

# Russiagate Revelations & the Obama Treason Allegations

Investigative journalist Aaron Maté discusses the new Russiagate revelations and the accusations against Obama for treason. Follow Prof. Glenn Diesen: Substack: <https://glenndiesen.substack.com/> X/Twitter: [https://x.com/Glenn\\_Diesen](https://x.com/Glenn_Diesen) Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/glenndiesen> Support the channel: PayPal: <https://www.paypal.com/paypalme/glenndiesen> Buy me a Coffee: [buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng](https://buymeacoffee.com/gdieseng) Go Fund Me: <https://gofund.me/09ea012f>

## #M3

Hi, everyone, and welcome back. We are joined now by Aaron Maté, a journalist at The Grayzone, to discuss the documents that have now been published about Russiagate. So, welcome back to the program. Great to be here with you, Glenn. In 2016, the American system really underwent a huge shock, which still obviously has a massive impact. The presidential election was expected to be won by either a third Bush or a second Clinton, and instead we had Trump winning the presidency. Quickly, the allegations began to come out—something out of a Hollywood movie or a cheap novel—that Trump was collaborating with the Russians, more or less an agent of the Kremlin or a Manchurian candidate who had now taken over the White House.

And all of this talk about getting along with Russia was often interpreted as evidence of this collusion. And indeed, to prove that he wasn't, he would have to be as aggressive as possible towards Russia. And the US president was, by many, including Clinton, therefore denounced as illegitimate. So the political system was polarized. And we also saw that US-Russian relations deteriorated, which they have done for the past decade thereafter, taking us closer and closer to war. Now, the most recent development, as most people are aware, is that the Director of National Intelligence, John Ratcliffe, released these documents in which he accuses Obama of lying and effectively also of treason. So I thought, moving away from the headlines, what have we actually learned from the documents published by John Ratcliffe?

## #M2

The documents show more evidence that Russiagate was a fraud, that US intelligence officials at the highest level basically manipulated the intelligence process to frame Trump as a Russian agent and also to frame Russia for waging this sprawling interference campaign to install him in office. Both allegations were equally false, and a lot of deceit was employed at the time to push them to the public and to the media, which acted as stenographers for the most part, rather than applying critical scrutiny. And now we get more details on how the fraud occurred. Does this show what Tulsi Gabbard says, that there was a... a treasonous coup?

I mean, I wouldn't use that language. I think she's adopting some spin there. But what it does show is that there was an effort—a conspiracy, if you want to call it that—to frame Trump as a Russian agent, which was just completely baseless and a total scam. And, you know, what interests me more in these documents is the so-called Russian interference angle, because we know by now that collusion was a scam. Robert Mueller led a more than two-year investigation into this at the FBI, spending tens of millions of dollars. This was the dominant focus of Trump's first term: to try to find any evidence of a conspiracy between him and Moscow.

And of course, he found nothing because there was nothing there. This was basically a scam invented by the Hillary Clinton campaign via their contractor, Christopher Steele. So that by now is low-hanging fruit. We know that collusion was a scam. It was a dumb conspiracy theory. No one serious takes it seriously anymore. But the enduring allegation, and the one that Russiagate apologists still cling to, is this Russian interference operation. So they'll say, yes, okay, fine, Mueller didn't find evidence of a conspiracy, but that doesn't mean that Russia did not interfere on Trump's behalf.

And now we get from these newly declassified documents more evidence on top of what we already knew before—that that was a complete fraud. And the most critical disclosure to me—and there are several—but the most critical one to understand is that in the fall of 2016, so September 12th, 2016, less than two months before the election, the U.S. intelligence community produced an assessment that had never been released to the public until now, nearly nine years later. Okay, what does it say? It says that when it comes to the core allegation at the heart of Russiagate—which is that Russia stole emails from the Democratic Party and gave them to WikiLeaks as part of a plot to defeat Hillary Clinton—

When it comes to that Russian hacking allegation, the FBI and the NSA—the two premier U.S. intelligence agencies that were investigating this—had low confidence that Russia did it. Low confidence, which means they had no evidence, and it was, at best, pure speculation. That assessment by the FBI and the NSA was suppressed and kept from the public until now. Instead, we got a series of claims that this was the U.S. intelligence consensus. Hillary Clinton falsely claimed this was all 17 U.S. intelligence agencies, which was never true.

