Wikileaks people simply have the integrity, frankly, to give us this information. These are the sort of documents *The New York Times* would have sat on.

DIAZ: Yes, and it's important to note also that if you want to know anything about Assange, he's not even charged with a crime. He's basically being holed up in the Ecuadorian embassy in London, because if he leaves there will be an attempt to grab him on charges of rape that haven't even been filed yet. It's really a very sad story. So maybe if we get the good guys winning in this situation, there are pardons for Snowden and everyone else that's been doing this sort of thing, and truth finally gets out there for everyone.

WOODS: Let me ask you from a libertarian standpoint, could you make a case to say that these are private communications, and it's really wrong to turn them over and reveal them to the public?

DIAZ: I don't think so, because it doesn't work the other way around. We're spied on consistently, and our information is tracked and recorded and looked at. They use it against us on a daily basis. I feel like if the playing field was level maybe that case would be a good one and a moral one to make, but given the circumstances we find ourselves in, I think that this is good versus evil and the only way we have any hope of stopping this crazy tyranny that's taken over our country.

WOODS: Yeah, I have absolutely no sympathy for them whatsoever. I feel completely confident in saying that it is completely consistent with libertarian morality to favor the complete exposure of these people. I mean, these are not normal private citizens going about their business. These are people plotting various things they want to do to us. And you know, they're in charge, and I'd like to know what they're plotting.

DIAZ: Well, I mean, especially when they're plotting amongst one another to destroy an email server that they know contains information that shouldn't be there, when they're plotting with one another to give a candidate an unfair advantage in the debate by providing the questions in advance. I mean, they're literally tampering with our government at every single level at every single turn. So yes, we have a right to know.

WOODS: Now has Assange himself said, not other people who might be somewhat related to Wikileaks or sympathizers, but has Assange himself said, We have the 33,000 deleted emails and we're going to release them? Has he said that?

DIAZ: No. No, he has not.

WOODS: So is there a real possibility — because there were rumors that they were all supposed to be released yesterday, and well, like a lot of things — like, "The world is supposed to end on June 12th, 2016." Then June 12th always and forever comes and goes, and nothing happens. Is this like that, or what do you think's going to happen?

DIAZ: No, I think that the reason why they didn't release them yesterday was because they were aware of this video and the kind of unveiling of the curtain of what's really going on. There will be something today. I am — well, "today" meaning November 2nd, so actually yesterday if you're listening to the show. But there will be those 33,000 emails. Where they come from, I'm not sure. I am fairly confident, knowing everything I know, with all the research I've done, that Wikileaks will release the 33,000 emails.

WOODS: It's such a strange thing, though. How could they know which emails — Well, I don't know. Look, I'm not a tech person. I'm sure a tech person could figure out these are the deleted emails fair enough. Of course if they ever do get out, well, that would be something that, no, I can't read 33,000 emails, but man, I would start looking through them. (laughing) I've got to find out what does she want to get rid of.

DIAZ: They have a search box up there; you just put in what you're looking for, and it'll come up. I mean, it's really intuitive, their interface. And there's another tool available. Some students at MIT put it together. It's a graphical interface you can use. You click some bubbles; emails come up on the right-hand side. You should look into that. It will make it a lot easier for you.

WOODS: Yeah, well, where do people go? Is it — I don't know even know — Like, does Wikileaks have a site? I mean, this is how out of it I am. I don't know.

DIAZ: Oh, wow, okay, yes, absolutely. Wikileaks has a site, Wikileaks.org —

WOODS: Okay, I figured it was that. I figured it was that; I've just never been there.

DIAZ: You can even see copies of the Trade in Services Agreement they're negotiating right now. It's not just Podesta emails. I mean, this goes all the way to 2005, I believe. Every single information dump they've ever done is on there. And you know, a lot of people don't realize that they've been doing this for that long, and a lot of people don't realize that they got the Republicans back then, and the Democrats were cheering like a —

WOODS: Of course.

DIAZ: Yeah, mm hmm.

WOODS: But you know, I thought maybe one of the most revealing reactions of this whole thing came from Marco Rubio.

DIAZ: Yes.

WOODS: Remember? When he said, Let's not any of us refer to any of the information coming out through Wikileaks, because you know, tomorrow it could be us. Which is of

course his way of saying, And we've got so many skeletons in our closet, we don't even want to touch this. I thought that said it all.

DIAZ: It did, yes, and that coupled along with the CNN reporter saying, It's illegal for you to look at any of this. You have to come to us for all your information. I mean, come on.

WOODS: Yeah, how's that been working out for us?

DIAZ: (laughing) So yeah, this is a crazy time to be alive. From Ron Paul back in, oh goodness, all the way through here, it's gratifying to see that we're getting somewhere finally. It really is.

WOODS: Well, listen, Tracey, I appreciate your time and the work you've been doing and keeping an eye on all of this stuff. I sure hope we do get a giant dump of additional material. It seems inevitable that we're going to get at least something more. And it's fun. When this is all over it's going to be like the Ron Paul campaign ending, you know? What do I do with myself? At least I get these exciting headlines every day, and with Ron Paul I got these YouTubes, and what's he up to today, and who's head is exploding today. And then what was I supposed to do with myself after that?

DIAZ: I don't know what I'm going to do with myself. I feel like it's going to be empty and void of any, like — It's been such a whirlwind. I know you get that deflation for a little while afterwards, even though, you know, it would be good if all this ended and Donald Trump was president, in my perspective.

WOODS: By the way, have you thought about, at this point, how these people are now communicating with each other? Because presumably they're terrified of email.

DIAZ: Yes, I think it's all via phone at this point, but you know, that doesn't mean anything either. Their own weapon against us has backfired on them.

WOODS: Yeah, that is really amazing.

DIAZ: Yep.

WOODS: That they have to go back to like it's 1980 or something now, in terms of communication.

DIAZ: Morse code.

WOODS: (laughing) Yeah, I know! Yeah, they've got to get their telegraph out and start tapping it out to each other. But you know what? I bet we can intercept the telegraph messages too, so there ain't no place they can hide. Well, Tracey, thanks again. I appreciate it.

DIAZ: Thank you so much for having me, Tom.