



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on February 28, 2018

The Russia Collusion Suspect Nobody's Talking About: CrowdStrike's Dmitri Alperovitch

Dmitri Alperovitch has played a key role in diverting attention from Hillary Clinton's documented unethical, illegal, and treasonous activities with Putin to allegations of ties between Donald Trump and Putin, for which no evidence has been forthcoming. Is Alperovitch, in reality, one of Putin's best deep-cover agents?



Before the WikiLeaks announcement in 2016 that it would be releasing thousands of e-mails from the Democratic National Committee, few Americans had heard of the cybersecurity firm CrowdStrike or Dmitri Alperovitch (shown), its Russian-Ukrainian cofounder and chief technology officer. He is still far from being a household name, but he remains a central figure in the ongoing "Trump-Russia collusion" investigations by Senate and House committees and Special Counsel Robert Mueller.

That WikiLeaks announcement, by the whistleblowing organization's spokesman Julian Assange, came on June 12, a little over a month before the 2016 Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia. The Hillary Clinton campaign, still facing an insurgency from staunch Bernie Sanders supporters, was thrown into a panic. The WikiLeaks release was seen as something that could seriously sabotage her march to the White House. Clinton and her Democratic National Committee allies — which appear to have included virtually all the top-tier DNC officials — decided the best defense would be an aggressive offense. They would make a pre-emptive damage-control strike to shift media and public attention away from the content of the e-mails (which they knew would be damning) to the provenance of the e-mails. They would divert the focus away from the embarrassing, unethical, and illegal actions revealed in the e-mails to how they were obtained and by whom.

As mentioned above, the WikiLeaks announcement came on June 12. Two days later, on June 14, DNC contractor CrowdStrike announced (via the *Washington Post*) that its forensic analysis of the DNC server had determined malware had been injected into the server — and it had been done by Russians. Not just any Russians, mind you, but agents of Vladimir Putin. Alperovitch and CrowdStrike's Shawn Henry (a former FBI executive under Director Robert Mueller and President Obama) told the *Post* that their investigation revealed the DNC server had been hacked by the cyber-espionage groups known as "Fancy Bear," allegedly associated with the Russian GRU (military intelligence) and "Cozy Bear," allegedly associated with the FSB (the successor to the infamous Soviet KGB).

The following day, on June 15, the "Russian hacking" narrative was reinforced by "Guccifer 2.0," an



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on February 28, 2018

anonymous Internet persona, who claimed that the forensics of the DNC server showed it had been tainted with “Russian fingerprints.”

Hillary Clinton and her campaign chairman John Podesta, along with their DNC auxiliaries, immediately launched their brazen Russia-bashing program, claiming that Putin was interfering in our presidential election to keep her out of the White House and put his “puppet,” Donald Trump, into the Oval Office. It was precisely the kind of audacious response one would expect from Podesta, who earned notoriety as a shrewd and ruthless political operative while serving as chief of staff to President Bill Clinton. In that post, he proved his worth as the master of damage control, handling Bill Clinton’s scandals du jour cavalcade: Chinagate, Troopergate, Coffeegate, Bimbogate, etc. Besides diverting attention from the e-mails released by WikiLeaks, the Russia-Trump collusion accusations served other purposes as well. Certainly among the foremost of those purposes was that accusing Trump of colluding with Russia would bolster Hillary’s image as an anti-Putin hardliner. This was not only a move calculated to counter Hillary’s and the Democrats’ images as historically “soft on communism” and “soft on national security/national defense,” but calculated also to serve as a sort of immunity against investigation and prosecution of Bill and Hillary Clinton, John Podesta, and many others in their circle for their own well-documented corrupt, illegal, and treasonous dealings with Putin and Russia, which we have reported on extensively over many years (see [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#), for example).