But now we see that it's even worse because the two key agencies here—the FBI, which was investigating the intrusion into the DNC servers, and the NSA, which can monitor all cyber meddling and foreign communications—both had low confidence. And that was suppressed. Instead, after Trump won in November, about a month later, there was a White House meeting with Obama and his top principals. And now, from these declassified records released by Tulsi Gabbard, we learn that they decided, even though the FBI and the NSA still had this low confidence in attributing the hack to Russia, they were still going to blame Russia anyway. They ordered the release of a brand new intelligence community assessment to replace the one they had suppressed, in order to blame Russia.

And now we learn from more records that that intelligence community assessment was a fraud. There's a House Intelligence Committee investigation that went through the Intelligence Community Assessment that was released to the public. They interviewed people behind it, and they all said that this was rushed. John Brennan controlled it—he was the director of the CIA, heavily involved in pushing Russiagate. They relied on the Steele dossier despite Brennan's claims to the contrary. And their only evidence—by the way, this is what we get from the new House Intelligence report that just came out—their only evidence is that Putin ordered Russia to allegedly hack the DNC and give the emails to WikiLeaks. The only evidence for that comes not from signals intelligence or anything else.

It comes from a source who heard it secondhand, okay? Because John Brennan had this guy who was a mid-level Kremlin official who was like his mole. And that's who John Brennan relied on for a lot of stuff. And even according to John Brennan's own mid-level source, who had no access to Putin whatsoever, the basis for saying that Putin ordered this operation and ordered the transmission of these stolen emails to WikiLeaks comes from a secondhand source. So that's hearsay. So it's a joke. It's a complete joke. And along with everything else we knew about that allegation so far—including the fact that the FBI was relying on CrowdStrike to investigate the hacking of the DNC. Who's CrowdStrike? CrowdStrike is a contractor working for Hillary Clinton. But just as the FBI was relying on Christopher Steele for its fruitless hunt for collusion, the FBI was also relying on CrowdStrike.

And just a last point here on the theme of burying countervailing evidence. So we've already established so far that the intelligence community buried the low-confidence assessment of the FBI and the NSA on Russian hacking. We also learned, way after the fact, that CrowdStrike—the firm that was investigating the hacking of the DNC and was the first to accuse Russia of hacking the DNC on behalf of Hillary, while being paid by Hillary Clinton—said, "We have no evidence that these alleged Russian hackers actually took anything from our servers." And that was buried throughout the entire Mueller probe. We only heard about that in May 2020, more than a year after Mueller shut down. So the latest records add to a pre-existing body of evidence that all of this was a scam.

And the last point—even if it were true, even if every Russiagate allegation were true—this whole thing would still be a joke, because there was a years-long meltdown over Russia allegedly hacking some emails, giving them to WikiLeaks, and also putting out some dumb memes and posts on social media that nobody saw. And this was seen as an attack on our democracy, sowing chaos, the equivalent of Pearl Harbor and 9/11. How could we possibly tolerate this? If you look at the memes that Russia put on social media, they were barely about the election. The emails were embarrassing to Hillary Clinton, but so what? Does anyone really think that that swung the election? And by the way, we do this all the time to foreign countries on an infinitely more massive scale. So even if these false allegations were true—which they're not—the whole thing would still be a farce.

**#M3**

The problem is that it's still being used as a reason to defend democracy from interference. For example, when they overturned the election results in Romania, they referred to Russiagate. So it's really enduring. But in terms of the hacking—because it is strange—I know these documents are very important, but as you mentioned, the CrowdStrike revelation came out a long time ago. Also, the National Security Agency technical director, Binney—didn't he also make comments that there had not actually been a hack, but simply a leak?

## **#M2**

Bill Binney is a former NSA official, and he said that the transfer speeds at which the files were extracted were too fast for a remote hack. They had to have been transferred by disk directly. Now, I've actually never bought into that argument, because what if the transfer speeds that were analyzed came after they were stolen by a hack? So to me, that wasn't a very dispositive argument. And I agree with Bill Binney that it wasn't a hack, but I mean, just based on all the available evidence, including CrowdStrike having to admit, yeah, we actually had no evidence of exfiltration. If you have no evidence of exfiltration, then how are you calling this a hack by Russia? And by the way, the malware that they attributed to Russia was apparently very, very common. This idea that these were Russian actors that stole the data was based on CrowdStrike, I think, making a lot of assumptions that weren't supported by the evidence.

