



TAPE NO or FILE No: 40

TIMECODE	NAME	Dialogue
	INTERVIEWEE	Casual pre-interview chat while film crew sets up. - It's all about the conspiracy between me and beraskovski
	INTV	No. Because of bielarus or because of ...
	INTERVIEWEE	Umm...I don't know. I mean it could be
	INTV	You know because I spent a year with the...
	INTERVIEWEE	Maybe the CIA, Berezovsky or something
	INTV	Fine well that's ...ummm...well I spent a year with ...so did you ever actually come across Goldfarm his
	INTERVIEWEE	I never met Berezovsky and didn't have anything to do with Berezovsky or any of Berezovsky's people
	INTV	Well I knew him all too well
	INTERVIEWEE	Yep?
	INTV	He's an extraordinary man,
	INTERVIEWEE	An extraordinary operator
	INTV	I did a film on the Oligarchs where they were finally tussling with Putin for power and so it was Berezovsky, Hornikovski and Muchkov
	INTERVIEWEE	Yep
	INTV	And it was when umm...yep the Muchkov film in retrospect was actually the most amazing film but there was Berezovsky paying for Ukranian the revolution and he disappeared from filming. "Oh Patrick I have flu". And so I'd say [laugh]...eventually I worked out what was going on but only eventually after about a month. I rang up and said " Boris does the flu come from Kiev" and he said "Oh you are naughty man " and so it ran that way and then there was..oh I can't remember...Nirvana Asyeta man..what's his name - Miratov. Standing there and he said"What are you doing" . It's an interesting time. Boris is causing trouble. And so we just... . You should see the film - there's a fantastic..!m...
	INTERVIEWEE	Which film is that?
	INTV	I think his sanity is slowly crumbling at the reality of it all...but er...he um..
	INTERVIEWEE	A real choice act was when um...some of Lebedev's banks were raided in the Ukraine
	INTV	Oh yes.
	INTERVIEWEE	And then he said the reason for this raid was because we had entered into a ...Wikileaks had entered into a partnership with Naboya Gazzetta..and that's why his bank was raided in the Ukraine.
	INTV	Well of course ..And in the film . In our film with Luzhkov he was then in alliance with Putin so at that stage And he was going

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies
 INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange
 TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46

		against Luzhkov who was the sort of public face of the anti Luzhkov campaign and there came a moment when the Kremlin had cut their deal with Luzhkov which in essence was..you don't run for President, and if they marry Moscow that's it. And the phone call came through Lebda Camera saying..OK, we've received the planes. Now you make a decision do you want to continue the campaign or not..doosh. Cos he then had a third share of an airline and he said hmm this is one of those moment in my life this. And it's like...right and ...strangely enough the campaign got a bit watered down but to his credit he did sort of keep it going. I think his calculation was that Luzhkov would get found out...anyway..shall we ..are you alright?
10:05:06	INTV	So, anyway I'm going to ask you a question that you've not been asked before in a burst of originality, umm..
	INTV	So, first question, not the most original question. why did you set up WikiLeaks in the very, very, very first place? Go on.
	INTV	Yes chuck it away
	INTERVIEWEE	Yes throw away the paper
	INTV	Throw away the papers, be a human being, we like you being human
	INTERVIEWEE	So how long do you want these answers to be?
	INTV	I don't care, as long as you want.
	INTERVIEWEE	How many questions have you got?
	INTV	Oh tons, I've got lots but you know, be yourself I think is the main thing.
15.05.56	JULIAN	We all have certain talents and abilities and capital, and we all live only once, and we all have our own temperament, and come from a particular culture. The combination of my temperament, the knowledge that I knew, the capital I had, and the culture that I came from, the Australian culture, resulted in a belief that I could change the world in a certain way that would appeal to me philosophically, and I set about bringing together my abilities, my friends, and the capital that I had, to achieve that purpose.
	INTV	And the spark?
15.06.41	JULIAN	You know, you want a little spark but actually this is part-, part of a-, a 20-year development that I had been involved in for a-, a long time, er the democratisation of information, the democratisation of knowledge, um the fight against censorship, the fight to secure people in their communications, give them the right to communicate with each other. That is something that I've been doing since I was 17, in one form or another, um becoming more professional and sophisticated as time went by. And there wasn't one particular spark, I had engaged in this um parts of this task back in 1999 in a concrete manner, concrete ties to the degree that I had registered leaks.org as a domain name. Um the bringing together some other components and-, and making the-, the theory behind the operation at WikiLeaks stronger um is something that was-, wasn't properly coalesced until 2006, and i-, it is not just a matter of my getting the theory mostly right, um and pulling in
15.07.29		

15.08.20		<p>the required resources, there is also another factor which is that the expenses required to do such a task, um the cost of internet communications, um were going down during that period. The number of jurisdictions which had a decent internet presence er was increasing, and the ability to-, to transfer money quickly from one jurisdiction to another also increased. So, the desire, the ability, and the times came together in such a way that permitted me to then roll out a multi-national technological organisation with a dedicated philosophical purpose, um and um do so with the capital and assets that I had.</p>
	INTV	<p>And the theory, the-, the definition of the philosophy, I know, you know, it's a tricky philosophy to sum up, but how-, what is it?</p>
15.08.56 15.09.51	JULIAN	<p>Well it-, there's three-, a number of pillars to look at this by. So, in the abstract civilisation as we know it is built upon our understanding of the rules of engagement that we have with each other, and with nature. It is built up as a result of information that we have learnt, knowledge that we have acquired individually from our direct experiences, and also knowledge that we have acquired through a mediated experience, from others, from history, from TV, from media and so on. And the sum pool of our knowledge altogether is what defines our limits as a civilisation, it defines how civil we can be, and when we look at inventions like the writing or the Gutenberg Press we see corresponding with them the ability to transfer knowledge from one person to another so that we can interact with nature in a way that is beneficial to us, and interact with each other in a way that is more beneficial. That is we are able to not simply do the done thing, because we can learn from the experience of others about how the world-, the natural world actually behaves, and how we behave, and how human institutions behave. So the-, our shared intellectual history, history itself you might call it-,</p>
	INTV	<p>Yeah.</p>
15.10.28 15.11.25	JULIAN	<p>The entire history of ideas, all the ideas that we have access to, the knowl-, our knowledge about the world, defines the parameters under which we all act in a rational way. Of course all of us also act in an irrational way and societies act in an irrational way, but there's nothing rational we can do about irrationality. Our ability as rational actors to shape our destiny is limited to our rational actions, and our rational actions are based upon what we know about the world, so in order to make our rational act-, actions as humane as possible we need the greatest source of input to our decision-making processes, individually and as a society, and as a global civilisation. So, there are th-, three types of history, by history I don't mean something that is 2,000 years old, by history I mean all that we know, including the history of last week. History circa now. Um so tho-, those three types of intellectual information or three types of history, er number one, history which has an ongoing industrial subsidy, that is how to make concrete, how to make windows, how to make pumps, how to smelt steel, etc. That seems to be dry and boring to most people but is actually the most important information in the world is how to harvest a crop, how to make metal and so on. However, it is stabilised history, there is existing industrial bases um and groups who have acquired that knowledge about the world and the knowledge about how to</p>

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies

INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange

TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46

15.12.23		structure some human interaction and organisational interaction, and have um stored it and teach it and will continue to um curate that information for the foreseeable future. So there is no need for us to assist with that cu-, curation. It's alr-, job is-, task is already done.
	INTV	Yeah.
15.12.47	JULIAN	There is the second type of history which-, history which does not have a curator but is not under threat. So that is the information that is-, has been produced by industrial bases that are no longer profitable. So, those include the books that have gone out of print, for example, that-, that are there, er various projects have digitised some of those, others are sitting in second-hand bookshops, um and so on. Um so, why some of that information may be important one day no one is actively trying to stop it and it has already been made. Um it is important to try and stop it disappearing, but others are engaged in that task and no one is actively trying to stop them. Then there's the third type of history that-, an intellectual knowledge that I am the most interested in because it doesn't have existing support, and neither have we ever had this branch of history to any significant degree, that is information about how human institutions actually behave. We have never had that information, and the reason that we haven't had it is because human institutions, in order to increase their institutional power and stop themselves being predictable, have tried to keep that branch of history obscured, and when someone goes about obtaining part of it in relation to an institution, some classified document for example, or a document about corporate strategy, or whole emails of Enron or something, and try-, tries to bring that into the light, and successfully brings it out, processes start to suppress that information and remove it from our shared knowledge of the world. So, this particular branch is interesting to me, and the other two we already have. This one we do not have. And when we look at all the political theories about how the world should be, or should not be, and what actions should be taken, or should not be taken, to push the world in one direction or another, we should ask under-, what information are these political theories based on. Because all theories must be based on experimental evidence, in the case of political theories they are based upon the knowledge that we have of how human institutions actually behave, but we don't know how human institutions actually behave because human institutions throughout history have tried to prevent how they actually behave entering into history. Therefore it is not possible to adduce, to create, a political theory that has as its goal a recommendation for certain actions to take place in order to reform human institutions, and all political theories in their essence have as a goal the desire to reform human institutions, and human society. So, we cannot say is capitalism right, is Marxism wrong, etc, etc, we're not there yet, we're not even there yet.
15.13.39		
15.14.08		
15.15.07		
15.16.03		
	INTV	Yeah.
15.16.32	JULIAN	First we have to understand what is the world that we are living in, how do human institutions actually behave in the 21st century where they span the globe, etc. Um once we understand how they actually behave, then we can start making theories about what we should do to make them behave better. So that is the-,

		the overarching theory behind WikiLeaks.
	INTV	So it's almost a theory of rational expectations, here, this is-,
15.16.58	JULIAN	Yeah.
	INTV	Yeah.
15.17.00	JULIAN	Okay, um and there are certain tasks we have to do that, we need to pull out the information from these institutions-,
	INTV	Uh-huh.
15.17.10	JULIAN	That describes how they behave internally and bring it out into our shared historical knowledge um where we can all think about it and ponder it, and do something about it. And um so that-, because those institutions-, because human institutions are resistant er to being opened up it requires work to do so. Now, so that is a long-term and very ambitious project, to adduce enough information about how our human institutions in the 21st century that span the globe actually behave, such that we can then create political theories which are informed and robust and can recommend actions about what to do to reform those institutions, and human society in general. It's very ambitious, er and what if it's wrong?
15.17.57		
	INTV	Well what if there's a limit to it? What is the limit to it?
15.18.12	JULIAN	What if it's wrong, or what-, what if we can't actually get there. So, part of the-, the theory behind WikiLeaks is that we should not make the mistake that other meta-political theories have made, or political theories, which is to propose an end state and then work towards this end state in various ways, and make many compromises in order to get to this end state. Because what is often found is that the end state was illusory, it was an illusion, or by the time you get near the end state the rules of the game played have changed so much that that end state no longer has any meaning. Um or that in order to pursue the goal of getting to the end state one engages in so many compromises that you actually corrupt the goal that you were trying to reach. And communism under Stalin, you know, classic example of um the end justifies the means and um the means being very aggressive, um but never getting to the end, and so um producing a-, a net bad effect overall. Um so, our particular course of action is predicated on that this is not just about the end, this is about each day as well. So, when we look to see how we can create justice in the interim, remember justice as a-, as a big-, justice as an overall concept comes from individuals' knowledge about whether the world is just or not, and how they interplay with the world, and how individuals can cooperate with each other in an efficient manner, instead of be hostile with each other. So that's knowledge about how to engage and um knowledge about how to ga-, engage in a more complex but more just interaction.
15.19.16		
15.20.27		
	INTV	Mmm.
15.20.30	JULIAN	Which is not sometimes always obvious. A trivial example is the water ritual in most Western cultures where two glasses are on the table, and a jug, you want some water so you pour someone else some water, and then you pour yourself some water, um as

