

4 Things You Won't Hear About 'Russian Hacking' From the Liberal Mainstream Media

President-elect Donald Trump's spokesman, Sean Spicer, said during Tuesday's transition daily briefing that once the final report was completed, the president-elect would receive a briefing from senior leadership of the intelligence community regarding allegations that the Russia government directed hacking efforts that affected the outcome of the 2016 presidential election.

Here are four items you aren't going to see anytime soon in the liberal mainstream media about those "Russian hacking" allegations:

Assange: Obama is Trying to Delegitimize Trump

WikiLeaks, which is at the center of the controversy, published much of the hacked information. Its co-founder, Julian Assange, has said repeatedly the Russian government had nothing to do with the hacking and wasn't the source of the emails and other documents obtained by WikiLeaks.

In an interview that will air Tuesday night on FOX News Channel's *Hannity*, Assange will charge that President Barack Obama is trying to delegitimize the incoming administration for political gain:

"They're trying to delegitimize the Trump administration as it goes into the White House," he said in the previously recorded interview. "They are trying to say that President-elect Trump is not a legitimate president.

"Our publications had wide uptake by the American people. They're all true. But that's not the allegation that's being

presented by the Obama White House.”

Conservative ‘Expert’ Goes Dark

John Schindler, a conservative professor at Naval War College who has frequently appeared in liberal mainstream media as an “expert” on global security and the NSA, was suddenly deleted all of his social media accounts. This after Gawker published inappropriate text messages he had sent to a woman who was not his wife.

The authenticity of the text messages has been confirmed by the recipient, who said she was a willing participant in a “virtual relationship.” Associated Press is reporting that Schindler, who has been a right-of-center foil used by the liberal media to continue its “Russia hacked the election” narrative, has been placed on leave by Naval War College.

The Tale of Two Statements

Oct. 7, Director of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson and Director of National Intelligence James Clapper issued the following statement that hacking activity appeared to be “consistent” with past Russian government-directed hacking:

The U.S. Intelligence Community (USIC) is confident that the Russian Government directed the recent compromises of emails from US persons and institutions, including from U.S. political organizations. The recent disclosures of alleged hacked emails on sites like WikiLeaks and by the Guccifer 2.0 online persona are consistent with the methods and motivations of Russian-directed efforts. These thefts and disclosures are intended to interfere with the U.S. election process. Such activity is not new to Moscow—the Russians have used similar tactics and techniques across Europe and Eurasia, for example, to influence public opinion there. We believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only Russia’s senior-most officials could have authorized these activities.

Then, on the eve of the Electoral College's vote, the Office of Director of National Intelligence changed the context of the original quote and insisted it stood by that quote—which it changed:

Recently, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence has received requests from Members of Congress, several Electors of the Electoral College and the general public for additional information on Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election.

On Oct. 7, 2016, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of National Intelligence publicly stated that they were “confident” that the Russian government directed compromises of emails from U.S. persons and institutions and that these thefts, as well as disclosures of alleged hacked emails by the Guccifer 2.0 persona were intended to interfere with the U.S. election process. The Secretary and DNI also expressed their belief that “only Russia’s senior-most officials could have authorized these activities.” We continue to stand by this statement.

ODNI has not responded to media requests asking to clarify why the context of the Oct. 7 quote was then changed to align with the liberal mainstream media narrative in December. While the changes are subtle, the semantic changes are enormous in the two statements.

About That Intelligence Analysis

The cybersecurity website Wordfence is punching some rather big holes in the U.S. government’s preliminary report. Here’s what it had to say, specifically, to the question of whether or not the report “proves” the Russian government “hacked the election”:

No, it does not. What Wordfence revealed on Friday is that the PHP malware sample the U.S. government provided is:

- An old version of malware. The sample was version , and the current version is with beta also available.
- Freely available to anyone who wants it.
- The authors claim they are Ukrainian, not Russian.
- The malware is an administrative tool used by hackers to upload files, view files on a hacked website, download database contents and so on. It is used as one step in a series of steps that would occur during an attack.

Wordfence also analyzed the IP addresses available and demonstrated that they are in 61 countries, belong to over 380 organizations, and many of those organizations are well-known website hosting providers from where many attacks originate. There is nothing in the IP data that points to Russia specifically.

Through an independent analysis of the U.S. government's data, Wordfence concluded that there is no evidence whatsoever of a government-sponsored hacking event. That the hackers may have come from Russia, they added, doesn't constitute state-sponsored activity.

Ultimately, these four different aspects of the story—none of which are likely to see the light of day in the mainstream media—destroy the liberal narrative that the Russian government sought to influence the outcome of the election. What we need to do now is pray that President-elect Donald Trump maintains his resolve in the face of growing media pressure. {eoa}