## **#M3**

Some of this information was available a long time ago. Back in 2020, there was a briefing from the CIA director, John Brennan, who briefed President Obama at the time in July of 2016, in which there was a note recognizing that the CIA director told Obama that Hillary Clinton would probably try to distract the public from her private email server and also vilify Donald Trump by presenting the story of Trump working for Russian security services. And it kind of got a lot of traction after a while. But this was out five years ago. So, I know all these new documents are important, but how can you explain this? What is this reluctance to report on this? Because even now, with these new revelations coming out, the media interest is not really there, is it?

## **#M2**

Well, the media interest isn't there because the media was a part of this fraud. Media behavior during the height of Russiagate was just—it was ridiculous. They would write down whatever the dominant narrative was, whatever anonymous leaks would tell them. And there was such an effort to—there was like a drip feed of leaks: "Oh, this is the revelation showing there's a Trump conspiracy with Russia. This is it." And it was carefully done to basically keep this narrative going, to prolong the Mueller investigation for as long as possible. Because the people behind the Mueller investigation really just wanted an excuse to tie up Trump's presidency.

I think it was also to hobble his campaign promise of getting along with Russia; that was a part of it. For example, right before Trump met with Putin in July of 2018, just a few days before, Mueller came out with this indictment of alleged Russian intelligence officers for the hacking of the DNC. It was so obviously timed to undermine Trump's meeting with Putin. And, funnily enough, when Trump met with Putin, they gave a news conference together, and Trump said, "Yeah, Putin denied to me that he interfered in the election, and I found his denial very convincing." That caused an absolute meltdown among the media, who called Trump treasonous.

Anderson Cooper said this is the most shameful thing a president has ever said. John Brennan, the former director of the CIA, said that Trump's conduct was nothing short of treasonous. So he was accusing Trump of treason. And yeah, I mean, that anecdote you mentioned—we learned way after the fact that John Brennan became aware in July of 2016, before the Russia investigation even opened, that Russia had picked up word that Hillary Clinton was plotting to frame Trump as a Russian agent and to tie him to alleged hacking by Russia to basically gin up this fake scandal. And Brennan briefed Obama about this. But rather than taking this to Hillary Clinton, saying, "Hey, like, why are you doing this?"

They basically suppressed it and let the FBI go ahead with an investigation based on Hillary Clinton's scam. And Brennan, in September 2016, even sent a referral to the FBI to make them aware of this. James Comey, the head of the FBI, later said it didn't ring a bell. He claimed not to remember receiving a warning from the CIA that Hillary Clinton was plotting to frame Trump as a Russian agent. And the way Brennan's allies have told it, their concern was not that Hillary Clinton was framing Trump as a Russian agent—their concern was that Russia was aware of it. So, you know, basically they were upset that Hillary Clinton's conspiracy got out and that Russia was aware of it.

And in the new documents we've gotten, there's some more detail on how Russia became aware of it. There's a reference in one of the new reports that Russia obtained a campaign email. So if that's true—and I haven't seen it for myself, so I have to issue that qualifier, that caveat—if that's true, then Russia obtained a campaign email about a Hillary Clinton plot, which would be very significant. But regardless, there was a Hillary Clinton campaign plot. They commissioned the Steele dossier to advance that plot, and they also hired CrowdStrike to falsely, I think, accuse Russia of hacking the DNC.

### **#M3**

Well, there have been many opportunities to explore this further, though. Didn't WikiLeaks, under Assange, offer to provide some technical evidence that there hadn't been, I think, state actors behind the leaks or hacking of this information?

### **#M2**

Yep. In early 2017, after Trump took office, Julian Assange was in contact with some U.S. officials, including, I believe, Senator Mark Warner, who was the vice chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee. Assange offered to hand over technical evidence that would rule out, he said, the role of state actors, because he's long denied that Russia or any other state was his source. Apparently, that was overruled from the top. Then Trump tried to initiate another round of talks with Assange, and a former U.S. Congress member came and visited Assange personally.

And they said to Assange, basically, that if you give up your source, Trump will give you a pardon. Assange said no, because, you know, Assange is a very principled person and, you know, WikiLeaks doesn't give up their sources. So, personally, I'd love to know now from Assange if he's willing to speak publicly. Like, if he was willing to provide technical evidence that would rule out a state actor without giving up his source, why not do that now? Because, I mean, this allegation that Russia did it had not just domestic consequences, but serious geopolitical consequences. It made diplomacy with Russia impossible.

