

2016 RT Interview Afshin Rattansi 'Smoking Gun' DNC Leaks

<http://temporaryehlist.blogspot.com/2016/11/assange-julian-julian-assange-special.html>

1. Rattansi: Julian Assange, thanks for agreeing for this Interview. Aren't you worried that you're on this channel, RT, after being accused by Hillary Clinton basically of working for the Russian Government? "We know Russian Intelligence Agencies hacked into the DNC." WikiLeaks is now publishing all the hacked emails.
2. Assange: I don't think WikiLeaks can be constantly worried about PR. **I've been called a Mossad agent. It got so bad, in fact, that the ADL, the Anti-Defamation League, had to put out a press release denying that I was a Mossad agent. I'm not sure actually that that's particularly helpful. Cat-torturer, CIA agent, et cetera.** It's expected with our Publications. RT is obviously of interest to People that are interested in Russia, and Russia has been brought up by Hillary Clinton, most recently just a few days ago on Fox, so I think it is necessary to address what WikiLeaks feels is its Perception of its own Publication to the RT audience.
3. Rattansi: When you started WikiLeaks, obviously the Afghan War Logs, these different leaks that you presented to the World, give us a context about the so-called War on Terror, the Atrocities by UK-, US-backed Forces. Did you ever think WikiLeaks was going to change the outcome of a US presidential Election?
4. Assange: Our proponents argue that we have shifted outcomes in approving Election, Kenyan Election, with being involved in removing the Intelligence heads in a number of Countries as a result of our Publications and the public Accountability that has come from it. I think it remains to be seen. The upcoming WikiLeaks Publications to do with the presidential Election, those can go either way.
5. Rattansi: Hillary Clinton says she has Proof that it comes from a Russian hack. Is that-
6. Assange: **She is very sneaky. She made a sneaky statement on Fox which contains elements which are simply, strictly false and other ones where she's sort of trying to push the Truth through a very small gap.**
7. Rattansi: Hillary Clinton just said, "We know Russian Intelligence Agencies hacked into the DNC. We know they arranged for emails to be released."
8. Assange: Actually she has a slight variant on the "We know." I don't think she says emails. I think she says "some documents" because the difference here is that do State actors hack are the political Organisations of different Countries. **Does the United States Government do it? Absolutely. Of course, it hacks the political Parties of many different Countries. Does French Intelligence, Chinese Intelligence, Russian Intelligence hack political parties in order to collect Intelligence? Yes. Did they hack the DNC? Has at least one State actor hacked the DNC? Probably. Now this is a separate Question to the release of our emails. In the US Media, there's been a deliberate conflation between DNC leaks, which is what we've been publishing, and DNC hacks of the US Democratic Party, which have occurred over the last two years by their own admission a number of times.**
9. Rattansi: You're not going to sue for Defamation, though, given all the People saying that you were endangering the Lives of People and all manner of Accusations about this set of DNC leaks that have come out. You don't plan on taking legal Action?
10. Assange: We look carefully. I mean we sometimes do take legal Action where there's a strict Liability and when we can show that someone knew that what they were saying was untrue. If it gets too bad in this case, then unfortunately that's what you have to do, because if there's no incentive to encourage People to say the Truth and they won't do it by themselves, then unfortunately you have to take Action. I think this statement by Hillary Clinton on Fox really does need to be tackled because it concerns us directly and our Publications. **What she is attempting to do is to conflate our Publication of pristine emails, knowing the Democratic Party argues, that even a single email is not completely valid.** It hasn't been done. The head of the DNC, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, is rolled as a result. Whatever hacking has occurred of the DNC or other political Organisations in the United States by a range of actors. In the middle, we have something which is the Publication by other Media Organisations of Information purportedly from the DNC. It seems to be the case. So that's a series of word documents and PDFs published **by The Hill, by Gawker, by The Smoking Gun.** This is a completely separate batch of documents compared to the 20,000 pristine emails that we have released. In this batch of documents released by these other Media Organisations, there are claims that in the metadata, someone's done a document to PDF conversion, and in some cases, the Language of the Computer that was used for that conversion was Russian. That's the circumstantial Evidence that some Russian was involved or someone who wanted to make it look like a Russian was involved with these other Media Organisations. That's not the case for the material that we released. **The Hillary Clinton Campaign has a serious problem in**

trying to work out how to counterspin the Publication. Why do they have such a problem? Because the emails are unarguable. WikiLeaks has a perfect 10-year history of having never got it wrong in Relation to what we have published. That means that what we have published is trusted. But even so, across the whole 20,000 emails, no one in the DNC, no one even in the Hillary Clinton Campaign, is saying, "Ah, look, that word there; I did not say that." It's accepted that they are all legitimate. So what is the source of the emails? I can reveal the source of the emails. The source of the emails is the Democratic National Committee. It is the president, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, it is the communications director, Luis Miranda, et cetera, et cetera.