<p>15.21.19</p> <p>15.22.12</p> <p>15.23.17</p>		<p>opposed to doing the-, the most basic thing which is to just grab the glass and pour yourself some water. And that water ritual comes from, or has evolved but if-, if you look at it at a sort of um in-, in game theory it is more efficient actually to pour the other person's glass of water first, and then your own, um because of all the steps that they will do after you've poured yourself water, and so on, you want to keep the relation, etc. So, these basic things that if we have more understanding about the world we can cooperate in a way that is more just, that is an overarching theory, but then, when we look at each piece of information um we can ponder whether that information results in justice or not-, or not. Knowledge as a-, as a whole, if people have it, seems to, the overwhelming evidence is, produce more just civilisations, but if we look at a single piece of knowledge, will that contribute towards justice or not, and given that we have limited capacities, all of us have limited capacities, all the institutions have limited capacities, what sort of information should we go after first. And looking at it from perspective of an institution, all institutions, all, are engaged in unjust activities, some obviously greatly exceed that of others. So, when trying to find the information that um will likely lead to a state of enhanced justice we look for that information which the institution does not want to be released, because that is a signal that the information can do something if it's released. That is that the institution who created it, the institution who knows best about the power of the information, is spending economic effort to prevent it from being released. And that is why I have always said that censorship, while it is something to be condemned, it is always an optimistic signal, it is always an opportunity, because censorship reveals the fear of reform by knowledge. That is if knowledge can be drawn out, then some action will take place which will result in some kind of reform. Now, I don't say that all suppressed knowledge will always result in positive reform, but it is the best signal that we have that it might.</p>
	<p>INTV</p>	<p>But the counterfactual will be that they've made the right decision, wouldn't it? That they've made a right ...</p>
<p>15.23.44</p> <p>15.24.48</p>	<p>JULIAN</p>	<p>Well right-, right for who, you see, so, r-, for their, you know, maybe they've made an irrational decision even for an institution because people are foolish sometimes. Um but your-, your basic assumption is-, is that they-, an institution makes decisions in order to increase the institutional power of the institution, um or to preserve it. Um that's the-, that is true for all institutions, that basic understanding. So, given that there is so much potential knowledge in the world, so given that there is so much non-public information in the world, and we have limited capacities, all of us have limited capacities, we seek that information which is the most powerful at producing reform, and to find it we seek a signal which is the economic work being put into suppressing the information, and that's the best signal to consider whether something should then become public. Um and so, WikiLeaks does it in a number of ways, but because there are very many institutions in the world um and the knowledge about um which information is being the most suppressed in the institution is internal to that institution, the best way, the most efficient way, for that information to be drawn out is t-, by appealing to the insiders in the institution, because they already know where the bodies are buried. So if they can be</p>

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies
 INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange
 TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46

15.25.44		<p>inspired and protected to bring this information out, um then we don't need to go hunting institution by institution to-, to see where the suppressed knowledge is, the insiders know where the suppressed knowledge is and the insiders can bring it out. So, we embarked on a course, as well as doing everything else in terms of protecting our publications, making sure the knowledge once published could not be suppressed and helping other journalists and human rights activists who had been censored, we also looked to inspire sources within organisations who were bringing knowledge out. And doing so, yes, by various legal and political and technical means to protect them, um but also to lionise them, to raise them up, to-, to raise up the role of a whistleblower, or a confidential journalistic source, to raise up its stature, and say that these are people who start reform. It starts from here, and then it comes to us, and then it goes to the rest of the media, and then it goes to the rest of the world, and then it goes to investigators, and then it goes to lawyers who sue for victims, and then it goes to political reform process, etc, but it starts with these insiders, and if they do not take the first step it is very hard for everyone else to take the step. Now, because they are insiders, and because of their difficult legal or job er or threa-, threat of violence position they have been exploited previously, so the media has exploited these people previously and has not given them their due. There are tens of thousands of journalism awards around the world every year, there is not a single award for sources anywhere in the world, any year, but it all starts from here. So, we quite deliberately lionise these people and put them back onto the pedestal they belonged on. The reason they were never on this pedestal is because they were anonymous and they couldn't come out, so it al-, it allowed people to steal their credit very easily, the credit they deserved, and um these-, it's not that these individuals um are inspired by fame, not at all because they don't get any fame, but rather we want-, wanted to demonstrate to them the legitimacy of their actions, that we and others thought that their activities were extremely important, er and give them back the true importance that they have. And that lionising the source is one of the reasons that so many sources have trusted us, and come towards us.</p>
15.26.48		
15.27.48		
	INTV	So how-,

TAPE NO or FILE No: 41

TIMECODE	NAME	Dialogue
10:29:54	INTV	So yes, ..oh we are...umm...right so the question I was going to ask..
	INTV	So, how important is the person, man or woman, woman or man, who supplies the cables?
15.30.09 15.30.57	JULIAN	Well, whoever those people are they're um they are the initiator, they are er the person who, or persons who um set off this process. Um of course they do so within a particular set of values, um which is rather interesting at the moment, that-, that our values um of lionising the source and freedom of information, the right to communicate knowledge, and the reform effects, and the justice that can come from it etc, has permeated um internet youth culture, and has moved even up from youth culture into adults, er and into those individuals who then gain employment in these um organisations or whose parents are already in those organisations. Um but it all starts with-, with their step, or perhaps another way to put it is if they do not take the critical step nothing happens. So they-, they're critical to every subsequent act.
	INTV	So, why you helping them?
15.31.20	JULIAN	Mmm?
	INTV	Why you helping them? I mean why do it, I mean, we've all got talents, we've all got things, why you-,
15.31.26	JULIAN	Well it is-, it is nice to help courageous people who seek justice, I mean the um each person to a degree likes to help someone they consider one of their own, that they share values with, so that's very easy to do. Um but it-, it is more that they enter into a larger process, they are the seed that starts a larger process um but the larger process is also necessary, um which is the amplification and spreading of that knowledge into the world in such a way that it will have the greatest effect.
	INTV	Right, something particular for just a second, um you see the attack er Apache footage for the first time and what was your immediate reaction, and did-, how did you come to see it, where did you see it, what, you know, how did it all start?
15.32.22	JULIAN	Well I cannot say for reasons of source protection um when I first saw that footage, clearly, or where, um but interestingly when I first saw it um I didn't think much at all. Um it's a helicopter on some streets um, if you watch for a long time there was a bit of shooting, it's rather confused, and then a little bit more, and then it's very boring for another 30 minutes and so on. And-, and that is what er informed the-, that is what decided how we did the eventual documentary. So, it was that when I first saw it I was not shocked, at all, um mind you I've seen a lot of bad things in my time, but when I first saw it I was not shocked at all, um I thought that's interesting, um but I thought it's interesting because um this is

15.33.21		<p>Apache footage, high resolution, um with a steady cam in the-, in the cockpit. Er that sort of footage hasn't been revealed publicly before, and that tells you something about how modern warfare-, how far down a-, an Apache can zoom and so on. Um that was instant. The-, the outrage or-, or the-, the concern for the people came later, once I had researched enough to understand who the people were, and I had followed the figures through um their course from in the beginning just milling around perfectly happily, walking down the street, etc, to being killed and running away and being wounded, dying in a gutter, and rescue vehicle coming and it being bl-, the guy had been blown to bits and then the vehicle being blown to bits and the children and so on. But um of course it-, it-, we did not know that there were journalists involved, um not that journalists deserve special attention, but rather we know for sure that the journalists are not um part of a military combat thing. Um and to see them being followed and to see that they had not engaged in any military conflict, these people, um that they were peaceful, milling around in a peaceful way, and the attack on them was unexpected to them, er they even looked up at one point to see the Apache in the sky and were like 'yeah, there's an Apache there'. So, um and the same with the vehicle rescuing, looked up to see the Apache, 'who did this?', 'Apache, Apache killed all those people', 'mmm, maybe, maybe not, anyway let's get this wounded man into the van', and leave, which was then-, they're all killed. Um so, seeing that it-, it was only as a result of investigating where this was, when it was, who it was, what happened to them, what happened to the-, that-, that there were children, what happened to the children, and all the lies that the Pentagon told at the time, all the extraordinary lies that um the van was destroyed by an Iraq um Iraqi insurgents' artillery shot, er that they didn't know how the children were-, were wounded, etc, um and the-, which The New York Times just printed whatever. So it was-, one of the working titles for this was Collateral Cover-up, because the cover-up element to it was so significant er in researching it. So, that's how it became more impactful to me, this-, as a result of seeing the difference between the reality of the situation as I researched all the points, and found out who all the parties are and what happened to the children and-, and what was said about it, and what was printed in The New York Times, which was completely different, um it-, it was-, oh and that um Reuters had tried to get this tape and then it was being suppressed, and that the investigation into the matter um had been suppressed, etc. It was all of this. So-, so then when we um cut um this short documentary version where we pointed out the different players and followed the two journalists along and zoomed up on the children to show that there they were sitting in the car windows, and gave the introductory narratives of where it was, when it was, and um some of the lies that had been told, um sorry, let's start again.</p>
15.34.04		
15.34.55		
15.35.52		
15.36.45		
	INTV	
	JULIAN	Um.
	INTV	So you've seen the-, you picked up the two kids in the video.
15.37.09	JULIAN	So-, so um I started off seeing the-, the raw tape and not being affected by it because it was completely unclear who was doing

15.37.51		<p>what to whom, who was involved, when it was, what happened next, etc. Um it was only as a result of investigating the presence of each person, um following them um through the ma-, various parts of the massacre, finding the children, what happened to them, seeing all the cover-up that had been involved, the suppression of this request by Reuters to get hold of the tapes, seeing the journalists, etc, it was as a result of that that I became more and more um disturbed by what had happened and-, and was-, was frankly dumbfounded. So, we-, we found out that there was journalists, okay, it's this guy and this guy, and we can see the camera bag and they move along, but the two principle visual characters, one who runs away when the Apache starts firing, people getting killed all around him, leaps he thinks to safety into a garbage dump, he's lying there, and then an Apache fires 30mm fragmentation grenades straight into his body and blows him up, that's one of the journalists, one of the Reuters journalists, Namir Eldeen. The other one, Saeed Chmagh, he escapes, he's the one person to come out alive of this initial massacre, and he runs down the street and he falls into the gutter and he's crawling along wounded in the gutter, and then eventually the rescue van-, and the Apache crew were saying, "Come on, just do something, just-, just pick up a weapon so we can blast you to pieces," um the van comes along and tries to rescue him and then they're all shot up and killed. So he's the other principle visual character, so extraordinary, the two principle visual characters in the whole massacre are the two journalists, and that came as a shock to me, that as it-, the research, as it-, the research proceeded that it became worse and worse and worse, and cid-, cinematically became stronger and stronger and stronger. Um and I have often wondered actually why was it that the two Reuters journalists became the principle visual characters, one killed separately in a dump after running away and the other killed as he was being rescued. My take on it is that they were war correspondents operating in Baghdad in 2007, Namir Eldeen was a very well-respected photographer, and Saeed Chmagh a driver fixer who went everywhere and protected er the journalistic staff. So, when this A-, you will notice just before the Apache starts firing Namir Eldeen looks up briefly, like that, no one else does, he looks up, um the one man who should not be guilty, you know, amongst all of them, he looks up, all the others are fine, he looks up, um and he runs quickly. He looks back down once the firing starts and hits the-, hits the ground, he runs first, fast, and Saeed pushes himself up against the wall and runs fast. Everyone else was killed. So, those are the two most experienced people at combat who were there, it was actually the journalists who were the most experienced, and therefore the most alert and managed to-, to get away initially, and then were both killed. So that's why they became the two principle visual characters, because they were the most experienced um at a combat situation, which tells you something about the rest of the people, that in-, in the [hide] of Baghdad at this time, in New Baghdad, the suburb, um sectarian violence was um ne-, nearly at its peak and every-, every block had the young men engaged in a-, a sort of gang to protect the black from Shia or Sunni in-, insurgents, and from the United States. Um so it's not unusual that there is young men gathered around, not even unusual that um one may have had an AK47 and the other may</p>
15.38.52		
15.39.46		
15.40.49		
15.41.38		

