Speaker 1:	<u>00:04</u>	Welcome to the Bill Walton show, featuring conversations with leaders, entrepreneurs, artists and thinkers, fresh perspectives on money, culture, politics, and human flourishing. Interesting people. Interesting things.
Bill Walton:	<u>00:24</u>	Welcome to the Bill Walton show. As we open the show today, we've just been through the travesty of a Democrat controlled House of Representatives impeaching president Donald Trump on a strictly party line vote. In other words, and once again, the Democrats are running rough shod over the Constitution. What on earth is this about? This goes way beyond mere Democrat versus Republican. We need to dig deeper into the root causes, connect the dots, pull the red thread.
Bill Walton:	<u>00:59</u>	Joining me to continue the conversation we started a few weeks ago is Diana West, author of The Red Thread: a Search for the Ideological Drivers Inside the Anti-Trump Conspiracy and also author of American Betrayal: The Secret Assault on Our Nation's Character.
Bill Walton:	<u>01:17</u>	Also returning is Frank Gaffney, founder of the Center for Security Policy and Vice Chairman of the Committee for the Present Danger, China. Diana, frank, welcome. We're really talking about a sort of big lie here. The big lie.
Diana West:	01:33	The big lie, which goes back a long way. We can actually date it to the 1930s. This is Robert Conquest, the greatest historian, and said the first big lie was the Ukraine Terror Famine. What could be more relevant today given the Ukrainian story?
Diana West:	<u>01:50</u>	And what he meant by that was a lie put over by a government using mass media. So, in other words, a big lie is only as old as mass media. And we can go back to the 1930s and see that in terms of national radio hookups and number of newspapers and so on. It looked different from our 24/7 coverage, but blanket coverage, nonetheless.
Diana West:	02:13	The point of it is to manipulate the people. And what was trying to be done at that time was to tell people that nothing was wrong in the Soviet Union, that Stalin was not starving millions of people to death. His political enemies, in his efforts to collectivize, take over farming in the Ukraine, and obliterate his political enemies.
Diana West:	02:32	So, this was the big lie, the first big lie, and many governments accepted it including our own because on the heels of that big lie, Franklin Roosevelt recognized the Soviet Union, and this
TBWS74 2019	12 19 West Gaffney	y (Completed 01/06/20) Page 1 of 29

Page 1 of 29

		normalized relations with this abnormal regime. So, big lies are very powerful, and they are tools of a state.
Bill Walton:	02:52	Well, see the thing, I want to Frank to weigh in, but the thing that makes us different, though, is that we've got this big lie, and the mainstream media is totally on board with it. They're promoting it, Democrat party's promoting it, but because of the internet and cable and the other radio talk shows, we know the big lie is being told in real time. So, we've got this orchestration going on. At the same time, we know it's not true.
Frank Gaffney:	03:24	One of the other perpetrators of the big lie, in fact, I think the man who coined the term was actually Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf, and one of the important facets of this, which Diana's sort of touched on here, is the endless repetition of it is what normalizes the lie.
Frank Gaffney:	03:45	It may be so outlandish that people wouldn't believe it, but when it's constantly reprised, as has been, for example, the idea that Donald Trump colluded with the Russians and then subsequently with Ukrainians to try to somehow influence our elections and the case of the Russians in 2016 and the case of Ukraine, for which he's now been impeached, the 2020 election, and the reality is, no matter how often you repeat these lies, no matter who authoritatively is repeating them, whether it's the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, whether it's the director of national intelligence, whether it's the Speaker of the House or the Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, it doesn't alter the fact that it is still a lie.
Bill Walton:	<u>04:41</u>	Well, except we have 63 million of us who do not believe it, but there's a timeline involved.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>04:45</u>	Probably more, actually, at this point.
Bill Walton:	04:47	At this point, it could be a landslide. We get lucky, but there's a timeline here. There's a narrative that starts about the time the Democrats became aware the Democratic National Committee servers got hacked or broken into, and that launched a whole series of coverups and actions and things like that. You've done a lot of work on this. How did the all this get started?
Diana West:	05:13	This is such an important part of the story that has been lost in the big lie that Russia interfered in the 2016 election. The genesis of that big lie is that Russia hacked the DNC to help Donald Trump into the White House. The DNC hack

Frank Gaffney:	<u>05:33</u>	That's the Democratic National Committee.
Diana West:	05:34	The Democratic National Committee, yes. This was when we saw the emails come out of the Democratic National Committee that showed that Hillary Clinton and the Democratic National Committee had colluded themselves, colluded in the real sense of the word to rig the primaries against Bernie Sanders.
Bill Walton:	05:54	But we only Did we know this at the time, or was after the fact when Julian Assange. Okay.
Diana West:	05:59	This came out at the time of the DNC convention in July of 2016, which is where we start seeing this notion that Russia was working for Trump. This is how the DNC turned it. At that same point, this is late July, 2016, what we now know as the big FBI counter-intelligence investigation into the Trump campaign begins July 31st.
Diana West:	<u>06:23</u>	This is Crossfire Hurricane, July 31st, 2016. The way all of our investigations have proceeded, certainly in the last year or so, has been starting on July 31st, 2016 with Crossfire Hurricane. And indeed, the criticisms of the FBI, which we recently see in the FISA abuse report by the Inspector General, Michael Horowitz actually begins with Crossfire Hurricane and takes as a given that Russia hacked the DNC. Now, what I would like to take us through a little bit of
Bill Walton:	06:59	Well, they're people involved here, because I think it's easier, because I've been hearing this for a couple of years now, and it's not my specialty, so I kind of glaze over this. There's Crossfire. There's this there But there's a cast of characters here. Debbie Wassermann Schultz was president, was Chairman of the DNC.
Diana West:	<u>07:17</u>	She was?
Frank Gaffney:	<u>07:17</u>	Congresswoman.
Bill Walton:	07:21	And they had this meeting, this emergency meeting when the hack happened, and somebody named Michael Sussman, from Perkins Coie, was really the leading actor in that, because he'd spent 12 years at DOJ doing work on cyber crimes and stuff like that. And then, he was the one who took this to the FBI.
Diana West:	07:40	Yes. Well, what's interesting is there is this event, I will not call it a hack, because it has not been proven to have been a hack.