11. Rattansi: I think that's not what they're asking.
12. Assange: They wrote them. We know they're accurate, we know who the source is, we know who the publisher is. **From our perspective, that's all that's important.** Now there's an attempt to bring in a metastory, and the metastory is, did some hacker obtain these emails? People have suggested that there's Evidence that the DNC has been hacked. I'm not at all surprised it's been hacked. In fact-
13. Rattansi: Clinton says it's the Russians.
14. Assange: If you read very carefully, they say it's been hacked many times over the last two years. Our sources say that the DNC Security is like Swiss cheese. The DNI, the Director of National Intelligence of the United States, several months ago said that both the RNC, the Republicans, and the DNC were being attacked by a range of actors from philosophical opponents to States engaged in espionage. **Now, the head of the DNI, James Clapper, who's responsible for all US Intelligence Agencies, he's the boss of the boss of the CIA. If anyone knows what the US Intelligence Agencies knows, he knows.** On Friday, he had to come out and say that there's a lot of Media hyperventilation, that they have no idea as to what motivation is even if they did know who it was. So that's the head of the DNI dampening down Ideas that they know who it is. Despite that, Hillary Clinton is saying untruthfully that she knows who the source of our emails are. She didn't quite say our emails. She's playing some games, because there have been other Publications by The Hill, by Gawker, of the US Media, of different documents, not emails. So we have to separate the various DNC or RNC hacks that have occurred over the years. Who's done that? The source. We know who the source is. It's the Democratic National Committee itself. And our sources. Who gave these materials and other pending materials to us? These are all different Questions. Clinton is playing a fairly effective game at trying to distinguish these. We say, "Look, can journalists count to two?" It's not hard to count to two. We have DNC leaked emails that we have published, and we have Questions about the hacking of the DNC over a number of different years by a number of different actors. These are different Questions.
15. Rattansi: Any Russian connexions between Hillary Clinton and Russia? Any Russian connexions there?
16. Assange: Hillary Clinton has done quite well strategically to try and draw connexion between Trump and Russia, because she has so many connexions of her own. My analysis of Trump and Russia is that there is no substantial connexion. Why do I say that? Because Trump was trying to invest in Russia before Putin in the 1990s, after Putin, and in fact nearly all the way up to the present moment, and he's had no success. He's not managed to build hotels and so-on in Russia, so that shows how insubstantial his contacts are. Now if you look at Hillary Clinton on the other hand, you see that Hillary Clinton was involved in approving the Sale of 20% of the United States' Uranium-reprocessing Market to a Russian Company. That's just an incredible Thing when you think that Uranium is part of the US Nuclear Weapons Complex. In fact, it is the origin.
17. Rattansi: Is a Russian Government funded Company.
18. Assange: Now American Uranium is being shipped off to Russia and potentially used in the Construction of Russian Atomic Weapons or at the very least displacing the use of Russian Uranium, so there's more spare Uranium.
19. Rattansi: Your involvement is through John Podesta, who's her Campaign manager?

20. Assange: The involvement is in a number of areas. So there's donations, large donations, going into the Clinton Foundation while Hillary Clinton is Secretary of State at the time that she is making the Decision as to whether to permit the Export or not. And through John Podesta, Hillary Clinton's Campaign manager, there's an extremely well-documented pattern of when Hillary Clinton was Secretary of State, those People, Companies, Governments, who wanted a Decision by the Secretary of State in their favour, making large donations to the Clinton Foundation or in some other cases Business-deals with the People around Hillary Clinton. **Now one particular instance is the approval by Secretary Clinton of selling 20% of the US Uranium Reprocessing Rights to a Russian Company to be exported to Russia. At that time, a large Donation was made by those Russian interests to the Clinton Foundation. In addition, Clinton's Campaign manager, Podesta, was on the board of a Company called Joule Unlimited, and Joule Unlimited held some of these Rights and received a \$35 million Investment from Russia.**
21. Rattansi: That's a Russian Government Company, so Hillary Clinton is-
22. Assange: From a Russian Government Company, and also Russians were on the board also with Podesta.
23. Rattansi: So the kind of email revelations from WikiLeaks reveal that Hillary Clinton is a Kremlin stooge?
24. Assange: I wouldn't say Kremlin stooge, but there is a much deeper connexion on record with Hillary Clinton and Russia than we are presently aware of with Donald Trump.