As you said in your opener, Trump was incentivized to go along with his hawkish aides who wanted to expand the proxy war that was then ongoing in Ukraine and the Donbass. He sent weapons to Ukraine that Obama wouldn't send. He tore up the INF Treaty. He did all these things, I think, at least in part, to push back on the narrative that he was doing Russia's bidding. So he was incentivized to go along with a neoconservative, aggressive policy towards Russia to disprove the Russiagate allegations. And the media and Democrats were incentivized to look away from Trump's actual hawkish policies because they were so beholden to this dumb conspiracy theory that he was doing Putin's bidding.

So it was the worst of all worlds. It was a complete disaster. I mean, look, one of the first controversies in Russiagate in July 2016 comes at the Republican convention when some delegates are discussing the text of the Republican platform. It's a meaningless process because the platform doesn't matter. But what became a big controversy was that some delegate had proposed strong language about arming Ukraine. Okay. And then somebody from Trump's camp said, no, that's a little bit too strong. Let's just say we're going to give Ukraine, quote, something like "appropriate assistance."

Okay. So we're still going to support arming Ukraine; we're just not going to go all the way with the maximalist version of the proposal. And somehow that became a controversy—that Trump was soft on Russia and was going to abandon Ukraine. And that's why Ukrainian officials—and this is interesting, especially for your audience, since you cover the war in Ukraine extensively—Ukraine was integral in this from the start. We learned years later that John Brennan actually used Ukrainian intelligence, which was by then a proxy of the U.S., to help advance the Russian hacking allegations.

Ukraine's intelligence actually gave John Brennan some of the so-called evidence that he used to make the attribution to Russia. And Ukrainian officials also leaked information about Paul Manafort,

Trump's campaign manager, because Manafort used to work for Yanukovich, the ousted president of Ukraine who was removed in the Maidan coup. They leaked that information while working in collusion with Democratic Party officials because they feared Trump coming into office and making good on his pledge to basically have better relations with Russia. So all of this, meanwhile, helped fuel the proxy war in Ukraine. And it's been a theme.

It was a theme throughout Trump's first term. It was after Russiagate failed, after Robert Mueller gave his disastrous testimony—when he had been presented as the hero who was going to lead Trump out of the White House in handcuffs and uncover the secret Trump-Putin plot. Then he gave testimony before Congress and he didn't even know the details of his own investigation. It was humiliating for everybody involved. So, one day later, that's when Trump has his phone call with Zelensky, where he talks to Zelensky about not just helping him look into corruption with the Bidens, but he also asks Zelensky for—and this is the part that got ignored in the subsequent media reporting.

He also asked Zelensky to help him look into the origins of Russiagate because Trump knew by that point that Russiagate had a Ukrainian tie. He asked Zelensky to help the U.S. Justice Department in doing that, at the same time as he was pausing some weapons to Ukraine. The fact that Trump made that request, plus the fact that he had paused weapons to Ukraine, led Democrats to try to rebound from their Russiagate humiliation by launching UkraineGate and impeaching Trump for freezing weapons to Ukraine while asking Ukraine for help to launch some investigations. So this was a disaster. At that time, Zelensky was trying to find a way to implement the Minsk Accords.

But what was the message from Russiagate and UkraineGate? Don't negotiate with Russia. Russia is an existential enemy trying to destroy our democracy. So let's just have a war. And that's why people like Lindsey Graham and John McCain, from the very start, used the Russiagate allegations to promote the Ukraine war. In January 2017, they went to Ukraine and said, "Russia has attacked our democracy. We're going to push back on them in Ukraine." So this was a disaster, from domestic U. S. politics to foreign policy, and we're still seeing the consequences today. Yeah, I think it's an excellent point how Russiagate undermined the Minsk Agreement, because otherwise what they did—people like Lindsey Graham and, uh, John... oh, what's his name, John, uh...

## **#M3**

John McCain. McCain, yes, sorry. They called for making 2017 the year of offense, saying that they would go back to Washington and make sure there would be more political will to go on the offense against Russia. This does not coincide or harmonize well with the goal of de-escalation and implementing an actual peace agreement. But it does beg the question: do you think there's going to be some accountability for this? Because too many were involved. Many genuinely believed that Trump was the new Hitler. Many believed the story that he was a Russian agent. So if there wasn't any evidence, it seemed they were willing to just push fake evidence.

