



Even if the Russians Did Hack the E-mails, So What?

“The Russians hacked the election!” say Democrats trying to discredit Donald Trump’s presidency. Of course, their statement is deceptive, referring only to the theory that the Russians provided WikiLeaks with the campaign season’s revelatory Democrat e-mails.

Not surprisingly, the Fake (establishment) Media has embraced the theory, which is probably the best argument for its falsity. In addition, WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange [denies Russian involvement](#). So does Britain’s former ambassador to Uzbekistan, Craig Murray, who [said](#) “I’ve met the person who leaked them [the e-mails]” and that [the individual is an “insider”](#) representing Democrats angry over “the corruption of the Clinton Foundation and the tilting of the primary election playing field against Senator Bernie Sanders.” Moreover, both FBI director James Comey and James Clapper, director of national intelligence, said there’s “no credible evidence” Russia influenced November 8’s outcome, [according](#) to reporter Ed Klein. Yet whatever the truth, the more important matter is that the issue is being used as a distraction and a tool for disruption.

What was actually revealed by WikiLeaks and what effect it had are being conflated with the matter of who revealed it, as if the messenger somehow changes the message. Consider an analogy: Imagine it came to light that a Capitol Hill restaurant’s kitchen was filthy and vermin-infested. Would the health department’s course of action be dictated by whether the information came from a disgruntled employee or an investigative reporter who illegally gained access to the kitchen? If the latter, would Washington Democrats still eat there?

As a reminder, the WikiLeaks e-mails contained damning information showing direct collusion between the mainstream media and the Hillary Clinton campaign, including evidence that a CNN figure gave Clinton debate questions ahead of time, thus disadvantaging primary-season opponent Sanders. They contained other dirt on the Democrats as well. Is anyone but Clinton and her apologists upset these truths came to light?

Of course, our systems must be made safe from intrusion by foreign actors, but this gets at an important point: It will reflect better on the Democrats if the WikiLeaks source is a leaker. After all,





Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 22, 2016

whose systems were supposedly hacked and under whose watch would it have occurred?

Answers: the Democrats' systems and the Obama administration.

The *New York Times* recently ran a painfully long article about how “how Russian cyberpower invaded the U.S.,” calling it “The Perfect weapon.” But the piece mainly illustrates how Democrat and administration entities exhibited the perfect storm of incompetence. The *Times* [writes](#) of how its examination “based on interviews with dozens of players targeted in the attack, intelligence officials who investigated it and Obama administration officials who deliberated over the best response — reveals a series of missed signals, slow responses and a continuing underestimation of the seriousness of the cyberattack.”

In contrast, there reportedly was also a [hacking attempt by Russia on the Republicans](#). It apparently didn't work, however, because they actually secured their systems.

So here's the Democrat complaint, translated: “We were too incompetent to secure our systems — or react promptly to a perceived threat by a hostile foreign actor — and as a result damning truths about us were revealed. We're such victims!”

Taking the above together with Hillary Clinton's use of a “home-brew” server to send classified e-mails, and that the FBI [stated](#) there appeared to be hacking attempts on it, a question is raised: Were these people ever qualified to be at the nation's helm, in charge of national security?

In the 1997 film *Liar Liar*, Jim Carrey plays a shyster lawyer who, after a birthday wish made by his son comes true, is suddenly incapable of telling a lie. Objecting to the opposing counsel's argument in court but robbed of his verbal legerdemain, he responds to the judge's question as to why he objected by [saying](#), with the only argument he could honestly muster, “Because it's devastating to my case!”

That is essentially the democrats' gripe regarding the quite true WikiLeaks revelations. Objection overruled.

[Contact Selwyn Duke](#), [follow him on Twitter](#) or log on to [SelwynDuke.com](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.