Bill Walton:	07:46	We don't know what it was.
Diana West:	07:46	There was an event at the DNC whereby they realized they lost a lot of inside information, their emails, in the spring
Frank Gaffney:	<u>07:55</u>	Very, very damaging.
Diana West:	07:56	Very damaging, embarrassing, showing corruption, et cetera. This would have been, according to what we know, we seem to think it's in April of 2016. Late April, they have an emergency meeting among DNC principals, plus this lawyer from Perkins Coie, Michael Sussman. This is where they first start trying to figure out how do we shut this down, who did this, et cetera.
Diana West:	08:19	These are the questions that were reported on, not, however, who did this. This is not what he wrote to his principles. He did not ask who did this, which suggests they almost may have known. So, that aside, we move forward a little bit, and we, by the time this is prepared for the people, the readers public, it's the Washington Post saying that Russia hacked the DNC. This is June, 2016, and you start seeing take shape, this, I will say, so far unproven narrative that Russia broke into the DNC server.
Bill Walton:	08:57	So, let us put ourselves in the inner sanctum. So, your Sussman, your Wassermann, all these other people, we have a terrible problem here, because it's going to be out there that we steered the election to Hillary.
Diana West:	09:07	Yes, but the nomination
Bill Walton:	<u>09:10</u>	We need a cover story, so what's a better cover?
Frank Gaffney:	<u>09:13</u>	Or a distraction.
Bill Walton:	09:14	Distraction?
Frank Gaffney:	<u>09:15</u>	As well as a cover story. Ideally, here.
Bill Walton:	09:17	So, let's say, let's hold those picks on me. Russia.
Frank Gaffney:	09:22	Let's see if we can get people thinking that not only is Russia involved, but the Donald Trump is involved with Russia. Look over there, folks.
Diana West:	09:33	Look over there, folks.

Frank Gaffney:	<u>09:33</u>	Not at this problem, and more to the point, and what Diana is just getting to, is the extent to which this same lawyer, Michael Sussman, does pull in the FBI and tells them, according to the New York Times, that you know Russia is responsible for this breach, and we need to get that out, and within days, the Washington Post is trotting it out.
Diana West:	<u>10:01</u>	The Washington Post is trotting it out, but also know at the same time, there is a genuine conspiracy, if you will, to layer in this same narrative about Trump being a Russian puppet that is coming out of the very famous Fusion GPS shop with the Steele dossier starting to be written in this period and the same notion of the very famous Carter Page. The FBI is starting to look at Carter Page in this same timeframe. Carter Page, of course, being the American citizen who was the subject of the FISA application to spy on the Trump campaign, that was used to spy on the Trump campaign.
Bill Walton:	10:42	You're watching the Bill Walton show. I'm here with Diana West and Frank Gaffney, and we're talking about the events that have led up to the recent impeachment in the House of Representative of President Donald Trump. Continue.
Diana West:	<u>10:56</u>	This is sort of like the real concocted, controlled narrative was being formed with Fusion GPS and Carter Page in the same spring that this unexpected event happens to the DNC.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>11:10</u>	In the midst of all of this, there's another meeting that takes place at the Trump Tower. You need to explain.
Diana West:	<u>11:18</u>	Absolutely.
Bill Walton:	11:18	Was that the Trump Tower meeting with Donald Trump, jr, Paul Manafort, and four so-called Russians?
Frank Gaffney:	11:24	And with whom did they meet before they met at the Trump tower?
Diana West:	<u>11:29</u>	Yes. It's all of these things.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>11:31</u>	The plot thickens.
Diana West:	11:32	The plot is very thick, and the same players do keep appearing, and so yes, it is a good idea to look at it as characters or a cast. In the same June, see, this is why I mentioned the July 31st date as almost being past the start point of the entire conspiratorial activity, July 31st everything's done in terms of the intelligence of Completed, 01/06/20)
TBWS74 2019_12_19 West Gaffney (Completed 01/06/20) Page 5 of 29		

		community set up. And so, if you're only looking at July 31st forward, you're missing all of this really juicy stuff.
Bill Walton:	12:02	And so, why we care about the so called old news is that this leads up to what the FBI has been about through this whole process and
Diana West:	<u>12:10</u>	And the CIA. And the intelligence community.
Bill Walton:	12:14	So, the FBI was involved in this, in the story?
Diana West:	12:18	Yes.
Bill Walton:	12:19	From summer of 2016 before the election.
Diana West:	12:23	Well, they're starting to look at Carter Page in the spring, and then by the time we get up to, see, and Fusion GPS has hired this former British intelligence officer, Christopher Steele, to start pulling the dossier together. And then, we see the Trump tower meeting.
Bill Walton:	12:38	And who had hired fusion GPS? Was that Who owned?
Diana West:	12:41	Well, we don't. The American people finally learned, toward the end of 2017, that the Hillary Clinton campaign, and again, the DNC, working through the law firm, Perkins Coie, hired Fusion GPS to put this dossier together, that would then, just as a good way to think of it, would be laundered into the American government coming from all the different departments and agencies, through State, through Department of Justice. In fact, Michael Sussman, this lawyer, important lawyer here, he would be one of the people who brought this information to the counsel, the General Counsel of the FBI, James Baker, late in 2016. So, you have this dirt, this opposition research, being laundered by senior officials at the Justice Department into the FBI, from the State Department into the FBI, from all over official Washington, attempting to essentially elevate opposition research to a point where it could be used to get surveillance.
Frank Gaffney:	13:43	The reason we believe this would be fertile ground is this is after eight years as Obama's president. At this point, he thoroughly staffed all these departments with Obama and Hillary partisans.
Diana West:	<u>13:56</u>	It's multigenerational. But certainly,

Bill Walton:	<u>13:59</u>	We go all the way back to the '30s.
Diana West:	<u>14:00</u>	It's been a long time coming. These people been replicating themselves for generations, but certainly the Obama Administration.
Bill Walton:	<u>14:06</u>	Replicating. You make them sound like pod people.
Diana West:	<u>14:10</u>	Yes, please, yes.
Frank Gaffney:	14:11	I heard just the other day, the number of senior executive service personnel that the Obama team put in was treble the previous number. So, you're right, Bill, that there was an insemination of large numbers of partisans into the permanent bureaucracy, which helps explain some of what's been going on of late. But I want to come back, though, Diana, because it's so important to the story, to the Trump tower meeting, and you've mentioned Fusion GPS several times.
Diana West:	<u>14:44</u>	Glenn Simpson.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>14:45</u>	But wasn't Fusion GPS, Glenn Simpson, party to the pre-meeting going into Trump Tower?
Diana West:	<u>14:52</u>	Absolutely.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>14:52</u>	Talk about that, and afterwards, too.
Diana West:	<u>14:53</u>	And afterwards, too.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>14:56</u>	So, what does that suggest in terms of trade craft here?
Diana West:	<u>15:01</u>	There's a lot of trade craft here. If you were looking at this as an espionage operation, an espionage, counterintelligence officer would tell you this is a very classic thing, whereby the one of the principle Russians to go to the Trump Tower meeting, this lady we later found out was actually a Russian government informant, essentially working for their equivalent of the justice department. The Natalia Veselnitskaya is her name. She meets with Glenn Simpson before the Trump Tower meeting, and she meets with him after the Trump Tower meeting. So, this is classic trade craft in terms of a hinge and open and door, an open and shutting of an operation, to the brief and then the debrief. Be that as it may, there are all kinds of connections that have never come out about the principals at this meeting.