		have had an RPG, not unusual. Um unusual that they were so relaxed in the face of these Apaches and obviously complete-, saw them there, didn't try and hide and were blown to smithereens.
	INTV	And, well, and what it-, again, so you learn all this and what does it tell you about the people who were keeping the secret?
15.42.15	JULIAN	What it told me, because oth-, reports came out of this massacre very quickly um from local witnesses, and because Reuters had lost two people they-, their local bureau did something on it, um and what the local witnesses in the street had said was absolutely accurate, and what the military had said, or the Pentagon had said, was a complete bloody lie. And so, and a number of local witnesses were interviewed, and a documentary maker, American documentary maker, happened to be in the area the next day filming a um documentary on Iraqi refugees, and so he also interviewed some people and filmed um the van that had been destroyed. And-, and th-, the reports from the local people were completely accurate, and-, but the reports from the Pentagon was a complete lie. So, and not only a-, a denial but even trying to blame it on their opponents and so on. Um so what it-, that plus a number of other incidents that I've researched t-, tell me that if you pick random people on the street and you interview them, and you pick a random Pentagon press spokesperson and you interview them, the random person on the street is more likely to be telling the truth-, truth, even if they're in the thick of some sectarian thing, than-, than the Pentagon spokesperson is. So we should stop reporting this official commentary, because it's e-, nearly always lies, and we should start reporting what the people on the ground say, um because whilst not always true it is more often true than the official Pentagon line is.
15.43.10		
15.43.54		
	INTV	Yeah, 'cause we-, we talked to Josh Stieber who said the day, that day, as he called them, the leaders of his unit had said, "Just," because of the violence, "kill them all, God will decide."
15.44.08	JULIAN	Really?
	INTV	Yeah.
15.44.13	JULIAN	Yeah well I mean, I mean they, the people, those guys in that unit had said that they were surprised that this video came out and made such a big deal, because this was one of the relatively minor incidences that they had-, they had seen.
	INTV	Yeah, exactly, so he said exactly the same with Josh, he said, "Yeah, that was standard."
15.44.31	JULIAN	Yeah.
	INTV	He wasn't surprised, he thought it was standard, it was only when it hit the wider world that he began to realise how off-kilter-,
	JULIAN	Yeah.
	INTV	It was-,
15.44.40	JULIAN	Yeah.
	INTV	With the wider world.

	JULIAN	Yeah.
	INTV	Yeah.
15.44.43	JULIAN	And you can-, you can hear that in the pilots' voices when they're discussing it, um that it's another day at the office, wi-, wipe out 13 to 21 people, because there's several incidences. Um-,
	INTV	Yeah.
15.45.01	JULIAN	And it's just very hum-drum.
	INTV	Yeah, abso-, yeah, it's standard.
15.45.05	JULIAN	There-, there are also-, the polit-, the political play of how this was all received was extremely interesting um and taught me a lot a-, about how the American media works and how the-, the pro-military lobby works in the United States, and also in its allied countries.
	INTV	Which is?
15.45.29	JULIAN	Well, as I thought would happen we had two days initiative and then it went to counterattack. So we were setting the agenda, 'look, here's this video, it's extremely important, this is what's happened', um and then it was 'over to you' and we had the counterattack, and then we were put on the defensive trying to justify the work in various ways, and explain 'no this really is true and this really did happen', etc. Um the counterattack came from the whole of US society, by that I don't mean every individual of course, we had extensive support as well, but rather it came from the full spectrum, from the gutters of San Antonio where a homeless person would go into a internet café and write some comment saying that we ought to be strung up for releasing it-,
15.46.23	CREW	Sorry Folks , can I just stop this for one sec
	INTV	Hope for the best...no, we're going on humanities side here..I know and annoying the hell out of you...
	CREW	No no no...
15.46.45	JULIAN	The counterattack came from the full spectrum of US society, it came from the gutters of San Antonio where homeless people would go into a internet café and write a-, a comment on the internet site saying we ought to be strung up, um because their brother was serving as a foot soldier in Iraq, all the way of course up to Hillary Clinton and her lot in the White House. Um and that-, that tells you something about the-, the economic size and reach of the national security shadow state in the United States. So, in terms of GDP and the number of people involved it is so significant that it covers this entire spectrum, and so the-, the counterattack was from all that. Um and I looked to-, to see what had happened for example in New York Times, so, yes our release was reported, so that is at least a positive sign, that if you have something that's extremely newsworthy, dramatically visual, well prepared, released at a press conference at the Washington Press Club, you can get it into nearly all the mainstream media in the United States, in some form.
15.47.54	INTV	Yeah.

<p>15.48.12</p> <p>15.48.45</p> <p>15.49.46</p> <p>15.50.40</p> <p>15.51.45</p>	<p>JULIAN</p>	<p>Some form. CNN, Wolf Blitzer, only did the first few seconds, blanked-, blanked out all the gory bits, didn't do the-, the shooting of the van, which was the collateral murder incident, that was intentional murder. Other stuff you can say maybe they made a-, a very negligent mistake in war, but the shooting of the rescue van was intentional murder. Um The New York Times-, sorry, CNN just showed this-, this first bit, and same with some of the other stations, and then immediately started making apologies, 'war is complex, war is hard', etc, the anchors made apologies. Um and in New York Times, although we had a write-up of parts of the tape the first day, which was fine, um immediately enormous editorial space opened up for military apologists, day after day after day, all sorts of excuses, from the psychological end, for it to have been justified under laws of war, etc, etc, etc. And you m-, you might think, well, it wasn't something that's newsworthy, the video was factual, and it had certain facts associated with it, and those facts were presented, and then, what else is there to be said, there's only the apologetics that you can-, you could put it in editorial space. That's not true. In fact, we had more material because we er Kristin and [-, Ingi], um two of our people had been to Baghdad, we'd found the children, we'd gotten hold of the hospital admissions records, we got hold of the death-, death certificate of one of the women killed in-, in missile attack, and there was a whole family wiped out, we'd been to the houses etc. Um we had pulled all that back and the documentary maker who hap-, a documentary maker, American, who happened to be in New Baghdad in July 2007 the day after the event, and had filmed and interviewed some people, they had their footage suddenly become newsworthy. And there was the er investigation was done by the Pentagon and so on, and there was um Josh Stieber from the unit, the-, the only English-speaking witness, the only American soldier who was a witness, who was-, went on the record publicly, and no one wanted to speak to him, no one would take this additional material we had collected, the internal reports, um etc. So, editorial space opened up but only for military apologetics, it didn't open up for new facts, even though there were-, it was raw f-, footage taken by Americans, an American soldier willing to speak, who was there, um credible information, proven to be true in the case of the raw footage um and a very credible source and-, to the degree that there was a soldier there speaking about it, but not taken up by The Times or any other mainstream media group. And so i-, it-, that plus other things have shown-, shown me what is necessary, what is necessary-, sorry. That and other events have shown me what is necessary to get mainstream media critique of the military industrial complex in the United States. It's an extremely high bar. You must have proven factual documentation of the highest calibre, the highest degree of newsworthiness, it must be a massacre, or something equivalent. But the apologists-, after you release that the editorial space opens up and the apologists, people pushing from the other direction, need nothing at all, they-, they can just rant and give opinions and so on, pull any non-, just invent any opinion whatsoever um without any factual basis, without any evidence, etc. Um-,</p>
	<p>INTV</p>	<p>Why?</p>
<p>15.52.38</p>	<p>JULIAN</p>	<p>It-, it reflects a basic power dynamic in the United States, and not</p>

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies

14

INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange

TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46

		just the United States but it's most clear to us in the United States. That is, the national security state, the national security industry, the national security sector, is such a powerful economic and political and social unit of the United States that it has completely infiltrated and can apply pressure to every other large organisation in the United States. And so, it is not possible for The New York Times as an institution-
	INTV	Mm.
15.53.21	JULIAN	To be proportionate and critical of that sector and still maintain its power as an institution. Its power as an institution will go down if it does that.

TAPE NO or FILE No: 42

TIMECODE	NAME	Dialogue
	INTV	Sweet though, how old was he
	INTERVIEWEE	4 or 5
	INTV	4 or 5 Oh right yeah, don't worry we may yet do for him.
	INTERVIEWEE	Shh..he can't do that..and then...
	INTV	It doesn't work
	INTERVIEWEE	4 minutes you get 4 minutes
	INTV	Yes exactly, no no, I would be the same
	TILLY	Patrick..... [unknown]
	INTV	Well lets just see, you've just got to go with it but we'll go back to that mainstream media point because it was such a vital point. It's also 4 o'clock, I think they're just back aren't they.
	TILLY	Yes
	INTV	So the likelihood is that they're going to go somewhere else before they come back for tea at which point it'll reappear won't it. He says in an optimistic selfish kind of a way. But you're a parent - come on you've been there. It's alright, they're gone , they're gone I think - yeah
	INTV	It's now turning into hide and seek Julian...it's even worse
	TILLY	There he is
	INTV	I saw this little figure just go what? Yeah alright. Well he's very piping.
	CREW	[unheard]
	INTV	Yeah yeah yeah, well, so protective
10:55:43	INTERVIEWEE	I'll try and speak loud.
	CREW	[unheard]
	INTV	So we're alright yes. Alright, ok
	INTV	So, mainstream media and society, wider society.
10:56:01	INTV	Stop laughing - very bad. Very bad for him...come on.
15.56.06	JULIAN	Is your question about the United States or-,
	INTV	Wherever.
15.56.08	JULIAN	Mainstream media in general?
	INTV	Mm. And the military industrial comp-, or-,
	JULIAN	Oh-,