25. Rattansi: Is this Revenge for **Hillary Clinton overseeing the Torture of Chelsea Manning**, of obviously seeking continuing Grand Jury against yourself, perhaps extrajudicial Killing of yourself, let alone the death penalty for yourself if you were tried in the United States? Is that why you're attacking Hillary Clinton?
26. Assange: I just find it quite amazing. WikiLeaks is doing what it's always done. That's what its mandate is for the past 10 years. In 2009 we published 50,000 donors from the Norm Coleman, Senator Norm Coleman, Campaign. He was a Republican. That's what WikiLeaks. **Just think, would WikiLeaks turn down tens of thousands of documents from a political Party in an Election?** I think the interesting Question is would another Media Organisation turn it down? These Questions about the motivations of an editor or a proprietor, actually I think they're fair. I think it is fair to ask those Questions. I don't think the answers are very fair. **But do you ever hear those Questions asked about Phil Griffin, the President of MSNBC, or Comcast or Time Warner?**
27. Rattansi: So whoever the source is, they couldn't trust those Companies to be able to publish the Information because they're already so partisan?
28. Assange: I mean I assume that's why the source came to us because of that Belief. When we were strategising our rollout, **which we had to really work hard to do a rollout before the DNC**, it was a lot of Work to try and meet that deadline, **but we thought, "Okay, well, who should we choose as, you know, Media partners in the United States who, you know, perhaps they know the backstory of some of these characters like Debbie Wasserman Schultz better than we do?"** And we thought, **"Actually, there is basically no one that we can trust to do an impartial job on this issue"** because the Election has **polarised everyone**. You basically have in the US Media Market, Fox going mostly with the Republicans, it's actually a bit unclear whether they're going to stay with Trump towards the end, **and then everyone else with Hillary Clinton**. So who can you choose to work with in that environment? You can't. The most impartial way of doing things is just to publish it ourselves and invite everyone to the table. That's what happened.
29. Rattansi: Some journalists would argue that it's actually the subject of the revelations that's more interesting to the American voter about the Election while the Media is, of course, fascinated about whether the Kremlin is working with you, whether you work for the Kremlin basically.
30. Assange: No, but it's very. I think it's a genuine Question. You should ask the sources of Information. The least, however, in the case of WikiLeaks Publications. Why do I say that? The principal reason why you want to know the source of some statement is to understand whether it's true or not. What are the motivations by the source in creating some Allegation or whatever. We don't publish Allegations. We know what the source is. The source is the DNC, the source is Debbie Wasserman Schultz, the source is the head of finance, the source is the communications director, Luis Miranda. So we know who the source is. The Question is who is the intermediary. We know who the publisher is; that's WikiLeaks. So for our Publications, it's a lesser issue. It is a big issue in the case of other Media Organisations who are simply making claims and not publishing original documents. **I'll give you an example, a very, very interesting example. I've done some research on the Turkish Coup. It's not spoken about in the West, but within Turkey, the Turkish newspapers are publishing elements of a Theory that the United States was directly involved in the Coup, that US Intelligence backed Fethullah Gülen, who's based in Pennsylvania as the head of the Gülen cult** that has been implicated in the Coup. In fact, according to the Turkish Government, is the leading actor in the Coup.

31. Rattansi: Who's wanted by President Erdogan?
32. Assange: Yes, and they've put out Extradition requests and so on. One of the key independent points of Evidence not coming from Interrogation in Turkey where People might have been placed under Duress, is that in the middle of the Coup, NBC published that Erdogan was on his way to Germany to seek Asylum. They say this was told to them by a US Military source, so what the hell is going on there? Because that went all the way around the World and was used to further the chance of the success of the Coup within Turkey. Because if the President has fled, then he has lost control.