Bill Walton:	<u>15:54</u>	Now, is there a man behind the curtain?
Frank Gaffney:	<u>15:56</u>	You want to hear continue?
Bill Walton:	<u>15:57</u>	I do want to keep hearing, but I keep going back to who
Diana West:	<u>15:59</u>	The man behind the curtain here, we do not know command and control. We still have these players that need to be linked up, but consider, for example, we know that this is a Hillary Clinton
Frank Gaffney:	<u>16:09</u>	We need a thorough FBI investigation.
Diana West:	<u>16:11</u>	Yes, we need an honest one, because we knew this was supposed to be this moment where Trump, the Trump campaign was supposed to be receiving "dirt," quote unquote on Hillary Clinton. Now think about that in terms of
Frank Gaffney:	<u>16:25</u>	From Russia personnel.
Diana West:	<u>16:26</u>	From Russia.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>16:27</u>	With ties to the Kremlin.
Diana West:	<u>16:28</u>	Exactly, and think about how we are just getting another iteration of this in the impeachment, supposedly dirt on political opposition from the Ukrainian government, so we see the same thing being tried
Frank Gaffney:	<u>16:40</u>	Which, it turns out, involves American personnel and Ukrainians who had ties to the Clinton campaign.
Diana West:	<u>16:47</u>	Exactly. It's the same
Frank Gaffney:	<u>16:49</u>	And/or the administration of Barack Obama.
Diana West:	<u>16:50</u>	It's another try. Yes, it's another iteration.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>16:54</u>	It's 2.0, basically.
Diana West:	<u>16:54</u>	But in the Trump tower meeting
Bill Walton:	<u>16:55</u>	If it is 2.0.
Diana West:	<u>16:56</u>	It's just another word, another whack at it. In my view, in that meeting, you had four Russians and a "British music promoter,"

		dual citizenship. They all were hostile to Donald Trump. Some of them admitted in their interviews that they actually voted for Hillary Clinton, and they also, three of them have had connections to Russian government intelligence entities.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>17:28</u>	So, I'm thinking about the movie scene. We have Donald Trump, no, we have
Bill Walton:	<u>17:34</u>	Junior.
Diana West:	<u>17:35</u>	Don jr.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>17:37</u>	We have Paul Manafort, we have four Russians, and we have a music promoter, and they're all in the room
Diana West:	<u>17:45</u>	And they all work for a Russian oligarch who's close to Putin, and also Robert de Niro, business partners with Robert de Niro, who, as you know, is one of Trump's most
Bill Walton:	<u>17:54</u>	Great fan of Donald Trump.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>17:55</u>	Who sucks.
Diana West:	17:56	One of the most vile critics, yes, but also friends with Obama. I mean, this, the connections here are so braided. It's like they're all walking around linked, and no one notices. They're all got their arms linked. The
Frank Gaffney:	18:11	All we're noticing, because that's what we've been told to focus on is this is proof positive that the Trump campaign was colluding with the Russians for the purpose of obtaining information that would help them win the election.
Bill Walton:	<u>18:27</u>	What do yo mean? [crosstalk 00:18:28]
Diana West:	<u>18:27</u>	There's supposed to be But consider that's the shiny object
Frank Gaffney:	<u>18:35</u>	Because it sets the narrative of what Diana's saying is
Diana West:	<u>18:38</u>	It's a set up. It's a hoax.
Frank Gaffney:	18:38	You look at the personnel, you look at their relationships, and it sure looks as though this was engineered to compromise the Trump campaign.

quote unquote, who, three of whom, I did a very big analysis on them, three of the Russians are actually American. They have

Diana West:	18:47	Now, there's another piece of it on Trump Tower. Just one more, one more, which was that one of the Russians was a long time business partners with a man named Edward Lieberman, an American lawyer whose wife was Deputy Chief of Staff for Bill Clinton in the White House and also worked for Joseph Biden as Press Secretary, early in her career, she's deceased now, and further, I mean, this is, it's just such an amazing story.
Diana West:	19:13	Edward Lieberman is very close to Madeline Albright, who, at this same period, over the summer, was one of the people at the Cambridge conference where Carter Page, again, this is our real bright shiny object that we need to track here, Carter Page was being encouraged by Madeline Albright to speak out, in other words, to say something, as an audience member, almost as if to make attention that if someone affiliated with the Trump campaign was involved in this particular event, the connections here between Albright, Clinton, Russia, are right there before us, and yet we are supposed to interpret it as Russians helping Trump, when the whole room was this hostile to Trump as the Democratic House.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>20:01</u>	Could I just make one other point?
Bill Walton:	<u>20:03</u>	You're here to make as many points
Frank Gaffney:	20:06	It needs to be said, someplace in this mix that the evidence of Hillary Clinton's involvement with Putin and the Russians on a massive scale, talked about this many times. The Uranium One caper is, of course, the most prominent of these stories, where she and her Clinton Foundation made immense amounts of money by selling off to the Russians, through the processes that she helped manage in the government, an enormous amount of our uranium, but also A word from our sponsor.
Bill Walton:	20:46	You're the bill Walton show. I'm here with Frank Gaffney and Diana West, and we're digging into the sorted roots of all the events that led up to the recent impeachment in the House of Donald Trump.
Frank Gaffney:	20:57	And the second of these capers, which hasn't gotten nearly as much attention, but to my way of thinking is even more odious, is something called Skolkovo, which was a project by which Hillary Clinton directed funds to the Clinton Foundation from companies that she was making it permissible to sell high technology to Vladimir Putin, because he wanted his own Silicon Valley. And some of that technology was clearly dual use,