	INTV	Whichever you fancy, yeah.
15.56.14	JULIAN	Basic-, the-, the basic problem with mainstream media is power corrupts, and mainstream media by definition has a large audience-,
	INTV	And a small one too – [laugh] stop it..very very bad..you weren't supposed to laugh. Ok, do it again. Because that was very good – oh well we'll just have to go with it.
	INTERVIEWEE	We can go to...we'll go with , alright, ok..go on,
15.56.47	JULIAN	Mainstream media by definition has a large audience and therefore is powerful, by definition. And once a media group is powerful for long enough it starts to enter into the-, a relationship with other powerful groups, that is very natural, because other powerful groups seek its favour, seek to make deals and agreements with it, and the individuals who run it. And it starts to stop seeing itself as a group that holds powerful groups to account and starts seeing itself as part of the social network of the elite, and the economic network of the elite, and the political network of the elite, and-,
	INTV	So what-,
15.57.33	JULIAN	Er that's why fundamentally mainstream media cannot be trusted to critique power that's in the same nation that it is in. What is interesting is that-, so, as a result of the internet um we are now seeing something hopeful about mainstream media, we see Russia today giving a strong critique of various parts of American elite power, and British elite power. Um we see Al Jazeera based in Qatar giving a strong critique-, critique um of Mubarak in the previous Egyptian regime and some other states in the Middle East, not all, not Saudi, not Bahrain, for example, because they have geopolitical realities for Qatar which is a small nation right in between those two. Um so, um and perhaps as CCTV, the Chinese state television, comes out more we'll see um similar critiques um in other languages of Western powers and power groups by er the Chinese. I-, I think that it is not possible to have a large powerful media group that isn't corrupt. I think-,
15.58.37		
	INTV	At all?
15.59.04	JULIAN	At all. By the very nature that media group is powerful and powerful for a significant amount of time it enters into relationships with other powerful groups, both institutionally and at an individual level for those people who have influence and control over the media group. So I-, I think there is nothing that can be done about that, one just has to accept and recognise that reality, and therefore what one needs is a plurality of powerful-, if-, if one accepts that there are powerful media groups what one needs is a plurality of powerful media groups associated with different states and different interests, that are able to critique each other according to their um national interest or their local interest, whatever is giving these groups their power. Um and at another level um we need er the bulk of people to be able to freely communicate and freely exchange knowledge. And then there are-, then there are roles for specialist groups like WikiLeaks where we specialise in breaking these controls, we specialise in breaking
15.59.44		

16.00.44		down those barriers, we specialise in undoing censorship and so on. Um but if it was the case that WikiLeaks grew to be a very large and powerful media group and remained there for a long time, um of course we would enter into the same elite power relationships and would become corrupted by it.
	INTV	And well..I was now going to say..actually there is an adult in there Till – do you want to go and have a crack
	TILLY	Is that ok?
	INTERVIEWEE	Hmm?
	TILLY	Is that ok with you if I?
	JULIAN	What?
	TILLY	If I go [unheard]
	JULIAN	yes
		Time code break
16:01:20	INTV	So for why?
16.01.23	JULIAN	Oh we-, we do and that-, that is-,
	INTV	No, but you do then, I mean immediately after this thing you-,
16.01.27	JULIAN	Well it's simply that-, that they um, having an existing audience, they have ways of making information slick and digestible, and pigging-, piggy-backing it onto various broadcast mechanisms and internet platforms and so on, and they're subsidised by however they're subsidised. So it-, it is simply a reality, just like um one might n-, not want to support the oil industry um but one has to drive one's car. So, we have to deal with the world as it is even if we're trying to move it to a more just place.
	INTV	So what was your fear? Well is-, as you were doing it what were you thinking to yourself? 'What have I got to guard against? What do I need to be worried about?'
16.02.13	JULIAN	What we needed to guard against was corruption and spinning of our material, um and capture, in terms of relationship capture um of our organisation with another organisation that is larger-, larger and had its different agenda. Um the-, the spinning of our material, that is the biggest problem, um very hard to deal with. The way we have tried to deal with it is that we produce the underlying source material for any stories or documentaries that are based on our material, and so the public and other journalists, and opposing media organisations can check to see that stories that are produced by mainstream media organisations actually correspond to the underlying source material. Unfortunately the vast majority of people never do check, so they are able to get away with spinning things quite a lot. Um however, there are some checks, and if they're too flagrant about it we can withdraw our cooperation um and expose the difference, which, you know, we-,
16.03.06		
	INTV	Yeah.
16.03.29	JULIAN	We have-, we have enough of a audience, enough of a platform, to expose the spinning. We have done that to some degree with The Guardian for example, where it has removed a number of um

		key statements from um cables that had been released about um particular classes in countries being corrupt, um or particular individuals or corporations, or where monies are hidden, and so on.
	INTV	I guess leaping forward, so go on, Nick comes to see you, what do you make of him and his proposal initially?
16.04.04	JULIAN	Well he didn't have a proposal, um it-, it's one of-, one of the extraordinary things about British journalism, it is the most credit-stealing, credit-whoring, backstabbing industry I have ever encountered, and um Nick Davies is a part of that industry. Nick Davies is a nice man, I actually like Nick Davies, I get along with Nick Davies, um or I got along with Nick Davies is perhaps better to put it, but he is a credit-stealer. I am not sure that he is any more of a credit-stealer however than anyone else involved in London journalism, um but this is an example of it. So, our first Guardian front page was in 2007 in relation to Kenya. We have worked with individual mainstream media groups um since that point in time, where we thought it made sense to increase the impact of a story in one way or another, where it wouldn't norm-, be picked up just [a matter as-,] as a result of our releasing it where we needed to spend extra attention to give it the impact it needed. Um when I was on the run from surveillance um in um the er I was on the run from surveillance at the European parliament, giving a talk on censorship, which was my cover to get out safely from Australia. I-, if I was arrested on the way to giving a talk at the European parliament on censorship, then that would be politically extremely embarrassing. Um I spoke to a Guardian journalist there and I had previously worked with Nick over um a Swiss banking scandal, um although I had not previously met him. And um so he came over and then we discussed what my plans were for this material, the Iraq war logs and the Afghan war logs, and that it was a lot of material, that I'd only be doing one thing first, first the Afghan war logs, if that was done well we'd discuss other proposals, um and that we-, a number of organisations we would have involved. We had already contacted Tagesspiegel and Der Spiegel um but I viewed that The Guardian would also be good to have and um The New York Times because we had to have an American partner to maximise the source protections for the source, or sources, who were probably American. And I-, so we could show er and that they would publish first, that the American media organisation would publish first so we could show a flow from a potential American source, through us, to an American newspaper, published there first, something that was clearly a first amendment activity, clearly a press activity and not an espionage activity. Um Nick to his credit um said that he would get Alan Rusbridger, the editor of The New York Ti-, er of The Guardian, to contact Bill Keller, the then editor of The New York Times, and do an agreement at the top level. Um I had done one or two of those previously but most of my agreements had been with journalists that we had rapport with at the individual organisations, but I could see um that another way of working the equation was to go to the top of The Guardian and then laterally across to the head of The New York Times, and then down as opposed to starting in the middle and going up. Um and er so, so we agreed and what-, what did I think of his proposal? Nothing, because it was not his
16.05.01		
16.06.14		
16.07.10		
16.07.59		

		proposal.
	INTV	Oh right. So that's the credit-stealing, I was wondering, just thinking 'where is the credit-stealing?' oh right, oh, okay.
16.08.16	JULIAN	Nick was instrumental in doing that arrangement, keep-, bringing The Guardian-, bringing The New York Times in at that level from the editor-in-chief at The Guardian to the editor-in-chief in New York Times-,
	INTV	Mm.
16.08.32	JULIAN	Um and we talked about different ways to slug it and so on. So i-, it was a um a good talk, talking about different things and different ways of doing it, but nonetheless it was already part of our existing plan. But Nick helped to speed the plan up, er and for that deserves credit.
	INTV	Okay, alright, and during this period, prior-, prior to all this ... um-,
16.08.57	JULIAN	It will become relevant later on, you know, that um the reason that we ended up having a problem um with Nick is that when he went back to The Guar-, so the-, so the-, the deal was that- , I mean this is the inside base point, [I don't see why it's an issue], but the-, the deal was that The Guardian, New York Ti-, we had to remove Tagesspiegel because The Guardian, New York Times and Der Spiegel felt that they were too big to have Tagesspiegel at the same table. Fine. Um the deal was that they would have print exclusivity in relation to the Afghan war diaries only, and that we would control the embargo time, we would say when it was time to go, because we had our own publishing considerations and legal considerations and trying to understand what allegations there may or may not be against potential sources, and what dates would affect that and so on. Um so we would control the go-, go date, it would be print exclusivity only, but we wouldn't bring TV in until the last moment to prevent leaks or the fact that we were working on this and we were going to go. Um so we did that precisely, and 36 hours before our go date we brought in Stephen Grey, who's a er print journalist and a Channel 4 journalist, um to produce something at the same time to come out half an hour after the online versions of the papers went out. Um and he was someone that The Guardian team wanted in because he's an expert on Afghanistan, but he wasn't available at the time, he became available, um and we then sent him, 36 hours
16.10.06		beforehand, down to The Guardian offices to interview um some of The Guardian people, including Davies, who worked-, worked on the material um so they could promote themselves, um and so on. There was no need to interview them but just so they-, just as a favour so they could promote themselves. And they said, "Oh, we don't think you're going to give this enough credit," and sent him out, and Nick Davies um refused to work with me, speak to me, after that point.
16.11.16		
	INTV	Oh right. Right, I see, so it wasn't a row over, okay, well I mean, this is slightly by-the-by from the-, the main thrust of the story is you're talking about sources, during this time the US arrest a man on the basis of, they claim, allege, that he is the source, and what do you-, what's reaction as this happens?

16.12.08	JULIAN	We first saw the-, an article in Wired magazine, how that article came to be um and the involvement of the journalist in it and um so on is-, is distasteful, so it's a-, it appears to be a corruption of their journalist. So it ap-, their researcher, Adrian Lamo, um if his story is to be believed, er came into contact with this young man um, Bradley Manning, who's a intelligence analyst in Baghdad, um and according to L-, Lamo um Manning er confessed to being one of our sources. Um Lamo, according to the chat logs provided by him, um offered Manning confidentiality and the journalist/source relationship, er even a confessor/confessee relationship because he's a priest part-time, etc, etc, um but then um sold him out er to the US army investigations team, and the FBI, and State Department and so on.
16.13.19		
	INTV	Yeah, and we've spoken to Lamo and he says, "Oh it's the toughest choice of my life, you know, it was a fucked up choice," was his phrase on-, what's your estimate of his choice?
16.13.33	JULIAN	Oh I-, I don't think that it's moral at all. Um of course we don't know whether this young man is one-, one of our sources, um but if we go by simply what Lamo's um story is, if he believes that that young man, or whoever he was speaking to, um allegedly speaking to, was a source um there are many different ways he could've handled it. First of all, could've done nothing, um he could've just spoken to him and said, "Well, what about this, maybe you could do that. Here's a lawyer I know you could contact, it's-, it's a difficult position." He could've gone to a lawyer, Lamo could've gone overseas if he was really that worried that he might be embroiled as being an accessory after the fact or something, he could've gone overseas, he could've set up a legal team, he could've, I mean, handled it in a political way, maybe he could've brought in a more higher powered journalist, he could've come to us um and say, "Well what do you have to say about this? This guy says that he's one of your sources," etc. So, um yeah it's clearly a immoral act but um if we look at the um this Lamo-, this Lamo character, he's a sad character, I mean, I mean he's drug-, drug-addicted and someone who steals, owes the federal government 60,000 dollars from a previous conviction. Um I'm sure this is not the witness the FBI want to have in any prosecution.
16.14.40		
	INTV	Yeah, for sure.
		Time Code break
16.16.20	JULIAN	Um and when I saw him do his first video interview I was like, "That guy has got to do more video."
		Laughter
	TILLY	Yes, I know. I mean he was-, yeah, god.
16.16.29	JULIAN	I saw him do one um some-, on Channel 4 or BBC, and he was talking about something or other, and a question was posed to him, and so you see him there, and then his um so like for a while he's speaking and then there's a little smirk grows up here, this tiny little micro smirk, and a glint in the eye, and it's like the cloven hoof come-, came out, and back in, and it was like-, it was like he sort of 'I know how to spin this one', and then-,
16.17.04		