However, the “Trump-Russia collusion” meme would not have taken hold and could not have continued causing the political distraction and upheaval more than a year into the Trump administration simply on the strength of Clinton, Podesta, and the DNC. The ongoing campaign against President Trump has only remained viable because of the continuous support and connivance of [Deep State operatives in the intelligence community and the major media](#).

This connivance was apparent from the start, when the DNC and CrowdStrike refused to allow official analysts from the FBI, CIA, NSA, and other agencies to examine the DNC server that was supposedly hacked by the Russians. One might expect that, in response, the “rebuffed” intelligence and law-enforcement agencies would refrain from endorsing the conclusions of a report that was obviously serving a partisan political purpose and that was based on evidence that they had not seen, because it had been purposely withheld from them. But no, the politically appointed intel chiefs lined up to parrot the Clinton/DNC/CrowdStrike line that Putin had interfered in the U.S. presidential election to torpedo Hillary Clinton and aid Donald Trump.

Phony “Fingerprints,” Phony “Hack”

Like the phony [“Russia dossier”](#) on Trump produced by Christopher Steele and Fusion GPS for Hillary Clinton and the DNC, the CrowdStrike “analysis” quickly came unraveled under expert examination. Among the many authoritative refutations of CrowdStrike’s claims are an early analysis by former top IBM executive Skip Folden, entitled [“Non-Existent Foundation for Russian Hacking Charge”](#) and [“Intel Vets Challenge ‘Russia Hack’ Evidence”](#) by Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS). The VIPS study, led by the legendary Dr. William Binney, a former technical director at the NSA, also benefitted from the input of VIPS members who were cybersecurity experts with the NSA, CIA, DIA, FBI, and military intelligence.

Among their most important finds are these two critical points:

1) The claimed “Russian fingerprints” provide no trace routing to prove that any “hacking” was done by Russian intelligence operatives. The software and methods allegedly used are commonly available and



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on February 28, 2018

commonly used by many private individuals, criminal syndicates, and state actors. Moreover, the “Russian” traces are so crude as to be obvious plants pointing to the Russians, whereas, if Putin’s cyberspooks had actually done it, they would have done a more professional job of covering their tracks, the experts say, and;

2) The “hack” of the DNC was actually a leak, not a hack. The technical analysis of the security breach shows that the DNC e-mails were copied onto a USB device, such as a thumb drive, by someone physically at the DNC headquarters, not downloaded via a remote connection on the Internet. Thus it was a leak by someone at the DNC, not Russian hackers, who provided the data to WikiLeaks. That’s not an insignificant distinction!

In addition to the Folden and VIPS reports, other top-grade technical experts who have challenged and discredited the faux “intelligence community consensus” on the DNC hacking include:

- Mark Maunder, CEO of cybersecurity firm Wordfence;
- Rob Graham, CEO of Errata Security;
- Robert M. Lee, CEO of the security company Dragos;
- Gregory Copley, president of the International Strategic Studies Association (ISSA); and
- Jeffrey Carr, principal consultant for 20KLeague.com, founder of Suits and Spooks, author of *Inside Cyber Warfare*, and a lecturer at the Army War College and the Defense Intelligence Agency.

In short, what we have is very credible technical analysis that challenges the claim of “Russian hacking” vs. a Clinton-DNC contractor who has a motive to produce a scenario that his employer is demanding. We also have the unexplained refusal of the Clinton-DNC “victims” to provide the evidence of the supposed crime to law-enforcement and intelligence authorities. Finally, and most suspiciously, we have the intelligence community (IC) that fails to demand seeing the evidence before endorsing the DNC/CrowdStrike verdict — a verdict that is obviously politically expedient.