		including hypersonic missile technology, which is now being aimed at us by the Russians.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>21:38</u>	So, the narrative that we have been fed, that Donald Trump was the candidate that the Russians favored is, I believe, on the face of it, absurd. When they owned Hillary Clinton, they had her compromised six ways from Sunday, and they knew that they could do business with her, why on earth would they prefer Donald Trump? And yet, that story, which tucks important with into the one Diana's telling here about the DNC, and the penetration, and so on, is the hardly ever mentioned, let alone made the centerpiece of the kind of FBI investigation.
Diana West:	<u>22:22</u>	That should have been going on, right.
Bill Walton:	22:24	Well, coming back to your timeline, then, this is all happened, and then at some point, I guess on July 5th, 2016, Comey comes out and exonerates Hillary Clinton, saying no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case, and he does that. Now,
Frank Gaffney:	<u>22:44</u>	Nothing to see here, folks.
Bill Walton:	22:45	What's his motivation, now that we know Let's fast forward to worry at what we know about him now. What was his motivation then, do you think?
Diana West:	<u>22:51</u>	He wants Hillary Clinton to win the election.
Bill Walton:	<u>22:53</u>	Okay.
Diana West:	<u>22:53</u>	Clearly.
Bill Walton:	<u>22:54</u>	Because a lot of people thought it hurt Hillary.
Diana West:	<u>22:56</u>	Well, it was a way to make that particular thing
Frank Gaffney:	22:59	It was the least hurtful thing.
Diana West:	23:00	Of many hurtful things.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>23:01</u>	Under the circumstance.
Diana West:	23:02	Yeah, she's been indicted, yeah.
Frank Gaffney:	23:02	She was so clearly violating the law with her emails.

Bill Walton:	23:08	Then shortly thereafter, Seth Rich, who was the DNC Voter Expansion Data Director, was murdered.
Diana West:	23:14	Yes, July 10. Well, this is another piece of the story that no one wants to investigate. Now, it is a theoretical piece of it, but the circumstantial evidence is quite overwhelming that he is a very strong candidate for having been the DNC official who literally downloaded these emails and pass them onto WikiLeaks.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>23:38</u>	From inside.
Bill Walton:	23:38	Now, this is the part I'm unclear about. It was hacked, but when did the email.
Diana West:	23:43	No, no, don't use the word hack? We don't know for sure. Hack would it be an attack from the outside.
Bill Walton:	<u>23:47</u>	Okay, so how did?
Frank Gaffney:	<u>23:49</u>	Tell them about Bill.
Bill Walton:	23:50	When do we think Julian Assange acquired these?
Diana West:	23:54	Well, he released them in about the third week of July, so sometime before the third week of July, WikiLeaks comes into possession [crosstalk 00:24:01] of the DNC emails.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>24:05</u>	This was after the national convention.
Diana West:	<u>24:06</u>	Yes, they are released, the DNC emails are released after the death of Seth Rich. That's very common, in terms of WikiLeaks doesn't just release things without going through things. They have a 100% percent authenticity rate. They have never had to retract or in any way correct anything they've ever released. Everything is authentic, which is way better than
Bill Walton:	<u>24:27</u>	Look at the people who paid the price for wandering into this world, and Seth Rich definitely
Diana West:	<u>24:32</u>	Seth Rich, Julian Assange.
Bill Walton:	<u>24:33</u>	But Julian, Assange, I have no quite what to think about him. He comes across as a hero, here.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>24:38</u>	He's now languishing in prison.

Diana West:	<u>24:40</u>	Yes, he is a hero, and he is languishing in prison for all of this time and essentially being destroyed by the solitary confinement and other, the UN repertoire on torture calls it torture, that Julian Assange been put through in his various incarcerations, including now at Bellmarsh, which is a maximum security prison with lots of terrorists and so on.
Diana West:	<u>25:05</u>	Right now the United States is trying to extradite him to essentially prosecute him for journalism, a publisher who published this information, all of it true. This is one of these parts of the story that also is lost, but for our purposes here, it is important to understand that whatever you think of Julian Assange, or whatever comes to be known about Julian Assange, he is one of the primary witnesses to the events of 2016 who has never been brought before any committee or interviewed, even, far away in London, by video, by the House Committee, either under Devin Nunez or Adam Schiff, by the Mueller Committee, by any investigative body to find out how he came into possession of these emails.
Bill Walton:	<u>25:55</u>	Well, the reason we want to get into this, maybe ancient history, it's not, just three years ago, but it bears on intelligence community [crosstalk 00:26:02].
Diana West:	<u>26:02</u>	Exactly.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>26:03</u>	It absolutely does.
Bill Walton:	<u>26:04</u>	You've written that Seymour Hersh said that the Trump/Russia disinformation campaign was started by Brennan.
Diana West:	<u>26:13</u>	Brennan. That was his take on it, and he has very good sources.
Bill Walton:	<u>26:16</u>	Where was Brennan at the time?
Diana West:		
	<u>26:17</u>	CIA Director.
Bill Walton:	26:17 26:18	CIA Director.  He was in the CIA when he started this Trump
Bill Walton: Diana West:		
	26:18	He was in the CIA when he started this Trump

CIA, he was Barack Obama's, national, excuse me, Homeland Security Advisor. So, he was very close to the president, and he was an obvious candidate to run an operation like this that was aimed at making Donald Trump a Russian dupe, making him a co-conspirator with the Russians and influencing our election, and I want to double back to this, because it's so important. What we have heard is that the information that was leaked from the DNC was actually obtained not from an outside source that hacked into the server, because according to William Binney, an old NSA hand, the download times were sufficiently short that it made much more sense that it was simply downloaded by a thumb drive from inside the DNC itself.

Bill Walton:	<u>27:45</u>	Okay, this is why you're objecting to me use It wasn't hacked.
		It was just download it.

Diana West:	27:47	Right, that's what

Frank Gainley. 27.47 It was downloaded	Frank Gaffne	ey: 27:4	7 It was	downloaded
--	--------------	----------	----------	------------

Bill Walton:	27:49	That's what the theory is, okay.
Dili vvaitori.	27.73	THAT'S WHAT THE THEOLY IS, ORAY.

Diana West: 27	::50 Tha	ıt's William Bill	y and a num	nber of intell	igent professionals
----------------	----------	-------------------	-------------	----------------	---------------------

Frank Gaffney:	27.51	An inside job.
Frank Gattnev:	27:51	An inside iop.

Diana West:	27:52	have determined doing experiments.
Diana West	77.57	nave determined doing experiments

Bill Walton:	27:53	So. do we think Seth Rich
DIII Walloll.	27.55	30. do we tillik setli kitil

Frank Gaffnev:	27:56	Maybe it was Seth Rich, maybe it was somebody else.
rialik Gallilev.	27.30	iviavue it was setti kicii. Hiavue it was sufficuouv eise.

Diana West:	27:56	Maybe it was Seth, but Julian Assange was interviewed in August, by Dutch TV, and you can find the interview very easily online still, and he all but names Seth Rich as the source. He discusses the murder of this young man in Washington, Seth Rich, and says that WikiLeaks has put forward a \$20,000 reward for information leading to the capture of his assassins, or murderers, and the anchor who's interviewing him, the Dutch
		anchor says, "Wait a minute, are you saying that that Seth Rich

was your source?"