	INTV	Well he-, he's very keen on pauses.
	TILLY	Very long pauses and then the smirk emerged quite a few times.
	INTV	Yeah, yeah, yeah, [no worry there], don't worry, we're not-, I'm sure we're every bit as gullible as the next but we're not completely gullible, but we are, you know, sure, but he was-, anyway, it was quite an interesting game interviewing him and he's-, right.
16.17.30	JULIAN	I don't know what-, his trajectory now is very strange. I mean there's that huge national security industry in the United States and all its participants, and now he's a welcome member of that club, on the other hand he's still a rat, you know, and so, once a rat always a rat, it doesn't matter which side you then go to. Um so-,
	INTV	But also the state is going to have to base their case at least in part on him 'cause they discovered-,
16.17.56	JULIAN	That's right.
	INTV	Because, unless we're all being dumb, they don't-, and this is, you know, bec-, whoever it is, or isn't, they don't find him or her on the basis of a trail, do they, they find him on the ba-, they arrest Manning after Lamo-,
16.18.12	JULIAN	On the basis of what Lamo said.
	INTV	Yeah.
16.18.14	JULIAN	Well, as far as we can determine.
	INTV	Yeah, exactly, [whereas it-,] assume, assume, assume. Anyway. Alright, so-,
	TILLY	Well they didn't-, they didn't trace him after the-, the Apache helicopter, did they?
	INTV	No, they-,
16.18.26	JULIAN	Not that I'm aware of.
	INTV	Yeah, anyway, we are running, so. Um but I'll make-, this is a slightly sort of Daily Mail-esque question, but anyway, I might as well ask you, but on a human level you must be thinking 'shit', aren't you, I mean, straightforwardly?
16.18.43	JULIAN	We were concerned about it, yeah, and we put-, we put a lot of detail into trying to understand what was happening.
	INTV	Yeah, and you go on, yeah, you go on the run. Okay, so, and so what to you are the salient-, what, again, so it's not unlike-, what are the salient bits of the Afghan war logs, what's important stuff to you as you're talking to the mainstream media?
16.19.10	JULIAN	For Afghanistan, you know, we've sort of eclipsed ourselves as time's gone by but at the moment that we leas-, released Afghanistan it was the largest military leak in history, um the most significant and detailed history of a war to have ever been released in a war. Over 76,000 individual events, and the GPS coordinates, and how many people died, and who was there in terms of um which unit of the US military, or the Iraqi military, or foreign military, um and although it was only classified secret, not top secret, the-, the shadow of various top secret operations leaked into the material. In that for example where there was
16.19.58		

16.20.58		<p>combined operations with regular US army units and special forces, special forces would be mentioned in the-, in the logs because the regular army units had written them up. When there was a combined operation between regular army units and the CIA, often referred to as OGA, other government agency, um that would also be in the log. So, it was a-, the-, the vista of the past six years of war um down to the individual deaths and their details, and all the way out to the whole country and where all these events were. We produced maps showing um the entire country and every death on the map that the US military had recorded, um IEDs and the various explosions and so on. So, this is the same information that the Pentagon uses to manage the war, to produce all its own internal statistics and reports, some of which are then released to the public, some are not. The Pentagon said for Afghanistan as in Iraq that they were not keeping any death counts, that is false, this information showed it to be false, and by adding up the individual records we saw in just in these records alone that there were 20,000 er deaths. Er and the records start ramping up in 2004, so they do not even cover the invasion of Afghanistan, they do not cover the first two years of fighting, and so, 20,000, 20,000 deaths.</p>
	INTV	And 373?
16.21.43	JULIAN	<p>And taskforce 373 was something I found by looking for children in the-, in the logs, and I came across an incident where task-, where a-, a special forces operation had been conducted to try and raid a particular-, try and raid a madras, a-, for young children, a small school for young children, to see if there was a Taliban figure there. And they had used a HIMARS missile system, a secretive um ground to ground GPS targetable missile system, to attack this, and they had put special classification on there, on the record, saying that not even the British could know about what happened here er in this event. And seven children were killed, er no one else was killed, no targets of their inquiry were found, and they had proceeded to cover it up. But they were hunting for a particular person on a list, a PEL list, or a JPEL list, that stands for joint priority effects list and that, it turned out to be by looking at the code numbers, was an assassination list, um some with at least 2,000 um entries that had been on it, or were on it. And so I then looked through the records for um other numbers that matched these type of numbers, the JPEL numbers and references to the PEL [project], references to JPEL, and we found that um the US has an assassination programme run by the special forces and others in Afghanistan, people on a list, at least 2,000 entries, that they had been going around and attempting to kill, er and of course they had killed many people including these children who were not meant to be killed at all. How do you get on the list? We saw some examples of that, um a Afghan governor nominates you 'cause of some business dealing gone wrong or whatever reason to go on the list, some general doesn't like you, etc, you go on the list. How do you get off the list? Well you're not notified you're on the list, um how you get off the list is by being killed, and in one particular case um they had received information to say that the person never should've been on the list and this was all nonsense ... and they had to remove them. Um so they had just been lucky that they had been taken off the list before they had been</p>
16.23.02		
16.24.13		

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies

23

INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange

TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46

<p>16.24.41</p> <p>16.25.47</p> <p>16.26.40</p>		<p>assassinated. So, what's the Afghan government position in relation to this list? The Afghan government, publicly at least, says that it does not want this list to exist, that it wants Afghanistan to have the rule of law, that people should not simply be arbitrarily assassinated because they are nominated by their business or personal rivals to go on such a list. Um drug dealers are also on the list, as opposed to just um Taliban-related people or-, or the very rare Al-Qaeda-related person. Um so it's a-, it's a serious, extremely serious thing, that people are on a extrajudicial assassination list in a country where there is a government, at least in Kabul and around Kabul, that is meant to be a legitimate government, that has had elections created by the US and NATO. That government says that it's opposed to this extrajudicial assassination list, it wants to control the list, the US says no. Um so, my colleagues in Der Spiegel thought this was a big deal and they made it the front page of Der Spiegel. Er Der Spiegel is a German news weekly, it comes out-, it's the most influence German news weekly, it comes out once per week, so a front cover of Der Spiegel is seven times as important as the front cover of a newspaper 'cause Der Spiegel only comes out once a week. Um it became a big story in The Guardian, um which was predominantly researched by Nick Davies for The Guardian, and for The New York Times it was written up by Eric Schmitt, one of their national security reporters and our primary contact with The New York Times, and it was then killed at an editorial level. It did not appear in The New York Times. So we-,</p>
	<p>CREW</p>	<p>Stop a minute there sorry just got to change the...</p>

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies
 INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange
 TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46
TAPE NO or FILE No: 43

TIMECODE	NAME	Dialogue
16:47:04	JULIAN	Grown into the role
	INTV	Are we cool?
	TILLY	Well it's a great place I hope they've managed to...
	INTV	Well it's great idea
	TILLY	It's a great idea it just needed a bit of growth and maturity...
	INTV	Well It's
	JULIAN	It's not fully there yet but..
	INTV	Anyone who's ever done it
	JULIAN	We have a new thing with them, so they
	INTV	Well look um
	JULIAN	We think we wouldn't work with them for a while
	TILLY	Neither would many people
	JULIAN	But I think they've grown up a bit more now.
	INTV	But it's ..if you've done it.
	JULIAN	Maybe famous last words..
	TILLY	Is Angus still there cos' I've always
	JULIAN	Angus is still there. Angus is now lead journalist.
	TILLY	He's good.
	INTV	It's a real aptitude thing, isn't it, you can do it or you can't do it, it's not-,
16.47.49	JULIAN	What?
	INTV	Oh the ability to be good at that, how to be moral at that is a really tricky thing, people can do it-,
16.47.55	JULIAN	It's a-, it's a tricky thing to do, I mean, none of them have ever run a non-profit journalism thing.
	TILLY	You're not quite sure ...
16.48.04	JULIAN	Wouldn't know what the rules are or what you can get away with and what you can't and-,
	TILLY	Yeah.
16.48.09	JULIAN	It's production but it's not production, you're-,
	TILLY	Yeah, there's a confusion-,
16.48.12	JULIAN	It's in-, it's insulated from libel. The-, so I would-,
	INTV	It's insulated from libel?
16.48.16	JULIAN	I was-, they have like a five-tier legal structure to keep the money away, and then only a certain amount of money is like employee

		services. Anyways, they spent 60,000 pounds on doing that structure. But um I was-, the thing that-, that annoyed me is that they had such an opportunity-,
	TILLY	Yeah.
16.48.37	JULIAN	Because they had two and a half-, over two million pounds of free money, like not tied to anything, they could do anything they wanted with it provided it was investigative journalism.
	INTV	And what did they do?
16.48.51	JULIAN	Anything at all, and they also had a legal structure that-, that insulated their capital from lawsuits, libel suits.
	INTV	Oh, oh right, they were-, oh okay, I was thinking, woo, this is a-, yeah, right.
16.49.03	JULIAN	And they could still be gone after but th-, they had minimal assets, you know, the ma-, big assets were over here, they were insulated.
	INTV	Yeah.
16.49.10	JULIAN	So then, both those two things, that they didn't need to satisfy any industrial group, they didn't need to satisfy anyone, except in sort of longer term if they were doing good to some prospective donors perhaps who were activist donors.
	INTV	Yeah.
16.49.28	JULIAN	Um and they didn't have to worry about libel, so they could've just have been very, very aggressive. Um and that is their niche, that they can be aggressive-,
	TILLY	Yeah.
16.49.39	JULIAN	Is their niche.
	TILLY	They don't have to worry, yeah.
16.49.40	JULIAN	Why the hell do the same thing that everyone else is doing, in the same way?
	INTV	And in a slightly under-funded kind of a way.
16.49.44	JULIAN	You just-, you just-, could just-, all-, in that case you're just a subsidised production house that's-, that's dragging everyone else down because you're dropping the rates because you're subsidised.
	INTV	Yeah, yeah.
16.49.54	JULIAN	Subsidised Channel 4 production house that's making it hard for everyone else.
	TILLY	Yeah.
16.49.58	JULIAN	Um no their niche was that they could actually do whatever the-, the hell they liked.
	TILLY	They took a while to realise that then.
16.50.04	JULIAN	Yeah.
	TILLY	They were confused on what their purpose was.
16.50.06	JULIAN	But they did a good thing on drones just recently.