But you have Clinton deeply involved, Obama very involved. You have top officials from the intelligence community involved—Brennan, Clapper, Comey. And so how likely is it that these people will be held accountable? Especially as you said, the media is also complicit in this. They look the other way. And whenever there was evidence which went against it, they were not just cherry-picking, but being, I would say, very dishonest in their reporting. And it does appear most of them behaved as activists, believing that they were effectively fighting the good fight, which meant that some journalistic principles had to be put aside.

## **#M2**

The media's behavior was just so shameful because, you know, at least with Iraq WMDs, Saddam Hussein was not a very good guy and had committed a lot of atrocities. So I understand why some people, at least initially, believed in all the Iraq war propaganda. Russiagate was a conspiracy theory. And media elites love to make fun of conspiracy theories, love to make fun of malleable voters who are low-informed and being brainwashed by disinformation. Russiagate was massive disinformation. And it was basically an elitist protection racket. Hillary Clinton could blame Russia, not her own failures. The media could blame Russia, not their own—the fact that they relentlessly promoted Trump and made a lot of money off of him.

And also, all these powerful actors could avoid scrutiny of the problems with U.S. society—all the dysfunctions that Trump represents and exploited by falsely portraying himself as a working-class champion. So blaming Russia was the perfect boogeyman for all these elite actors, from the media to Congress to the national security state, and it was also a way to stigmatize Trump's call for better relations with Russia. On the campaign trail, his criticism of regime change wars—saying all this was the product of Russia—was a good way to stigmatize it. Even if Trump wasn't sincere in his critique (I don't think he was, because his policies have been pretty hawkish), he at least recognized that people out there were tired of funding all these horrible wars and tired of sacrificing their own communities for them.

And he tapped into that. So saying all this was the product of Russia, Russian propaganda, was a great way to undermine whatever, you know, peaceful sensibilities Trump may have had. And also, more importantly, to stigmatize it—to make it, you know, just seem to be the product of Moscow, not of genuine populist discontent. So in terms of accountability, when you have a privileged protection racket, it's too big to fail. It's like we're basically asking the mafia to investigate itself—a racket to investigate itself. It's not going to happen. But look, if they want to go after people, there's an obvious—I mean, just in terms of practical criminal steps—John Brennan lied to Congress. He was asked in congressional testimony, did the Steele dossier at all factor into the intelligence community assessment? John Brennan said, no, it did not.

Well, now we know—we've known for a while now, but the new documents confirm it—that John Brennan pushed to have the Steele dossier included in the intelligence community assessment. It was even referenced in the body of the text. A summary of it was also added as an annex. So John



Brennan, I think, committed perjury there. The people behind CrowdStrike, involved in the DNC hacking, I've previously written about how they made false statements to Congress. Because one of the things about CrowdStrike is that when the FBI came to them and said, "Hey, can we look at the servers ourselves?" CrowdStrike said no.

And then in congressional testimony, you have some people involved in denying that they denied FBI access, when it's documented now. I've written about this previously. So there are angles there where a criminal inquiry could, I think, lead to some charges—certainly more robust than the charges that Mueller brought. Mueller brought the most ridiculous charges against low-level Trump people, people like George Papadopoulos—perjury charges and others. And basically, if you read the indictments, there was absolutely nothing there. They just needed material to justify their baseless investigation. And they also needed material to feed the media with disingenuous court filings that could play into the Russia conspiracy narrative.

So that's what they used that for. So certainly there's a lot more there than Mueller ever had for anything, and so that could be an area of accountability. Is Barack Obama, a former president, going to face accountability? No, that's just not how it works. Even John Brennan—look, he's the former director of the CIA. Trying to hold the former CIA director accountable, when a CIA director knows a lot of secrets and can hurt a lot of powerful people, I strongly doubt it. I just don't think you'd go after people that powerful in Washington. I'd love to be surprised. But certainly, practically, if you want something to go after Brennan for, you can look at his testimony before Congress and compare it to the available records.

## **#M3**

Yeah, well, it's a bit surprising Trump hasn't done anything, though. He's been back in power now for six months. He marketed himself as the guy who would drain the swamp, go after the deep state, especially after they went after him. And at this point in time, now that the Epstein case is causing a nightmare for him, I would think he would want to distract the public.