Diana West: 28:31 And Juliana Assange says, "We don't, WikiLeaks does not reveal the names of our sources."

Diana West:	28:36	But he keeps talking about him and how difficult it is for sources tohow dangerous it is for sources. Plus
Bill Walton:	28:43	So, we had the CIA engaged in this. We had the FBI engaged. In late July
Diana West:	28:48	Yes.
Bill Walton:	28:49	They opened their investigation they called Crossfire Hurricane, and so we've got
Frank Gaffney:	28:55	Before we go there, can I just make one other point, at the risk of introducing yet another conspiracy.
Bill Walton:	28:59	Well, I'm trying to get a line on this thing.
Diana West:	<u>29:02</u>	There's so many layers leading up to it.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>29:05</u>	We want to go to Crossfire next, but before we do, there's another candidate for the inside job, and that is an outfit known informally as the Awan brothers, Pakistani nationals, who, at the time, were working for, among others, Debbie Wassermann Schultz, providing IT services to about 40 members of Congress and using, among other things, servers in Pakistan to handle some of the information they were obtaining from congressional sources. Bill, this is worthy of a whole 'nother show by itself, because it's another of these stories.
Bill Walton:	<u>29:46</u>	And Pakistan's such a great ally of the United State.
Diana West:	<u>29:50</u>	Right, it's been essentially smothered, but the main
Frank Gaffney:	<u>29:51</u>	But they had the passwords for Debbie Wassermann Schultz's computers. People at the DNC, when they wanted to get at her emails, they had to go to Imran Awan to get the passwords, which means we've got another possible explanation for how this was an inside job, not Russian job.
Bill Walton:	30:12	But I want to develop the storyline in terms of who was Speaking broadly, we're talking about things that should be investigated by the intelligence community, and
Frank Gaffney:	<u>30:25</u>	Specifically, by the FBI.
Bill Walton:	30:26	the intelligence community was not merely, not nearly, not even investigating, they were involved in it.

Diana West:	30:32	They were suppressing it.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>30:32</u>	Part of the problem
Bill Walton:	<u>30:33</u>	They were suppressing it, so that's the thesis that we
Diana West:	<u>30:35</u>	That becomes the thesis.
Bill Walton:	30:36	And that becomes relevant to what's happening now with Ukraine, because Trump tried to go outside
Diana West:	<u>30:41</u>	Outside.
Bill Walton:	30:42	of the intelligence to find out what really happened in Ukraine.
Diana West:	30:44	And the Justice Department, and the See, the thing is here, I think you hit on something in the sense that you look at who is essentially suppressing investigations into these possible explanations for the reveal of the DNC. And, of course, later, John Podesta's emails, also, which start dropping from through WikiLeaks in October.
Bill Walton:	<u>31:07</u>	John Podesta's were about steering the election to Hillary and away from Bernie.
Diana West:	31:10	It was about all kinds of things.
Bill Walton:	<u>31:12</u>	For everything, okay.
Diana West:	31:12	Yeah, it was very grossly embarrassing, very helpful.
Frank Gaffney:	31:15	The senior
Diana West:	31:16	The senior, yeah.
Frank Gaffney:	31:18	Democratic operative, long time friend and Chief of Staff to the Clintons, their administration. Big player, in other words.
Diana West:	31:24	Yeah, but you have I think one of the really important things for people to understand, because love is confusing, is the number of living witnesses who should be who should be interviewed to find out what they know about this. There's also a former British ambassador to Uzbekistan, by the name of Craig Murray, who has given interviews about how it was that he was in Washington in the summer of 2016, I believe

September, at a conference where he became a conduit to
WikiLeaks East as an affiliate or as some association with
WikiLeaks, and that he received, from an American, information
that WikiLeaks later released, which, judging by his timeline, I
would say may have been the Podesta emails. I'm not certain,
but he discussed two Americans as having been the people who
pass to WikiLeaks the information that became this scandal. He
has never been interviewed by any of these investigative
bodies.

Diana West:	32:24	Then we get to the people who determined that it was Russia, and this takes us to CrowdStrike, which is the name of the company that Michael Sussman of Perkins Coie, and the DNC lawyer, called in to make this report
Frank Gaffney:	<u>32:43</u>	Clean it up.
Diana West:	<u>32:45</u>	and clean it up literally.
Bill Walton:	<u>32:47</u>	Clean it up meaning wash.
Diana West:	<u>32:48</u>	Well, yeah, replace all of the computer equipment. So, this is a very important point.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>32:51</u>	Get rid of the evidence.
Diana West:	32:54	So you have the DNC people basically saying, "Oh my gosh, we've had this terrible event. Let's not call the FBI. Let's call our fixer," who brings in CrowdStrike.
Diana West:	33:05	And it's important to know that CrowdStrike is a company that is founded by a protege of Robert Mueller by the name of Shawn Henry and other one of these cyber experts.
Frank Gaffney:	33:17	At the FBI.
Diana West:	33:18	And at the FBI.
Frank Gaffney:	33:20	Assistant Director.
Diana West:	33:21	Yes, very high ranking and a Russian born, Soviet born, man by the name Dmitri Alperovitch, affiliated with the Atlantic Council, which is one of the sort of new world order organizations, very

anti Trump, et cetera, in Washington, for Hillary.

Frank Gaffney:	33:37	And who also been entrusted with very high level clearances and access
Diana West:	33:42	Very high level.
Frank Gaffney:	33:43	under the Obama administration.
Frank Gaffney:	33:44	So you have, and here's the kicker, Bill. These guys are charged with getting rid of the evidence, and by virtue, I think, primarily, of Sean Henry's prominence and standing within the FBI. When it was supposed to do the investigation, guess what happened? The FBI was told, "Oh, you know, you don't need to look at the actual servers. CrowdStrike's got that."
Frank Gaffney:	<u>34:16</u>	And I can't believe it, Bill. And as long as I've been in Washington, I can't believe the FBI said, "No problem."
Diana West:	34:22	But that's when you start thinking that this is really it.
Frank Gaffney:	34:25	They dig into this forensic deep dive themself.
Diana West:	34:26	And they were fine with it.
Frank Gaffney:	34:28	They took the word of these characters.
Diana West:	34:29	And so, when you look at all of the supposedly authoritative government entities that are supposed to be watching over this stuff, one by one, accept this, you realize how many are really in the tank on this, what I call conspiracy, against President Trump.
Frank Gaffney:	34:46	But here's another angle to this. The number of agencies that actually bought this was far smaller than the number we were told, which goes to your question about the intelligence community. There are 17 agencies in the federal intelligence community, and we were told by Speaker, I guess at the time, the Minority Leader, Nancy Pelosi.
Diana West:	<u>35:11</u>	Oh no, it's Hillary Clinton.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>35:12</u>	Excuse me, Hillary Clinton.
Diana West:	<u>35:13</u>	In a debate.
Frank Gaffney:	35:13	In the debate with Donald Trump, she says all 17 agencies of the intelligence committee say it was a Russian hack, and you know who actually is the source of this? John Brennan. John Brennan,