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies

26

INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange

TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46

	TILLY	Oh?
	INTV	Yes.
16.50.09	JULIAN	Don't know if it ended up-, don't know if you saw that, on the drones in Pakistan, it was front pages of the Pakistani papers and The New York Times.
	INTV	Yeah, yeah ... right. I'm conscious that the light is going. So you're running out-, talk to me, you're running up to a publication and The New York Times, or somebody says, "We've got to go talk to the White House," and what did you say, or feel? I mean, were you surprised?
16.50.29	JULIAN	Well, our-, my view has always been that the organisation you're exposing um should not know before the victims . Um one might even argue that it should know after the victims, but it certainly should not know before the victims, and that is because as soon as it knows it will engage in a [reguard] action to spin the whole issue, set up its whole press lines, get all its consultants and its leverage and pull it all together to try and defeat your exposure. And if you're producing journalism with the goal of it producing justice, then you don't want that goal undermined . If you're producing journalism just to make money, then you just want to sell scandal, you don't actually want to get reform.
16.51.19	INTV	The New York Times argument is this is the nature of journalism, this is responsible journalism.
16.51.28	JULIAN	Well, responsible to whom? It's not responsible to the victims because it undermines the ability for them to achieve justice, so that's not responsible to my book. It-, it is re-, responsible to those people who are in power, but those are the people you're meant to be policing, and they need to be policed because they have so much power and no one else is capable of policing them. Whereas people who are victims, I mean, they are victims, they have no power, everyone is policing them.
	INTV	And you've had that anyway, this is the standard ...
16.51.57	JULIAN	So-, so when we-, when, for example, when we produced Collateral Murder um we had very good operational security. So we had a cover for the whole operation, their cover was a good cover, um rumours started to go around that it was a video about Afghanistan, um and we allowed those rumours, although we didn't create them, but we permitted them to grow and grow and grow and grow, er to the degree that General Petraeus two days before our Monday press conference in Washington DC on April 5 2010 received a briefing that we were going to have a press conference about the massacre in Afghanistan.
	INTV	Sure? Are you sure of that?
16.52.31	JULIAN	Yes, I am sure of that, and when um so when-, after the press conference when the Pentagon and White House was asked to comment they had no comment, for hours. Extraordinary situation that the Pentagon has no comment, 'we don't know what to say about it', and after a few hours they managed to trawl back through the original incident reports and got their party line from those reports back in 2007 and then just came up with that, um

16.53.34		which was a misplay by them because other information was in contradiction with that. So, that's the way we prefer to run operations if possible, um which is that the public knows at the same moment as the accused organisation knows. Now, that isn't to say that you shouldn't do your fact-checking and do your research, you have to be confident about what you're saying is correct, but if you're confident that it is correct, um then the organisation that you're trying to hold to account should definitely not know um prior to the release of material to the public, because it simply engages in every action it can to spin away the reform effects.
	INTV	So what did you say to Keller?
16.53.59	JULIAN	Well, actually in dealing with Keller I-, I understand parts of the world, how they are. The New York Times exists within this very difficult milieu where the military industrial complex in the United States has such extraordinary power from down low, in the middle, and up on high. He has to make certain compromises, just to deal with the reality of that situation. I am not going to demand that someone do something that they are incapable of doing given the circumstances they're in, that would not be rational, um but um I do demand that they are-, that they do do all that they can do given the limitations of the circumstances they're in. Um now in-, in the end er what Bill Keller did is I mean he went to um went to them four, five days ahead of time with the cables, um ten days um ahead of time, um briefed them in-, in great detail, you know, about the situation. Um for the-, for the cables that was every individual cable, every individual story they knew ahead of time as a result, um and that-, that I found deplorable, completely deplorable. There-, there were cases where you could go 'well, this, I don't understand what it said here, I don't understand this cable, it does appear to be very sensitive, maybe there is a sensitive intelligence source somewhere, very rare, but maybe it's possible here, and I just want to get their feedback about this paragraph to see is there someone here who needs to be protected'. That's fine, I accept that they can do that, but to actually show them the whole cable that they're going to produce um and give them um a und-, understanding of the angle of the story, um I find that to be deplorable, absolutely deplorable. Now, perh-, perhaps it is the case that it was a forced move, that The New York Times as an institution could not have survived with its power intact after the publication without that incredible sucking up, not just in handing the material and forewarning, but actually in public statements which were designed to do nothing else but to suck up to the military industrial complex, and um saying that 'the White House was pleased with us' publicly, bragging that the White House had patted it on the head, I mean, cri-, cringe worthy. To-, to me as someone fighting for freedom of expression, to hold these um government to account that is cringe worthy for a journalist or an editor to say something like that, that the very institution that it is tasked to hold to account was pleased with it as a result of its behaviour. Um-,
16.54.46		
16.55.36		
16.56.39		
	INTV	So on account-,
16.57.13	JULIAN	So-, so-, so um so the question is did Bill Keller of The New York Times, the editor-in-chief, need to publicly suck up to the degree

<p>16.58.15</p> <p>16.59.06</p>		<p>that he did? Did he need to go into backroom deals with the CIA and um and the national security agency and the State Department, etc, which he admits publicly, brags that he did, um did he need to do that in order to protect The New York Times? Did he need, as their opinions editor Brisbane put it, um need to inoculate themselves from criticism by attacking me personally? Did they-, did they need to do that? I actually rather suspect they did need to do that, and it was mostly a forced move. Perhaps a real g-, had a real genius, a political genius, been in charge of The New York Times they could've manoeuvred in a snakier way and wouldn't have been forced to do it, but even an average man being in charge of it, I think it actually was a forced move. And that is much more interesting than saying The New York Times editorial staff are a pack of cowardly scumbags, much more interesting, because it tells you something about the power dynamic between big media institutions and the military industrial complex and the White House and diplomatic power within the United States. And it doesn't matter who you have there, in order to preserve the institutional power, to preserve the voice of The New York Times and similar big media operations in the United States you have to pay the piper, you have to do it. And um that was a mixed metaphor, wasn't it? Sorry.</p>
	<p>INTV</p>	<p>Yeah, well, you pay the piper. So come on, redactions going on at the same time, now there is or isn't a row going on about redaction, I haven't the faintest clue whether there is or isn't, there are so many conflicting versions, what is going on?</p>
<p>16.59.16</p> <p>17.00.29</p> <p>17.01.40</p>	<p>JULIAN</p>	<p>No there's-, there's no row going on about redactions at all. Not at all. The-, the-, what happened with um so for the Ir-, for the Afghan war, the Afghan war logs, we looked at the US markings and classifications on them, and the way that informants were protected, so the various intelligence reports actually anonymise the informants. Er there's-, from marines intelligence, G2, and other intelligence forces the informants were-, the US informants, er were correctly by their standards anonymised. There was a-, a group of reports where although they were not really intelligence informants they were sort of hotline tips and-, and things like this, low, very low level tip-offs, um something called threat reports, um that were not ano-, anonymised. And those threat reports comprised one in five of the Afghan war logs and so we held them back for a line by line redaction, and that was the view of the journalists at The New York Times, Guardian, Der Spiegel that it was only the threat reports that needed the serious consideration, the other ones didn't, so we withheld them back for a line by line analysis um and released the rest. But what we didn't do was redact one in five lines, putting black marker through it, we just removed them, and so it looked like we hadn't redacted everything but in fact we had redacted a fifth of all the material, and this permitted um an attack, a political attack, to come from The Times of London. It didn't come from the Pentagon first of all, it came from Murdoch's Times of London, which is a competitor to The Guardian, who was our partner in London. So The-, The Times did a proxy war on The Guardian through us by attacking us, and how they did it is they went through um the files that had been published um the thr-, the er four fifths that had been public, and they found various names in them. Now, um just over 100. So, most of those names were meant</p>

<p>17.02.38</p> <p>17.03.27</p> <p>17.03.57</p> <p>17.04.57</p>		<p>to be there, it is right for them to be published, it is right to publish the names of politicians, generals, bureaucrats, um who are involved in this sort of activity, it is right even as we did to publish the names of corrupt radio stations in Kabul that were taking SYOPS programming content. It is also right to publish the names of those people who have been killed and murdered and who need to be investigated, and it is right to publish the names of all incidental characters who themselves are not at serious and probable risk of physical harm. Those incidental characters are someone who owns a company who for example is just involved in shipping operations, of moving stuff from one side of Afghanistan to another, because they provide the informational matrix out of which you investigate things, out of which the Afghani people can understand the situation, journalists can understand the situation, etc. So then there is the question is were there any sort of villages or so on who gave information that might lead to retri-, reprisals, were there some of those? Um there were some villages who-, who had given information, um so that is a regrettable oversight but it is not our-, not merely our oversight, it was the oversight of the United States military who should've never included that material and who falsely classified it, and who then made it available to everyone and it then got out. And also the oversight of the journalists in The New York Times and Der Spiegel and The Guardian, who'd never mentioned that form of material although it was their job to go through the individual records. Um that said, looking at it and speaking to a number of people in Afghanistan, it was our view that no one would be um killed as a result, simply because it was-, the sort of information was rarely inflammatory, it was given-, it was someone would come into um US military would come into a town and search someone's house um and say, "Are there any Taliban in your town?" and they'd say something like, "No." So they're an informer, or they would say um or, "There used to be," or, "Maybe in the next town," something like this. So these weren't significant events and people um that we spoke to um said that because these communities are so small in Afghanistan, and so tight, everyone knows who supports who, which side of the fence you are, it is-, it is no secret, and it tends to be that a whole town is one way or another way. Um and er so CNN told-, sorry um a NATO official in um Kabul told CNN that they could not find anyone who needed to be protected at all, needed to be moved, protected in any way, there's no official allegation from any official body um that has been made to me or has been made publicly that um there is any individual who's come to harm as a result of the publication, which is the line that we took and has proved to be correct, and um although-</p>
	<p>INTV</p>	<p>So you were having-, you were at least having a different approach from The Guardian, that much is true, or at least you're arguing the merits of a different approach, but the sort of mammoth row is not true, is that what you're saying?</p>
<p>17.05.33</p>	<p>JULIAN</p>	<p>There was-, there was no row at all. There was no row, there was no-, there's not even um only hints of a discussion, I mean.</p>
	<p>INTV</p>	<p>Okay, sure.</p>
<p>17.05.43</p>	<p>JULIAN</p>	<p>Um what is interesting in a more general sense is c-, can the-, the-, sorry, a-, amongst the-, the hand-wringing liberal left in the United</p>

<p>17.07.07</p> <p>17.07.58</p> <p>17.08.55</p>		<p>Kingdom there is a view that one should never be permitted to be criticised for being even possibly in the future engaged in a contributory act that might be immoral, and that that type of arse covering is more important than actually saving people's lives. That it is better to let a thousand people die than risk going to save them and possibly running over someone on the way. And that is something that um I find to be philosophically repugnant, and it's-, it's one of the things I saw um in science for example, um my friends were doing PhDs in malaria research. So, 40,000 children every year die in Kenya and you can predict that without fail next year it's going to be between 30 and 60,000 children, a huge number, and-, but the various techniques to stop malaria have been produced, not just to treat it. For example, genetically engineered mosquitoes that have a scorpion venom chromosome, scorpion venom gene planted within them, such that when the mosquito gets the malaria parasite into it it's killed, and so when it goes to feed on a human being um the malaria is not transferred. But of course the ethics communities made sure that never had a chance of being done because what if this mosquito venom poisoned some fish or there was a rare allergy for some people and some people [died]. But you-, you know for sure, guaranteed, that some two million people a year are going to die across the world and 80 percent are children, 30 to 60,000 kids, for sure, every year, um but the very hint that someone might be blamed for doing something causes people to do nothing at all. And it's um the problem here is that there is not correct-, there's not blame for doing nothing. Where you could've acted to save someone's life and do not act there is no blame, but if you go to act to save someone's life and you make a mistake, then you're to blame. And that has resulted in-, in-, actually in-, in a litigious system such as in the United States and in the UK, quite perverse outcomes where medically educated people will not resuscitate someone who they find on the pavement who has been hit by a car, because of the possible negligence suit that might be filed against them if they go to do so.</p>
	INTV	Mm.
17.08.58	JULIAN	<p>So, it-, it is that same perversity um that causes people in journalism to not act if they could-, not even if th-, there's a possibility if they make a mistake something bad might happen, but if there's a possibility they might be blamed even if nothing happens. Um and that's what happened here in Afghanistan, nothing happened. We had our task, our duty, to get to the Afghan people all this information about their immediate history, their past six years, the most detailed history about Afghanistan in the past six years without a doubt.</p>
	INTV	Yeah.
17.09.40	JULIAN	<p>Without a doubt. Um po-, political, military, um geographic history of Afghanistan. Um did any of those mainstream me-, media organisations move to work towards, one way or another, in getting that material released to the Afghani people? No, they didn't lift a finger, not a finger. They made so-, they made some stories, some of those stories were important and helpful, um but in terms of the duty to the historical record to bring this 79-, sorry, 76,000 classified reports to the people of Afghanistan and the</p>