In addition to the technical forensic analysis that discredits the “Russian hacking” charges, we also have the claims of two WikiLeaks principals involved in the DNC e-mail breach who insist that the data was obtained via an inside leak, not a Russian Hack. WikiLeaks spokesman Julian Assange has repeatedly and emphatically stated that neither Russia nor anyone associated with Russia had anything to do with providing WikiLeaks with the DNC e-mails. For many people, however, Assange’s denials are barely more credible than those of Vladimir Putin himself, even though Assange and WikiLeaks have — time after time — reliably delivered precisely what they promised and have been non-partisan, exposing wrongdoing regardless of the wrongdoers’ political affiliations. Assange is not alone, though, in denying a Russian source connection. Craig Murray, the human-rights whistleblower and former British ambassador to Uzbekistan, has said in interviews with two British newspapers, [The Guardian](#) and [Daily Mail Online](#), that he personally flew to Washington, D.C., and met with the DNC employee who provided him with the DNC e-mails to give to WikiLeaks. “I’ve met the person who leaked them,” Murray told *The Guardian*, “and they are certainly not Russian and it’s an insider. It’s a leak, not a hack.” Ambassador Murray’s career has shown him to be a credible witness, as well as heroically courageous. In exposing the brutal communist dictatorship of Uzbek President Islam Karimov, he also stood up to the British Foreign Office, which was covering for Karimov, and in so doing, sacrificed his diplomatic career and drew down on himself a vicious campaign of character assassination aimed at destroying his reputation. Thus, we have highly credible technical analysis that asserts the DNC e-mails were obtained by leak,



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on February 28, 2018

not hack, and we have a credible witness/participant who testifies that he received the DNC data from a DNC “insider” and delivered them to WikiLeaks.

Who is Dmitri Alperovitch?

Who is Dmitri Alperovitch, and why is his highly suspect CrowdStrike analysis accepted as gospel by the DNC, Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, the IC, and the IC-tainted [Big Media “Mockingbirds”](#)? Dmitri Alperovitch was born in Moscow in 1980, which is to say, during the latter years of the Soviet Union. There seem to be large gaps in his *curriculum vitae* concerning his life before emigrating to the U.S., making his background somewhat mysterious, which, some might think, would be problematical for someone who is reputed to be a top go-to guy on cyber security. But it certainly doesn’t seem to be problematic for major investors such as CapitalG (formerly Google Capital), which led a \$100 million capital drive for CrowdStrike in 2015. By May of 2017, *Business Insider* [reported](#), Alperovitch’s startup had attracted over \$256 million and its stock was valued at just under \$1 billion.

Billionaire Eric Schmidt, the longtime CEO of Google (and its parent company, Alphabet, Inc.) is, of course, a big-time DNC donor, and was a major supporter of both Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, as were many other Google executives. Schmidt was a principal investor in The Groundwork, a start-up tech company formed to assist Hillary Clinton’s presidential campaign. Besides Google, CrowdStrike has benefitted from cash infusions from Warburg Pincus, Accel Partners, Telstra, and March Capital Partners.

Just as interesting as Alperovitch’s apparent Midas touch is his cachet with the elite media and the great and the good of the globalist one-world set. He has been the subject of flattering profiles at *Esquire*, *Fortune*, *Politico*, the *Washington Post*, NPR, CNBC, and many other media herd venues. He is also featured as an anointed expert at such exclusive insider assemblages as the [Council on Foreign Relations \(CFR\)](#), the [World Economic Forum](#), the [Aspen Institute](#), the [Brookings Institution](#), the [Center for Strategic and International Studies](#), the [Atlantic Council](#) (where he is a senior fellow), and the [Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs](#) at Harvard University (where he is also a senior fellow).

All of the above organizations — most especially the [CFR](#) — have [longstanding, troubling ties to the Deep State intelligence services](#). Notwithstanding Alperovitch’s many elitist ties listed above, it is his connections to the Atlantic Council that are especially noteworthy, as they illustrate the extensive and dangerous interconnectedness of these private globalist organizations with think tanks, major corporations, intelligence agencies, national governments, the United Nations, and other intergovernmental organizations. These private globalist organizations form the top level of the pyramid of power of the state-within-the-state — the Deep State — and they consider themselves above the rule of law and all that stuff meant for lower mortals.