		handpicked a couple of analysts, trusted analysts who would do his bidding, and they came up with the answer that it was the Russians, not 17 agencies, not unanimous.
Bill Walton:	<u>35:42</u>	You're watching the Bill Walton show. I'm here with Diana West and Frank Gaffney, truth tellers, both, just diving into what happened back in 2016 and why that matters now with what's happened in Ukraine.
Diana West:	<u>35:56</u>	Well, it really matters, because when you actually get right down to it, you see
Bill Walton:	<u>36:01</u>	But let me see if I can't frame it in the way that I'm thinking, because you look at the conventional pushback, here's an article somebody wrote, Michael Anton: The Empire Strikes Back: The Effort to Impeach President Trump is Really About and it talks about really sort of the view that there's the deep state that just wants to preserve its power. And that's been another narrative. But your narrative's
Diana West:	<u>36:25</u>	Mine's different, yeah.
Bill Walton:	<u>36:26</u>	more sinister, which is that it's the intelligence agencies, which have been involved in these coverups, refuse to investigate things which should have been investigated, and by Trump calling the president of Ukraine and saying, "I can't find out," in effect, "I can't find out" I'll do the paraphrase; I'll do the Adam Schiff thing, "I can't figure out what's going on. My people won't tell me."
Diana West:	<u>36:48</u>	Well, CrowdStrike.
Bill Walton:	<u>36:49</u>	"My people will tell me. Well, your people find out."
Bill Walton:	<u>36:52</u>	So, it wasn't really about the Biden's so much as just finding out what, as Trump would put it, what the hell's going on.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>36:58</u>	And the first question was about CrowdStrike.
Diana West:	<u>37:00</u>	CrowdStrike and the server.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>37:02</u>	This company that we now know was deeply involved in the coverup about what actually happened with the DNC.
Diana West:	<u>37:11</u>	So, what you have, because we talked originally about how it was that this unexpected breach of the DNC was layered into

the whole Russia hoax, and here you see... This is, for me, is the absolute screaming headline of all of this. You get the Steele dossier, which was really supposed to be the vehicle of the Russian collusion hoax, and this CrowdStrike redacted draft, we find out through the Roger Stone case it wasn't even a final report that the FBI accepted. It was redacted. CrowdStrike redacted it before it gave to the FBI. Draft.

Frank Gaffney:	37:47	To say nothing of actually looking at the servers. They just took

Frank Gaffney:	<u>37:50</u>	a redacted report that was a draft. I mean, you can't make this
		stuff.

They just took the report.

Diana West:	<u>37:53</u>	Right, so these two documents

Bill Walton:	<u>37:56</u>	And wasn't there some 25 pages that were completely
		redacted?

37:50

Diana West:

Bill Walton:	38:00	Anyway, I thought I heard that.
DIII VValtoii.	30.00	Anyway, i thought i neard that.

Diana West:	<u>38:00</u>	But basically, you've got these two completely untrustworthy
		documents, to say the least, become the basis of every single
		government investigation to go forward from that moment
		forward. So, you have that with the claim that the 17 agencies
		said it was Russian interference. You have it with the so-called
		scope memo, which Rod Rosenstein, the Deputy Attorney
		General wrote for Robert Mueller. It was based on one or two

of these...

Frank Gaffney:	<u>38:31</u>	His mandate for his investigatio	n.
----------------	--------------	----------------------------------	----

Diana West: 38:32 The Mueller report itself, the indictment of the Russian military

officers that Mueller put forward during the investigation, all of these things, court cases that have since come down, indeed, the FISA abuse IG report, too, they all are rest on one or both of these two fraudulent, essentially DNC, Hillary Clinton, paid for, documents, CrowdStrike and the Steele dossier. So, our entire history right now is being rewritten based upon utter fraudulent information.

Frank Gaffney:	39:06	One of your real strengths is the way you connect the dots. How did you conclude the connections between all the other documents in the source document? Was it the original research?
Diana West:	<u>39:16</u>	Well, it was simple.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>39:18</u>	How do we know what we know?
Diana West:	39:19	Well, that's a really interesting question. I've been watching this particular story for so long that I've learned to recognize how it is being discussed and how it is being enshrined in these official documents. When you see anyone talk about Russian interference in the election, you can peel it back and find CrowdStrike. You can peel it back and find Steele dossier, and sure enough, with some of these various documents, there have been confirmation by the principals themselves. Clapper, Brennan for a while, they were arguing about who, Comey, they were arguing about who actually used, or asked for the Steele dossier to be used in their very pivotal assessment of January, 2017, so some of it comes from that kind of confirmation. Others, you just see in the footnote, Devin Nunez was able to look at the Mueller report, for example, a certain paragraph where he says, "Well, this tells me everything I need to know."
Diana West:	40:14	The Steele dossier was used in the scope memo, so in other words, I pulled together all of these various open resources to stitch it together, and then you start seeing the language that's being used. I believe Mueller talked about the systematic Russian interference, and then you see William Barr, the Attorney General thanking Muller for his wonderful work into Russian interference. You realize, aha, we're still stuck to this.
Bill Walton:	40:40	Well, both sides seemed to buy the story of Russian Interference.
Diana West:	<u>40:43</u>	Yes.
Bill Walton:	40:43	The Republican's haven't challenged that.
Diana West:	<u>40:45</u>	No, they have not. [crosstalk 00:40:46] Disturbing it.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>40:48</u>	That's been the great frustration.
Diana West:  TBWS74 2019_12_1	40:49 9 West Gaffne	Yes, and I think it is something to consider when people have great high hopes for what William Barr will finally produce. If you don't open this, what we're talking about, up to sunlight, y (Completed 01/06/20)  Page 21 of 29