33. Rattansi: NBC had close supporters, so Trump supporters would say, of Hillary Clinton, so would a Hillary Clinton presidency endanger the NATO alliance and the Ability to store American Nuclear Weapons at **Incirlik Air Base** and use it as a base to bomb Iraq and Syria under Hillary Clinton?
34. Assange: I think either Government is potentially a Problem because of that Coup in Turkey was very serious Business. Hundreds of People have died. That a hundred thousand People have been fired or arrested in the post-Coup Purge, opportunistically in some cases of political Enemies of Erdogan, in other cases trying to purge the Society of the Gülen movement.
35. Rattansi: Okay, but for an American viewer of this programme right now, Donald Trump is being castigated for undermining NATO. You seem to be saying that the Turkish alliance within NATO-
36. Assange: I think regardless. Perhaps not the broader NATO Alliance but the Relationship between the United States and Turkey is seriously compromised.
37. Rattansi: Back to the democratic process in the United States. Basically the first batch you released showed. At least you could admire Wasserman Schultz for resigning very quickly after the WikiLeaks Publication. **There was a dirty tricks Campaign against Bernie Sanders, so Democratic primary voters didn't really understand what was going on during that process. Because the Clinton Foundation's major donors include members of the Gülen movement that Erdogan says were responsible for the attempted Coup d'État.**
38. Assange: Right. I mean Erdogan's going to look at that and treat Clinton suspiciously. **Regardless of who becomes President of the United States, you have an extremely large Intelligence Bureaucracy that has its own mind in things.** Unless Trump is elected and engages in a significant purge of the CIA, for example, I think Erdogan will continue to view it very suspiciously. Especially as long as we've got Fethullah Gülen being protected in Pennsylvania.
39. Rattansi: The vice presidential pick for Clinton ...
40. Assange: So go back. Hillary loses the primary process against Obama. **At that point, Tim Kaine was the head of the DNC, the Democratic National Committee. Debbie Wasserman Schultz was Hillary Clinton's Campaign manager. Then some kind of deal is done whereby Debbie Wasserman Schultz becomes the head of the DNC and Tim Kaine steps down.** If you're Hillary and you're thinking strategically that you're going to run again in four years or eight years, have your Campaign manager as head of the DNC, controller of the, if you like, the regulator who's regulating the nomination Competition, is a huge strategic Advantage. Now let's wind forward. The 20,000 DNC leak emails that we released. They're from Debbie Wasserman Schultz, head of the DNC, and six other prominent People, Finance, Communications, and so on. What they show is that within the DNC, there was a unity of the most senior People, including Debbie Wasserman Schultz, to act against Bernie Sanders in the nomination process and for Hillary Clinton. What particular Actions were performed? There's a lot of Discussions, so Discussions about we can use a captive reporter and push out the fact that Bernie Sanders might be an atheist and not a Jew, and this is going to cost him in the South.
41. Rattansi: **Which Organisation? Sorry to interrupt. CNN, I think, was the name, was it?**

42. Assange: No, they didn't mention the reporter in that particular case. Where MSNBC on its most influential morning programme, Morning Joe, was defending Bernie Sanders, then Debbie Wasserman Schultz called up the president of MSNBC. Amazingly this is not reported in the US Media. It is reported in the US Media that they called up Chuck Todd, who's the host of Meet the Press. Something much more serious is not reported, that Debbie Wasserman Schultz herself personally called up the president of MSNBC to apply pressure in Relation to positive coverage about Bernie Sanders on Morning Joe, their big morning TV programme. Then to my mind what is the most serious from an evidentiary point of view is the communications director, Luis Miranda, making an instruction to his staff to pump out a black Propaganda story against Bernie Sanders saying that his supporters were violent and to put this out in a quote unattributable unquote manner. Why do I say that is the most serious? Because it is an Instruction given through the Chain of Command to staff. It's not a Discussion, it's not any one Person calling up to another Person. It is to depict Bernie Sanders supporters as violent. That is not just a critique. That is not just to give Sanders a break here or make things a little bit harder for him there. It is to demonise a Democrat in the eyes of the Public. Democratic Party demonising a Democrat in the eyes of the Public through covert means. Why did Hillary Clinton appoint Tim Kaine, this kind of a non-entity? If Hillary Clinton's going to win, she has a range of things she can use, but the biggest demand for her going into the convention was to show prominently to Bernie Sanders supporters that they had one of their guys at the table. Bernie Sanders as Vice President, one of Bernie Sanders' key Allies as Vice President or something of an equivalent nature. Didn't happen. In fact, when Debbie Wasserman Schultz was pushed to resign, within hours Hillary Clinton put out a statement saying that she was taking Debbie Wasserman Schultz to be the honorary head of her Campaign and would be her surrogate and is her friend and would be used throughout the Campaign. What kind of signal is that? Where the Person has been found to be acting corruptly, acting against Bernie Sanders, and you're trying to create unity. To conspicuously display that. She could've waited a week. She could've gone under the surface. Why conspicuously.