17.10.34		surrounding regions, they did nothing. And left to their moral interpretation those reports never would've been released, and that is true for all the material that we have worked on, and it's also true for most, if not-, sorry, it's-, it's also true for all of the large leaks that the mainstream media has received, that they have just picked a line here and a line there and they have buried the rest and they have kept it away from all other people, because they see it as their commercial imperative to give the population as little information as possible. They see it as their commercial imperative to build up a giant pile of internal archive that they can cherry-pick occasionally when a new story makes this little piece worthy or that little-, little piece worthy, and keep the rest out of history and out-, and out of the hands of the population who can make more use of it than just a few new stories.
17.11.16		
	INTV	So do you feel on a sort of philosophic and indeed a personal basis any kinship or not with those journalists and those-, do you feel a different person from them?
17.11.33	JULIAN	I have great kinship with some journalists, you know, who-, whose i-, who believe in finding out the truth about our recent history and human institutions, and various unjust acts, and bringing them out, getting reforms in, and getting people um to behave in a more intelligent way 'cause they know what's going on. Um and-, and a bit of-, some journalists also are good fighters, I mean they like the fight, right, so I-, I like the fight as well and that's a camaraderie. Um but institutionally, not individually but institutionally there's a different institutional value. The institutional value of most mainstream media organisations is to hoard information and keep it away from the public, and then just produce little things that are spun, hyped up to the maximum degree, that will attract attention and also be used as a stick against the enemies of the proprietor, or the competition, or the enemies of the ideological values of the institution.
17.12.28		
	INTV	And you?
17.12.48	JULIAN	So, we believe it is our primary task to add to the historical record, that is our primary task, to have an accurate historical record to maintain the rights of people to communicate with each other. The-, the rights of people to communicate with each other safely, and the rights of the-, of people to create the historical record, and that's very-, seems very abstract but these things are what in essence produces justice. So justice is an expression of these two things, and-, and we are driven by the desire to um to-,
	INTV	'Cause there's sort of-, the only reason I ask is, time and time again the sort of the journalists will say, "Julian wasn't like us," I mean it's such a sort of, "he was different."
17.13.44	JULIAN	Well you-, you see, um Bill-, Bill Keller once said that while he-, maybe he's a journalist but he's not my kind of journalist, and, well, thank god, I mean that's all I can say, thank god I'm not Bill Keller's type of journalist. Um perhaps ... another way, I mean, um yes I've done a lot of journalism and I've written books and I have done two documentaries and so on, but um if you mean journalist as someone all they do is they write stories, no I'm not, I'm not just that. Um that's a noble profession but I am a systematiser, I like to solve big problems, and the way you solve big problems is you see what

17.14.52		<p>someone does individually, in one case, and then you try and do it in a thousand cases and in a million cases, and you create a system to do it. Um and to that degree I am an engineer, that's-, and it's a different approach, one wants to solve the whole problem, not just knock off um there-, there's a corrupt company and some individual, and there's a-, there's a massacre in Afghanistan, and you knock off this one and this one. Rather-, that's noble activity but it's only ever going to be a small activity for any one individual, um rather, I like to create a whole system that can multiply that type of activity a million times and-, because it would be completely impossible for me to individually produce all the journalism we have done, absolutely impossible. There's a story right now every two minutes based on our material, according to Google News, there's also other stories that are not indexed in Google News but according to Google News every two minutes the last week there has been a story, there has been 35,000 stories um this month according to Google News that've come out. So, obviously I cannot possibly write myself a story every two minutes, so, but if you want the effects of those stories, I mean, what do these people want, do they want the effect or do they want to be the person who has written a story? And so, I-, I've often-, when I</p>
17.15.43		<p>was in-, did a conference at Berkeley and um [I] said there, "Are-, are you a journalist or are you an activist?" uh, I thought, who cares, you know, isn't it more interesting just what you-, what you-, let the-, let the information speak for itself. But um "Why?" I said, "Well, you know, as far as journalism is getting information the public doesn't know and processing it, verifying it's true, giving it to the public in various ways, well, I'm a journalist. But if I had to choose between the goals of justice and the goals of whatever that is, I would choose the goals of justice. So to that degree, and-,</p>
17.16.17		<p>and that I fight for the rights to do this at all, I am-, I am an activist, and actually do not see these things as being incompatible with each other." I find it very bizarre actually, because if you ask what-, what is the goals, or what are the goals of journalism, what is the goals of a journalist activity, and of course there's journalism about shoes and there's journalism about navels, and there's jour-, there's journalism about the type of pie you should eat, but I'm going to put all that aside and say that's not too hard to do so I'm not going to talk about it. Um but the-, the journalism that holds power to account, it is about powerful institutions and it's about information that is fighting not to be revealed, so you've got to work for it, what is-, what is that journalism about?</p>
17.17.22		

TAPE NO or FILE No: 44

TIMECODE	NAME	Dialogue
	INTV	Okay cool, so, right, back at shoe journalism which you're not doing. You can't-,
17.18.40	JULIAN	So-, so if we look at that journalism which is involved in the description of power and how power operates in the world, which is the one that I find interesting because it is trying to so hard to stop the information coming out so you've actually got to do some work to get it out, um why do it? And the seeming response by many journalists who write about themselves, 'cause there's many who actually just do proper work as opposed to those who talk about journalism, although I'm talking about it now, um the response by those journalists is, "Oh no I don't do my journalism for any reason, I don't do it for a reason at all, I'm not-, not trying to achieve anything by doing this," and of course you know that's a lie 'cause everyone does something for a reason. Um so well what-, what is your reason? Are you trying to address injustice? Are you trying to um satisfy your desire for sadism? I, I mean, what is the reason that-, that you are engaged in [that activity], are you just trying to make money? And if you push them far enough eventually most people will go, "I'm just doing it for the money, and my organisation's just doing it for the money," because otherwise they have to-, they're forced to admit that they're either doing it for a political reason, in which case they no longer have that neutrality that they're searching for, um or they're doing it for a temperament or values reason, in which case also their neutrality appears to be compromised. So, most of them will say, "Well I'm-, we're just doing it for money," and I go, "Okay, so you're just doing it for money, your personal money, your career, and your institution's money which is coupled with whatever other business interests your proprietor has. So, now that we have established that we can completely dispense with any future discussion of how moral and important your journalism is because we've understood that you're just doing it for the money. We can just dispense with that, we don't need to bother with it anymore. Um if on the other hand you say that er you are-, you are motivated by another purpose," which all people are um to a-, various degrees, "then we can say okay, then the purpose of journalism, the-, or at least the um why other people should tolerate it, um is that um it addresses injustice and it makes the society more ju-, more just and it-, it holds powerful people to account and powerful organisations to account that wouldn't otherwise be effectively held to account." And so that's a-, that is the-, the type of journalism that I do, it is-, it's to hold these powerful organisations to account, and you can say, "Well, you just do that because of your-, your temperament and because of your cultural values and so on," okay, I accept, I accept it is just my temperament and-, and my cultural values and my upbringing and so on, but that is who I am and that is what I do.
17.19.31		
17.20.26		
17.21.20		
	INTV	Right, and [which is back-.] well, nevermind, come back to your temperament, yeah, what is your temperament then, actually,

		what do you say is your temperament?
17.21.58	JULIAN	I think it's probably best not to talk about it too much.
	INTV	Why?
17.22.03	JULIAN	Um well I haven't-, I haven't had time to think about it, I-, I have just noticed that um, you know, like we all do, that we-, we find particular lines of work pleasurable and-, and satisfying and-, and other lines of work not pleasurable and satisfying. Anyway, so-, so, addressing injustice on a mass scale I find pleasurable and satisfying, and it-, and it's not just a matter of um that I like to see powerful, unjust people fall, or to see victims rise up and have their day in the sun, um it's-, one can achieve that feeling to some degree on small individual cases, um but it-, it is the-, the systematisation of that process, um to work out how to do that on a mass scale, that is philosophically and intellectually challenging.
	INTV	Mm.
17.23.12	JULIAN	As well as combining with it a desire to do a particular um line of work, er probably as a result of my temperament.
	INTV	Okay, well I'd leave it to yourself to push on the temperament. Alright, so come on engineer, you make your first systemisation with the mass media and what's your initial judgement on how it goes? 'Cause, you know, it's published, it's out there.
17.23.38	JULIAN	We have different things and different types, but um the-, the counterattack against the Afghan war logs was very interesting. So, I predicted, based upon previous experience, that we'd have the initiative for a couple of days and then turn around and that is precisely what happened, we had the initiative um to-, the Pentagon and so on was on the defensive, the White House was on a defensive, um and then there was various forms of counterattack. It was quite aggressive, and-, and it's interesting to contrast the Afghan war logs to the Iraq war logs in terms of the counterattack. Now, we learnt from the Afghan war logs and we put together a stronger team, we pulled in non-mainstream media groups, we pulled in Iraq Body Count, um we pulled in lawyers for Iraqi refugees um in London, um TV, so er Channel 4 and Al Jazeera, um a non-profit investigative um journalism group, the Bureau of Investigative-, Investigate Journalism, and we had a-, a united press conference and so on, so. So the-, the stage management and atmospherics were better structured with this, and also um Le Monde we [brought to the team], so that was better. But I-, I think the extra success we had with the-, with the Iraq war logs um is primarily due to a number of groups currently operating in Iraq, versus operating in Afghanistan.
17.24.21		
17.25.15		
	INTV	Hmm-hmm.
17.25.19	JULIAN	So, the ISAF, the US, NATO and other coalition operating in Afghanistan has over 30 countries involved in it, um including Jordan, um which didn't admit that it was involved until we leaked a NATO paper show-, showing that it was, um so that's essentially all of NATO, United States, Australia, New Zealand and some other countries. Now, left in Iraq when we released the Iraq war logs was only about five countries and many of those countries saw that they were trying to be on their way out, as gently as possible [to

		the] United States, ["We're going to leave."] Um so, the counterattack for the Iraq war logs um was only the United States, and for the United States the current administration saw that Iraq was most closely associated with the previous administration.
	INTV	Mm.
17.26.31	JULIAN	For Afghanistan it is most closely associated with the Obama administration, it's Obama's war, and he pushed that in his election that he was going to move the whole war from Iraq to Afghanistan.
	INTV	Hmm-hmm.
17.26.48	JULIAN	So the-, the number of powerful groups that the Iraq war logs threatened was lower than that of the Afghan war diaries, and as a result the counterattack was correspondingly smaller. Um and-, and we saw very quickly a-, a number of inquiries um in response to it in er in the UK, in Denmark, in the United Nations, er in Iraq itself.
	INTV	Til, I think you are going to have to go and play with them, I think this is...
	TILLY	unheard
	INTV	Ok, oh well fuck it, we'll just have to go with it. Umm.
	JULIAN	Are they going to have dinner?
	INTV	They've had it
	TILLY	No they've just had it. Don't know what time bath time is...
	INTV	Oh well, such is life.
	JULIAN	Now they're all energised from the food.
	INTV	Yes – stop it. We'll just have to ride it. There's nothing we can do
	JULIAN	We can move to another room
17:27:52	INT	It would be a bit weird if you suddenly move and shift location umm..
		Time code break
17:42:40	CREW	And happiness
	INTV	Happiness, alright
	INTV	So what is going on now, 'cause I will freely admit I don't understand what is going on now in terms of, you know, cables out there and not out there, and how they came there, and everything like that.
17.42.51	JULIAN	Yeah. So, over the last um since November 29 we have been engaged in a process of pulling in media organisations and human rights groups from over 50 different countries, 90 organisations, to go through um the US embassy cables, 200-, 251,000 of them, um produce stories and reports on them, and in return redact them, bring them back to us, and we publish them at the same time as the underlying stories and reports are published.
	INTV	Right.