		Trump's candidacy election and presidency, that it was somehow perverted by Russian involvement, and this, to me, shows that you are
Frank Gaffney:	<u>41:14</u>	Whether he colluded or not, it still was run by the Russians.
Diana West:	41:16	Right, it de-legitimized. Yes, and that it also makes Trump supporters into essentially Russian bots, and this can be quite dangerous if you go down the road toward any sort of skirmish or hot war involving America and Russia. Who is trustworthy? The people who were put in power by Russia? No, it's the left. Who has never, in its history, been critical of the Kremlin. I mean, this is one of these great flipperoos here that you have to kind of also factor in.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>41:44</u>	Jiu-jitsu.
Diana West:	41:44	It's a damaging big lie, and it's ultimately the biggest lie of all, even more than just the little pieces of it attached to CrowdStrike, or Julian Assange, or this or that. It's this notion that Russia installed Donald Trump, and when you see who doesn't want to open it up, who doesn't want to interview Binney or Assange or look at what happened, you have to suspect that they are in and off the swamp, and they are part of the movement to prevent Trump from being successful and reelected and supported.
Frank Gaffney:	42:14	Yeah. I'm not sure I'd say that about the Republicans so much, but the Republicans have simply gone along with this narrative to such a degree that the big lie has again been further reinforced and affirmed, and they're now operating on the basis of it, as Diana said. But we do need to
Diana West:	<u>42:30</u>	They're manipulated, too.
Bill Walton:	42:31	Well, the FBI's operated with an assumption of innocence and trustworthiness. I mean, even though it started with J. Edgar Hoover, who was hardly either one of those, but
Frank Gaffney:	<u>42:42</u>	He had his merits.
Bill Walton:	<u>42:43</u>	He had his strengths, I'm sure, but
Diana West:	<u>42:45</u>	He's been demonized, too.

you are going to preserve the essence of what de-legitimizes

Bill Walton:	<u>42:47</u>	You could probably change my mind on J. Edgar Hoover, too.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>42:50</u>	He's anti-Communist.
Bill Walton:	42:52	But I guess the thing that's sort of the paradigm shift here is that if you think the FBI are the good guys, and there are just a few bad guys, Page, and Strzok, and things like that, but everybody else is fine, and they're doing the bidding of the American people, you feel pretty good. But now, we're seeing 10, 15, 20, 25 people in the FBI have all been reassigned, at high levels, and so
Frank Gaffney:	<u>43:14</u>	Or fired. Or both.
Bill Walton:	<u>43:16</u>	And so, the scary thing is, you no longer trust the FBI.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>43:22</u>	It is scary.
Diana West:	<u>43:22</u>	It it scary.
Bill Walton:	43:22	And you haven't trusted them for awhile.
Diana West:	43:24	Well, it's, when you start seeing police powers
Bill Walton:	<u>43:26</u>	And how deep does this go? 70,000 people in the FBI or some big number like that.
Diana West:	43:31	Well it's a big number, and when you start realizing that domestic political opposition is now coming under surveillance by these powerful, powerful entities, and, given what we know about every American coming under surveillance in terms of our electronic communications being preserved, logged, it's horrifying.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>43:52</u>	Unmasking.
Diana West:	43:53	The unmasking, I mean, these are the trappings of the surveillance state that we think of when we think of East Germany and the Stasi.
Frank Gaffney:	44:02	But Bill, that's what makes so alarming the leitmotif of the red thread, what Diana has developed, and what we talked a little bit about the last time is that ideological component. I don't think the institutions themselves are necessarily hopelessly corrupt. There have been very serious problems, though, but there are people at the top of these agencies, or have been,

who have, they're imbued with this big lie sort of a practice because their adherence to one form or another of that sort of totalitarian revolutionary program. That's the crux of this.

Bill Walton: 44:44 You're watching the Bill Walton show. I'm here with Diana West

and Frank Gaffney, and we're talking about the ideological roots of what's going on today in Washington with the impeachment and basically everything else. That is, that ideological piece is interesting, though, because we talked about, when we got together last time, you say Marxist Communists. You seem to be such a... It's like it's the '30s and those, those Commie reds and stuff like that, you get marginalized. But the -isms... There's Islamism, there's neolism, there's socialism, Communism, maybe even environmentalism, if you look at the political agenda, totalitarianism.

Diana West: 45:23 Of course, absolutely.

Frank Gaffney: 45:23 It's all one form or another.

Bill Walton: 45:25 But the capturing -ism is totalitarianism. Is that your thesis?

Diana West: 45:29 Yes. Anti-democratic, anti-small-D-democratic, anti-

constitutional. And there's one piece of it I think it's important to think of when we look at the entities like FBI or even CIA. Think of how the old fashioned Communist front works. It is filled with wonderful, innocent, well meaning people who are the majority of the members who are steered by hardened operatives who are using them as their front. I mean, that is the essence of what a front is. So, in other words, the ideological drivers and people don't have to be very many in order to turn an organization to their agenda. And I think that's an important thing to think about when we're talking about the FBI or the Congress or the Republicans or Democrats. Lots of people can be manipulated and it goes back to our discussion even if the big lie, but there is also sort of the mechanism by which these things are weaponized, and it is very often a tight command and control group, a special operation, a special group.

control Broady a special operation, a special Broady

Diana West: 46:37 And I think what we've seen with some of the revelations about

FBI, there is, they talk about it in some of the texts, the secret society, there is a special group that maybe share in these

beliefs.

Bill Walton: 46:50 In the FBI?

Diana West: 46:51 Probably all of these entities. But yes, I think...

TBWS74 2019\_12\_19 West Gaffney (Completed 01/06/20) Page 24 of 29

Transcript by Rev.com

Bill Walton:	<u>46:53</u>	In all the agencies.
Diana West:	<u>46:54</u>	Agent Strzok talked about secret society and their texts.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>46:57</u>	The thing is, it extends beyond the FBI.
Bill Walton:	46:57	Putting an innocent gloss on this. Let's say these are purely political difference, and these people are globalists, and they don't believe in nationalism, and they want to be, it's a one world philosophy. They're not necessarily totalitarians. They just believe in this idealism of one world, world without borders, all that sort of thing, and
Frank Gaffney:	<u>47:17</u>	Well, lots of totalitarians believe in that.
Bill Walton:	<u>47:20</u>	Okay.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>47:20</u>	Why not call them useful idiots?
Diana West:	47:23	But then they go in the electoral process. I mean, if there are normal Americans who believe these things, they take it to the people. They don't spy on the political opposition. That's where I think we can make this judgment that they are totalitarians, because they are using the tools of the state, the weapons of the state against citizens who have rights. And when you think about a James Comey, who not only was FBI director, but number two at the Justice Department, perverting the rights of American citizens, it is truly frightening, and I think totalitarian is something we should definitely consider as an apt label, not just Americans who have a belief about open borders or distribution of wealth and want to take it to a vote.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>48:07</u>	Amen.
Bill Walton:	48:08	So, we also have this phenomena where these people want to fundamentally transform America, and we have presidential candidates want to fundamentally transform it. We had Obama obviously, and then, we now have Warren and Sanders.
Diana West:	<u>48:21</u>	And the rest, yeah.
Frank Gaffney:	48:22	But that one presidential candidate who actually frankly spoke of that as being what was going to happen on his watch had eight years to act on it. This is the crux of this, Bill. We're talking about people that he entrusted with these responsibilities. There's evidence as well, it should be said, that he was