The Atlantic Council is subsidized by taxpayers through its government-related funding partners, which include the U.S. State Department; the European Union; the European Investment Bank; NATO; and the governments of Norway, Sweden, Japan, Finland, Lithuania, South Korea, Cyprus, Latvia, and Slovakia; among others. The Atlantic Council’s corporate sponsors include JPMorgan Chase, the Blackstone Group, Bank of America, Airbus, Chevron, ExxonMobil, Ford, Saab, Zurich, Walmart Stores, Inc., Lockheed Martin, 21st Century Fox, Arab Bank, Boeing, CIGNA Corporation, Coca-Cola Company, Raytheon, Pfizer, and many others. Besides the Rockefeller and Soros foundations, the Atlantic Council also receives generous handouts from the usual establishment tax-exempt foundations that fund globalist and leftwing causes.



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on February 28, 2018

The Atlantic Council's website tells us, "In 1961, former Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and Christian Herter, with Will Clayton, William Foster, Theodore Achilles and other distinguished Americans, recommended the consolidation of the U.S. citizens groups supporting the Atlantic Alliance into the Atlantic Council of the United States."

What the Atlantic Council's website doesn't mention is that all of these founders were also leading members of the CFR, the principal organization pushing for world government and the annihilation of national sovereignty for most of the past century. Virtually all of the individuals populating the Atlantic Council's [historical roster](#) of its current and past chairmen, presidents, and directors are/were also prominent CFR members. The Atlantic Council represents and projects the CFR globalist agenda on a multitude of political and economic issues, as, for instance, in its support for the TTIP (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership), the UN Climate treaty, increased Muslim migration into Europe, expanded EU control over its member states, expanded funding and powers for the United Nations and NATO, and much more. The Atlantic Council is a staunch opponent of the Brexit, President Donald Trump, nationalist-populist movements, and the burgeoning independent media.

It is the Atlantic Council's involvement in launching an insidious campaign to stamp out the growing Internet-based independent media that is our main concern here, and the area where Dmitri Alperovitch appears to be a central character. A key instrument in that effort is a group of anonymous national security and cybersecurity "experts" who claim to be fighting Russian propaganda in the alternative media. The group, which goes by the name "Is It Propaganda Or Not?" or "PropOrNot" (www.propornot.com), joined up with Snopes, Politifact, Fake News Watch, Fort Liberty Hoax Sites, and other left-leaning groups to attack conservative and libertarian news sites. It has been boosted in this treacherous attack on the First Amendment by the *Washington Post*, the *New Republic*, and other members of the Fourth Estate with deep ties to the Deep State. This danger has been amplified by the efforts of Google, Facebook, Twitter, and other tech giants to censor politically incorrect speech on the Internet. We first wrote about PropOrNot in a December 2016 article, ["FAKE NEWS: Media Hysteria Over Irrelevant Fake Websites Masks More Sinister Agenda."](#)

In a forthcoming article, we will be examining the threat to our freedom of speech posed by the PropOrNot-Deep State complex and the roles of Alperovitch, CrowdStrike, Google, CFR-Atlantic Council, and the "intelligence community" in that ongoing dangerous attack on liberty.

Image: screenshot from [YouTube video of CBS News interview with Dmitri Alperovitch](#)

Related articles:

[Deep State: Underbelly of the Intelligence Community](#)

[All-out War: Deep State vs. Trump](#)

[Hey, Mueller, Here's Proof of Election-influencing Collusion With Foreign Nationals](#)

[Mueller Indictments: "Smoking Gun" or "Exoneration"?](#)

[Deep State: Why Did the Del Beccaro Timeline of Obama DOJ-FBI Abuse Disappear?](#)

[Deep State-Fake News Marriage: CIA, NSA, FBI Operatives Join Media In Drones](#)

[FBI Informant in UraniumGate Case: Moscow Funneled Millions to Benefit Clinton Foundation](#)



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.



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.

Subscribe