43. Rattansi: Well the DNC says because they didn't believe Bernie Sanders would win November, which is why they would do everything to help the Democrat Party-
44. Assange: No, no, no. But why did Hillary Clinton conspicuously, after Debbie Wasserman Schultz, the head of the DNC, was pushed out as a result of our Publications, why moments after did Hillary Clinton release a press release saying that she was effectively rehiring her? What kind of signal is that to create unity with the Bernie Sanders supporters? It is mad. My Perception is that the appointment of Tim Kaine and the conspicuous rehiring of Debbie Wasserman Schultz both come from the same Phenomenon, which is Cronyism. That Clinton's Campaign, Clinton's structure, is based upon these Friendships and Alliances that she has built up. She cannot permit any signal to go out that says that she doesn't respect these Alliances, because that's what the structure is based on.
45. Rattansi: She would be endangered by breaking Relations with those Forces?
46. Assange: Exactly. If she, for example, didn't pick Tim Kaine, and there was a deal done eight years ago for Tim Kaine to resign and put in Debbie Wasserman Schultz for strategic purposes, and then she doesn't give Tim Kaine whatever he was promised, perhaps the vice presidency, then of course she'll pay a price. Debbie Wasserman Schultz, no doubt, knows a lot about Hillary Clinton, having been intimately involved in her previous Campaign, so Hillary needs to keep her close. But more than that, she needs to publicly demonstrate to all the other People, "Don't worry. If you take a fall for me for doing a corrupt act for me like Debbie Wasserman Schultz was doing, then you'll be

- taken care of.” So that is, creates a limit on the moves that Hillary Clinton can take. She can't take any move. An obvious move would be to appoint some key Bernie Sanders Person. Vice president. That's an obvious move. Or to not be conspicuous about saying, “Oh, you just screwed over in a corrupt manner the nomination-”
47. Rattansi: You're implying that there's much more Information which she's blackmailable by these different People.
 48. Assange: Hillary Clinton does not have an unlimited number of moves she can make. She's confined on her chessboard as a result of these Relationships. That may well cost her the Election. She's not an idiot. She's a highly intelligent woman. There wasn't a move available to her to unite with Bernie Sanders supporters. That move was not available to her because those squares were already occupied.
 49. Rattansi: There is no way, presumably, Hillary Clinton can win if there is a link between Hillary Clinton and ISIS-Daesh. Now I know your WikiLeaks is reviewing all these different emails. You have so many of them and you need to look at them and who they can damage, who they can't, all sorts of things WikiLeaks does before releasing them. President Obama is now bombing ISIS-Daesh positions in Libya, so it's reported. **Did Hillary Clinton use Libya as a conduit to sell arms to ISIS-Daesh in Syria?**
 50. Assange: **The US Government at the Time that Hillary Clinton was in charge of Foreign Policy did use Libya as a conduit to get Arms to jihadists in Syria. That's well established, not just by a range of our materials but by the investigative Work of Sy Hersh and a variety of other investigative reporters in the United States, some of those even published in the New York Times.**
 51. Rattansi: And any of the emails. You have mentioned that Libya comes up in so many of the emails that you've been releasing, as regards Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State-
 52. Assange: In the batch of 32,000 emails we released a few months back, there are 1,700 in Relation to Libya, including. I suppose that the most useful one is, which is colloquially referred to as **“Hillary Clinton's Libya Brag Sheet.”** She was documenting all the ways in which she led the Invasion of Libya in a political and to a degree an organisational sense. Pushing it within the US Government, bringing in the European partners, et cetera, et cetera. Even going herself personally.