		your butt memo to herself on inauguration day, saying the president was fully briefed on all of this. This is the sort of thing, and I just want to salute you for taking the time and using this platform to actually allow these kinds of facts to be presented.
Bill Walton:	49:17	Well, I would like to find what's really happening in this country. You these events, and you think, who's behind this? What are the drivers?
Diana West:	<u>49:24</u>	Well, who benefits?
Bill Walton:	<u>49:26</u>	We talked about some of that, timeline, but who benefits?
Diana West:	<u>49:29</u>	Well, certainly our enemies do, in Russia and China.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>49:34</u>	And the revolution.
Diana West:	<u>49:34</u>	Certainly, the revolution, la revolucion.
Frank Gaffney:	49:35	This was going to be, the killer revolutionary was going to be stopped, as Diana put it, was very much in the interest of the revolutionaries.
Bill Walton:	<u>49:43</u>	We know there's
Frank Gaffney:	<u>49:44</u>	Including Obama and his team.
Bill Walton:	<u>49:45</u>	Well, there's a connection here, because a lot of people in the conservative movement used to talk about, well there's social conservatives and their national security, national defense securities, and then economic conservatives
Frank Gaffney:	<u>49:59</u>	And that's all merged now. That's all become one thing. You don't have an enemy that's China that you're fighting apart from outside the borders. They've got people inside the United States. You're detailing what's happened with Russia. Islam has done many of the same things, so it's what you guys have called the enemy within, right?
Diana West:	<u>50:17</u>	Subversion.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>50:19</u>	And in each of these, the idea is to actually bring down.

personally briefed on what was going on here, if not actually managing it or overseeing it day-to-day. He was Susan Rice, for heaven sakes. His national security advisor writes a sort of cover

Bill Walton:	<u>50:23</u>	You have such a nice smile.
Diana West:	<u>50:25</u>	I know. It's ridiculous. It's a lot. It's a lot to take in. It really is.
Frank Gaffney:	50:33	And Trump understands this.
Diana West:	50:34	I think he does.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>50:35</u>	Trump is, in the terms we're talking about, is sort of the true counterrevolutionary
Diana West:	<u>50:40</u>	He is. He is.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>50:42</u>	and therefore a great threat.
Diana West:	<u>50:43</u>	He is the mortal threat.
Frank Gaffney:	50:44	He'll have to be stopped, and anything, the ends justify the means, anything that was necessary to stop Donald Trump, first, when he was a candidate, then when he was transitioning to the White House, and even once he became the president of the United States, this enterprise had to stop him, and I think Diana deserves immense credit, as well, for helping connect the dots on who was involved.
Bill Walton:	51:11	As usual, we've covered about 20% of what I've got on my sketchpad here, so we're going to have to continue at some point, but we're just after the House impeaching Trump. We know that's not getting out of office. That requires a Senate vote. Presumably it goes to the Senate, doesn't go. How do you see this playing out?
Diana West:	51:33	It will be a sort of Damocles, I guess, over the election year as it stands at this point, with Nancy Pelosi not sure of how she's going to advance it. I think that they
Bill Walton:	<u>51:49</u>	Do you think Trump survives?
Diana West:	<u>51:51</u>	I think if he literally and physically survives, I think he survives politically. I'm worried about him. It's a difficult thing, what he's undergoing. I think that we probably don't think enough about his own suffering under this kind of excruciating pressure, but I think he's about the strongest man to emerge on the national stage that I've ever seen, and the courage is incredible.

Frank Gaffney:	52:18	The question probably is, what's 3.0? What's four? What's the next
Bill Walton:	<u>52:27</u>	We had Russia. We had Mueller. We've had Ukraine. We've had impeachment.
Frank Gaffney:	52:31	What are we going to see next in terms of the revolutionaries trying to undermine him. We've heard some of them talking about continuing new impeachments. They don't get him this time, they'll just try another one.
Diana West:	<u>52:42</u>	In the next administration, yeah.
Frank Gaffney:	52:45	And in the end, this is all, I believe, about trying to prevent him from winning the presidency. They didn't expect to get them out of office. This is damaging him. This is trying to undermine his support. This is tying to discredit him, and I think this story and what makes talking about it so vital is, if the fact's out, I think the American people are going to understand that would be a terrible miscarriage of justice and deny them probably the only hope we have in this country for a future that isn't going to be dominated by one or the other of these -isms.
Bill Walton:	53:22	So, to repeat what is, I think, is one of our conclusions, the threat was that Trump, with the Ukraine engagement, with the phone call, was circumventing intelligent communities to get to the bottom of what had really happened and going all the way back to the DNC server and everything
Diana West:	<u>53:41</u>	The set up, the original set up.
Bill Walton:	<u>53:45</u>	So, had he continued down that path and worked with the Ukraine to find out about these things, there would have been a lot of bad stuff that came out. Therefore, the impeachment.
Diana West:	53:55	Perhaps, perhaps. I think, also, there's another piece of this that we haven't mentioned, which has to do with Trump still has his hands on all of the secrets this government has, the swamp has. And I think, in some ways, that's his greatest power over them, if he chooses to execute. At this point, we have not seen releases on these various documents. He gave that power to William Barr, who was not exercised it yet, but Trump, I imagine, still has it. That, I think, is what they're really afraid of, and trying to figure out a way to get out.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>54:25</u>	They need to.

This transcript was exported on Jan 07, 2020 - view latest version <u>here.</u>

Bill Walton:	<u>54:26</u>	So, whether Barr buys into the Russian collusion or not is relevant. As long as he takes this information and does something with it, then there's a reason for hope, if he releases it, that's the line of action.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>54:37</u>	And John Durham pursues the prosecutorial side as well, but they can reinforce one another. That information is out. I think it will make Diana less skeptical, then.
Diana West:	<u>54:48</u>	Yes, it would. It would very much so.
Bill Walton:	<u>54:49</u>	All right. Well, Frank, Diana, thank you. Fascinating.
Frank Gaffney:	<u>54:52</u>	Thank you.
Bill Walton:	<u>54:53</u>	That's it for now, unfortunately. Thank you for joining us. We'll see you back on the next Bill Walton show.
Speaker 1:	<u>55:00</u>	Thanks for listening. Want more? Be sure to subscribe at thebillwaltonshow.com or on iTunes.