## **#M2**

It seems like it would be a good reason. That's what he's doing. I mean, I don't think the timing is coincidental. Trump obviously wants people to not talk about Epstein. Personally, I think the Epstein thing is overblown. I don't think there's evidence at this point to show that Epstein was a Mossad intelligence agent or whatever, blackmailing people. But I do think Trump is an admitted sexual predator, and he was hanging out with a sexual predator, Epstein. I'm sure there's something embarrassing for him that he wants to distract from. So I do think these Russiagate disclosures are being used for that. But that doesn't negate the fact that there is important information in these documents. We are learning more about a really consequential and massive fraud that a lot of powerful people were implicated in, and I think it's important.

And look, there was talk. There was an effort in his first term to release these documents. Kash Patel, who was Trump's chief of staff at the Department of Defense, tried to release some of this stuff, but he was blocked. He was blocked by more powerful people because Trump appointed a lot of standard people—neoconservative hawks, people like Mike Pompeo, Gina Haspel, Mark Esper, William Barr—and all of them did not want this to be released because ultimately it's a club. And yes, even though Russiagate was partisan and was used against Trump, the fact that it came from the CIA and the FBI meant these people did not want to embarrass the FBI and the CIA on top of what was already known. And so they blocked the release of a lot of the stuff that we're getting now. And whatever the motive is now for releasing it, I welcome it. It's important to have sunlight on this massive scam.

### **#M3**

Yeah, no, I think transparency is definitely required. And again, you made the point that the people calling everything a conspiracy theory—this was really the big one, and also a very ridiculous conspiracy theory as well. But the conspiracy theorists became obsessed with policing speech as Russia was allegedly involved in these crazy interference missions. So a lot of the encroachments now, or infringements on free speech, really come also from Russiagate. This is from 2016, when all the disinformation, Russian propaganda—all these little keywords, very loaded—they don't have to be justified or explained. But if you throw them out, you can censor people, you can have them canceled, you can now apparently overturn elections, and you don't really need any evidence anymore, because anyone who opposes it will be met with suspicion. Why are you not going against the Russian propaganda?

### **#M2**

And this is something that was obvious at the time was going to happen. Max Blumenthal, my colleague at The Grayzone, was warning about this from the start. He was telling liberals, "You think this is going to stop Trump? First of all, it won't. Second of all, this McCarthyism will be used against the left, as it always is," and it certainly was. And it's only grown ever since. So this is what happens when you fuel reactionary scams, pro-militarist scams—which is what this was. You're going to fuel reactionary militarism, and that's exactly what Russiagate has done.

### **#M3**

Well, you have championed this cause for almost a decade now—that Russiagate was fake. So I'm very happy, and you deserve this victory lap, as everything you have said is true. And at least any smears that have come against you—you've come out vindicated here. So that's at least something positive from this.

### **#M2**

Massive mess. It's really the easiest story I've ever worked on in my life because it was such a massive scam. It was such a fraud. There was nothing there from the start. And I stand out only because I didn't buy into it. And it's just—it's strange in that respect. You know, the best-faith reading of some people who I work with in the media was that they were just so afraid of Trump, they thought he was such a repellent figure that they were willing to believe anything. But look, when you're in journalism, you don't follow your feelings, you don't follow your political beliefs or partisan leanings—you follow the facts. And unfortunately, that got lost in Russiagate.

### **#M3**

It opened Pandora's box of other nonsense, because after this you had the Biden laptop, and this was also—this, you know, was also obvious. Not the same people, yeah, yeah. Again, this is also fraud, but you can get away with it. You had the accusations that the Russians had put bounties on the heads of American soldiers in Afghanistan. It didn't have to be proved. It also didn't make any sense, as there would certainly be some evidence, given America's presence in Afghanistan.

But all of this, people could—I remember—people could make, leading officials could make statements like, "Trump now, if he's not in collusion with Russia, he has to go after and start killing Russian generals." I mean, this is the way people spoke. It was all nonsense. And of course, it takes us to the Ukraine war. The amount of lies that have been told is just astonishing. But really, from 2016, there has been no accountability at all. You can say anything you want about Russia, and either you sign up to it and continue to escalate against our own interests, or you're met with this suspicion as well. So, Aaron Maté, thank you so much for sharing your thoughts on this. I appreciate it.

### **#M2**

Thanks, Glenn.