 53. Rattansi: Anything to add to reports that, according to the French Papers, **the big French industrial conglomerate Lafarge, which has been donating Money to the Clinton Foundation** and has got. The reports in the French Press were it was relating funds with ISIS-Daesh. Any Information, any emails that connect up Hillary Clinton to ISIS-Daesh through Lafarge?
 54. Assange: Well most of this Work was done by Le Monde, **so that's the New York Times equivalent of France.** What they show is that Lafarge, which is a giant, amongst other things, a giant Concrete Company, transnational Concrete Company, was involved in Syria. There's interestingly more than 350 Lafarge-related emails in our Syria emails release, so that's two million emails that we've published about Syria, including the Personal emails of the President Bashar al-Assad. **The Investigation by Le Monde reveals that they paid ISIS-Daesh Money, Taxes, if you will, for their Operations in certain Areas. Yeah, they engaged in a variety of Business dealings.**
 55. Rattansi: They donated to the Clinton Foundation-
 56. Assange: **And Hillary Clinton's involvement is that Money from Lafarge in 2015 and 2016 went to Hillary Clinton Foundation, so that's recent. You ask why does it go to a Foundation? Actually there's a long-term Relationship between Lafarge and Hillary Clinton. She was a member of the board, for example.**
 57. Rattansi: Okay, let's go to **Venezuela, the Country with the biggest Oil Resources on Earth.** Obviously there was an attempted Coup d'État by the United States a while back. People are now predicting. Anything in your email cache to suggest Hillary Clinton has been involved in sabotaging the Economy of Venezuela? Or the DNC?
 58. Assange: You mean our pending emails or our present?
 59. Rattansi: Both, of course.
 60. Assange: Pending emails I can't talk about. Yes, there's a lot of material that we have published: cables, emails-

61. Rattansi: But some are saying People are starving to Death in Venezuela because of the sabotaging of their Economy via Sanctions with Hillary Clinton and the DNC involved.
62. Assange: There have been a range of attempts by the US Government to undermine the Venezuelan Government, the Venezuelan State, for years. Our Publications document that, going back to at least 2005, so I don't think Hillary Clinton's term as Secretary of State was especially unusual. **It's a continuation of US policy going back at least to 2005 of attempting to marginalise in a variety of ways the Government of Hugo Chávez and now the Government of Maduro.**
63. Rattansi: I know we don't have time to go through every Country in the World, but Hillary Clinton's involvement, of course, in the overthrow of **the democratically elected President Zelaya of Honduras.** Any other emails that suggest that we can get more Information how Hillary Clinton tries to overthrow democratically elected Governments? I know that her brother, Tony Rodham, was implicated in Haiti with Mining licenses via the Clinton Foundation.
64. Assange: Bill Clinton as well. Bill Clinton basically became the Overseer or Governor of Haiti. I mean Clinton's intimately involved. There's reports back from quite an amazing report back from Chelsea Clinton, which we have already published, describing her trip to Haiti, but that's a kind of ingenuine, naïve description. Chelsea Clinton is not, from what I have been able to read, she's not involved in the dirty Work of the family. Like some daughters of powerful families, they're treated like princesses to try and keep them away from that.
65. Rattansi: I was actually talking about the brother, Tony Rodham. He got some licenses, and he actually is on the record for saying I get licenses via the Clinton Foundation. "I deal through the Clinton Foundation. That gets me in touch with Haitian officials." So it is this foundation which is central-
66. Assange: Yeah.
67. Rattansi: I know you can't comment directly about the pending email releases from WikiLeaks, but do you expect more about the Clinton Foundation?
68. Assange: Yes.
69. Rattansi: I have to also get to Yemen, because Saudi Arabia does crop up in some of the emails you've already released. 20 million People now facing humanitarian disaster. There was no mention of the Clinton Foundation at the DNC conference, noticeably, at all about the Good Works it does. Do you think part of it is that connexion to Saudi Arabia, let alone the 28 pages of connexion with 9/11 to Saudi Arabia? What is the connexion between Hillary Clinton and Saudi Arabia that certainly got Israel angry?
70. Assange: It's extensive. **There are Relationships between Hillary Clinton and Saudi Arabia, between the Clinton Foundation and Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia is probably the largest single donor to the Clinton Foundation. You can see Clinton's Arms Export policies while she was Secretary of State favouring extensively Saudi Arabia.** It's not just Hillary Clinton. Even before Hillary Clinton, a variety of US policies shifted by Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia extensively hires consultants-
71. Rattansi: But as President, would President Hillary Clinton be more likely to do the bidding of Saudi Arabia than President Obama, or actually does it make any difference?
72. Assange: I'm not sure it makes a difference compared to Obama. I'm not aware of significant Relationships between Trump and Saudi Arabia. **He would probably, I imagine, develop those Relationships rather swiftly once he was in Office.** There's a turning point in the United States, potentially a turning point in Relation to Saudi Arabia policy, because the United States is about to become a net exporter of Oil because of Shell. So the dependency on Saudi Arabia is no longer there. In fact, Saudi Arabia is a oil competitor or soon-to-be oil competitor to the United States. The existing financial and personal ties and Arms Export ties to Saudi Arabia, those will still be there, but the Relationship can go to one of a deep embrace in dependency to a more independent kind of Relationship. Arguably, that has already started to happen. The Iran Deal, it's part of Obama's and Kerry's legacy phase, probably couldn't have happened if it wasn't for those changing nature of the Oil Relationship between the two Countries.

73. Rattansi: William Binney, the whistleblower who's been on our show, says that the NSA can easily get access to all these emails, so if there is illegality in the pending emails of your release or malfeasance in the ones you've already released, President Obama could presumably act on it and get Hillary Clinton charged, regardless of whether you're about to release an email, which would mean that James Comey of the FBI would have no alternative but to arrest Hillary Clinton.
74. Assange: [Our View, which we have already stated, is that the Evidence that the FBI has is enough for a Grand Jury to indict already. That's not hard. It's actually a saying that a Grand Jury would indict a ham sandwich if you instructed it to do so. Because I have a Grand Jury myself, a federal Grand Jury in Washington, DC, I'm well aware of what they're like.](#) The prosecutor has to ask the Grand Jury to indict. If the prosecutor doesn't ask, the Grand Jury won't indict, so that's the basic problem.
75. Rattansi: Do you believe she can win given the emails you've so far-
76. Assange: Can she win the Election? That's an interesting Question. I wouldn't be willing to say so far we're releasing a number of-
77. Rattansi: Will it be up to Media to be covering WikiLeaks properly for her to lose?
78. Assange: There has been some decent coverage, to be fair. There's also a very fast turnaround. It's interesting to see how these Things go. You've got. News Organisations want an Audience, so initially People think, "Is that newsworthy?" Then there's a rush, a Competition for Audience. [Then you have the more politically connected People, the more senior Management in News Organisation going, "You know, this is not helpful for our industrial Interests or political Interests." And you have some of those Interests calling up and going, "What the hell are you doing?" Which is one of the things that came out in our emails, Debbie Wasserman Schultz calling up Phil Griffin, head of MSNBC.](#)
79. Rattansi: You're giving Trump the Election, in effect.
80. Assange: Hmm?
81. Rattansi: "What the hell are you doing" also in terms of you're giving Trump the Election, presumably.
82. Assange: [Yeah, calling up and saying, "Are you with us or against us? What's going on?" Then you see a kind of turnaround in coverage over the next few days. We're quite used to that with many different Publications.](#)
83. Rattansi: Just one last Question away from the US presidential Elections. It's five years since [Mark Duggan](#) was shot to Death by British Police. Of course, Black Lives Matter in the United States has come to the fore partly because of Evidence gained via Technology, well, phone footage. What message would you have for Black Lives Matter, both in the United States and here in Britain?
84. Assange: It's transparency. Transparency in Relation to DNC leak which took the head of Debbie Wasserman Schultz, head of the Democratic Party, that came from us presenting to the public pristine, original documentation of what People were doing. Black Lives Matter movement has come up, yes, by hard Work for activists, but the core of what is driving it is footage that is undeniable. It's not a matter of "Do you believe the Police? Do you believe the friends of the Person who were shot, the Witnesses?" No, there's undeniable footage of exactly what has occurred, and that is what is stimulating the ... Probably, it's what's not only stimulating parts of the black Community. I think the black Community has understood this for all too long, actually. But it's stimulating enormous acceptance and sympathy outside the black Community because their Argument is proven.
85. Rattansi: Julian Assange, thank you.
86. Assange: You're welcome.