17.43.30	JULIAN	That way these media groups can be kept honest because the primary source material is in the public, we eventually build up a library of all the cables to make available to the public, um so we fulfil our duty of getting every single diplomatic cable into the historical record for everyone, um and we exercise due diligence in removing the occasional person's name, it's rare, but the occasional person's name um who might be wrongfully at risk of er incarceration er or assassination. So, that process had been working well um until we discovered that David Leigh, the brother-in-law of the editor, Alan Rusbridger, of The Guardian, had put into his Guardian book the entire decryption password, including that very part that he was meant to never write down anywhere, um into his book, described as such in detail um and in violation of the written agreement we had with him. That decryption password is capable of decrypting the encrypted backup archives of the material. Now, for er to-, to protect the cables from being seized prior to their publication by US authorities or UK authorities um or intelligence agencies, we had encrypted them using the same method that the US government use-, uses to encrypt top secret documents, A-,
17.44.36		
	INTV	Sure.
17.45.11	JULIAN	AS-,
	INTV	Sorry.
17.45.12	INTERVIEWEE	AS256.
	INTV	Right.
17.45.15	JULIAN	And distributed in a number of places. Um so, that is perfectly secure provided the key is not revealed. He revealed the key.
	INTV	Right.
17.45.29	JULIAN	However, people still didn't know about the fact that-, that-, which key revealed er decrypted which file, although s-, described accurately in the book as a key that decrypts all the cables um the file name is not described, um and the file name we used was a-, a hidden file um zdot um PGP, so ob-, obscure. That obscurity is not to protect it from decryption, it-, it is impossible to decrypt without the passphrase, it is to simply to protect it from attacks at destroying it. Um back in November and December when um there was a 120-man Pentagon taskforce, a publicly declared CIA taskforce, publicly declared taskforces in Australia involving internal, external intelligence agencies, Department of Defence, the Australian Federal Police, FBI taskforce] etc. So, the biggest risk we faced was that there would be no publication at all. Um the risk that The Guardian would deliberately publish the secret key um we did not consider to be a risk, um given that they had signed a contract that they would not do so, and that we were giving them all the cables anyway. We had to give them all the cables and the key so that they could publish stories based on the cables.
17.46.39		
	INTV	Right.
17.47.02	JULIAN	Um but we di-, we discovered um a cou-, a couple of months ago that um an individual in Berlin who was in friendly contact with David Leigh, a man by the name of Domscheit-Berg, had been

		telling very selected people the location of the file and pointing to the David Leigh book, pairing together these two bits of information, and in that way giving them all 251,000 unredacted cables. And um-,
	INTV	So why not change the password?
17.47.42	JULIAN	Well, you can't change passwords of encrypted files, that's not how that works. It's-, encryption is like translation, you take a doc-, a big book in English, you run it through Google Translate or some translator, you get a book in German, and then you go and distribute that book and only people who can read German can read it. So, it's the same thing with encryption. You take the original document, you encrypt it using a passphrase into another form, encrypted form, and then you can distribute that everywhere, and no one can read it, provided they do not have the decryption key.
	INTV	And you can't-,
17.48.21	JULIAN	David Leigh published the encryption key.
	INTV	Sorry, I [didn't mean to charge] across, but you can't re-encrypt it in a different form?
17.48.26	JULIAN	Well you can re-encrypt your copy of it, but you can't obviously re-encrypt any of the other copies. And there are many copies in order to protect it from censorship attack, in order to protect it from attacks by the US military.
	INTV	Right. So you discover this, and what then happens, and what do you do? What are you doing?
17.48.45	JULIAN	There's quite-, quite complicated steps of procedures. Um this individual in Berlin then er so-, so um to get um for his own power reasons he would-, let-, let's start at the beginning. So, the approximate news value of all the diplomatic cables is something like five million to ten million dollars, as news value. We know that because even three months after we had started publishing and a lot of the choicer stories had been revealed, we were receiving approaching for two million dollars for the cables. Now, we don't sell cables, but we enter into other-, other sort of partnership and we win concessions in relation to the number of journalists that will be put on it and how big they'll run with it, etc, so that's how we-, we win concessions but we don't take money. But those are the sort of offers we were getting. Um so, that prize has corrupted a lot of people, it's caused people to break contracts, it's caused people to do all sorts of things. Um a number of people have been um corrupted by the possession of that prize, that includes David Leigh, the editor's brother-in-law, who broke every point in the contract in order to get that prize. Also too The New York Times, they were engaged in that conspiracy to break the contract and publish everything um without telling us or involving us or making sure we were secured, or that the alleged source was secured. Um and it has also been used by this Domscheit-Berg character who um entered i-, into business deals with er Freitag, a newspaper in Berlin, and information.dk, another in er Denmark, by given them all the cables through the mechanism of saying, "Here, I'm telling you about the password in the book and the file location." So, mutually deniable.
17.49.54		
17.50.56		

	INTV	Right.
17.51.00	JULIAN	So from that perspective he can say, "I didn't give them the cables," and they can say, "He didn't give us the cables, he just gave us the decryption password and the file location." Um and Freitag er decided that that was quite a s-, a story, eventually, that they wanted to run with, um and they could use that to attack us because um he started trying to start a rival um whistleblowing organisation.
	INTV	So. So, what are you trying to say? I mean how do you-
17.51.32	JULIAN	So we found out that Freitag is going to publish this information and we implore upon them to not publish it, because once this combination is revealed then [that all] reveals and-, and all our redaction work is in vain, not our publishing work but all our redaction work is in vain. Um and er we also asked the State Department how their warning programme has go-, been going along and could they speed that up, they started in November and December last year. Um it took us 36 hours to get a-, a proper correspondence-, a proper interaction with the State Department, um the State Department having a policy of refusing to communicate with us, so we had to re-, reach a high enough level for that to be undone.
	INTV	Did you ring Crowley? What did he say?
17.52.21	JULIAN	Yes I spoke to Crowley as well, um and-, and a number of others and their top lawyer. So, th-, they were of the view 'well, we can't do anything more than we've already done ba-, back then we've informed all these people', etc, um and er then our lawyers instructed this Domscheit-Berg character to stop telling people, this was a dangerous activity and to stop doing it. Um Freitag then prepared another article, much more explicit, and we asked them that they do not publish that, but they did. Um and then Spiegel published more information, um and that was then enough um for anyone interested er in the subject to go and find it and decrypt it, and that is what happened, and it started er spreading um via Twitter, this information, um and eventually started appearing on websites and then someone threw it on a search engine, etc. So,
17.53.32		at that point um we understood that although we had been preparing to publish the majority of material by November 29 we'd have to rush this forward and publish all the rest. Now, very interesting plays between different-, different groups and institutions sprung up as a result of doing that. So from-, from our perspective we saw that all the bad guys, all the intelligence agencies, um which Crowley said as well, would have the material as a result of this exposure.
	INTV	Right.
17.54.02	JULIAN	Every autocratic regime worth its salt. Um that in fact any computer literate person would have the material if they're interested, um and any department with a computer section would have the material, 'cause all it required was um searching a little bit, um or eventually nothing was required, you could just downl-, all that is required is just downloading this great big file and then searching through it. Er a little bit of effort required to actually do the searching but um well within er the abilities of any

17.54.51		computer literate person or any department that has a computer section. Um but not within the abilities of every activist and every journalist, er or those people mentioned in the material. So, we had a race between the reformers who can use the material to reform their governments, as has been done across the world in various ways, and those organisations resisting reform, to undermine and subvert and prepare their press l-, prepare their press lines, um and round up agitators and so on. So, both from a impact maximisation perspective and from a harm minimisation perspective it was necessary to then publish everything, since it was already available, to publish everything in easy to read form er to make the-, the playing field level, so that everyone would have easy access to the material, not just the intelligence agencies and the people who were computer literate.
17.55.47		
	INTV	So your critics allege that 'look, this is just Julian doing what he's all along wanted to do, just get it all out there with everybody ...'
17.55.57	JULIAN	No, no, no, not-, not my critics, David Leigh at The Guardian, the person who disclosed the password, the person who-, that we are in pre-litigation action in as a result of the disclosure of the password, alleges and has been fighting for his career as a result of that act of ne-, negligence and malice. So, he has pulled in all his contacts at The Guardian, and of course he's the brother-in-law of the editor, um and others. Quite remarkably um his underling, James Ball, went to Reuters to a journalist by the name Mark Hosenball, to put out some poison into Reuters to get them to do a newswire that was hostile to us to try and protect David Leigh. So, it's-, it's a bit like this Tolstoy story of the forged couco-, the forged coupon. So it's just a little bit of fraud happens one day, coupon is-, is forged, but then it ne-, the fraud needs to be covered up, and then someone doesn't have the money as a result of the-, the fraud being committed, etc. And-, and the-, the poison from the one immoral event starts to cascade into more and more moral-, more and more immoral events, and more and more lies start to accumulate as people try and justify and defend their position, and um remove the credibility of those people who are explaining what they did, what was the error that they conducted, or what was the mal-, the act of malice that they engaged in. And that is true for David Leigh, and because David Leigh's part of The Guardian, because this was a Guardian book with The Guardian on the front of the cover, um that organisation has been fighting for its life to avoid culpability, morally, politically and legally, um over that action.
17.56.51		
17.57.44		
	INTV	And does it matter 'cause from the outside it can look like just a pissing match amongst people who used to work together?
17.58.04	JULIAN	I-, it matters to the-, it matters in a number of ways. So, it matters that it was done at all so that our schedule was interfered with, on the-,
17:58:16	MAN	I'm sorry to interrupt – you've got to take this call.,
	INTV	Ok, cool
		Time Code break
18:46:35	JULIAN	Doing visa in the US

	INTV	Good, very good for blocking it?...ahh...go for it? Right...
18:46:46	INTV	So, from the outside this could look like a pissing match between journalists, does it matter at all? And be-, sorry, pissing match between people who used to work together, does it matter?
18.46.54	JULIAN	The-, the details don't matter much to the-, to the average person, the effects are significant, and the effects in relation to this organisation is significant. Er may-, maybe it's-, it's simply um an old-age human story that um wealth that is small and can be-,
18:47:15	INTV	It's Alright
	JULIAN	Hey (shouting at kids)
	INTV	Is that management by example?
	INTV	So the effects.
18.47.30	JULIAN	Er the-, the effects have been significant, even though they were not intended to be significant, but they have been significant, and they have also made it very difficult for this organisation in a number of ways. Um it has to a degree er compromised the ability er that we should have to complete our mission, and complete it well.
	INTV	Why? How?
18.47.58	JULIAN	Oh well, that resources that would've been spent on er carefully managing this chessboard that we have to play with um have instead been on managing these um squabbles is not quite right 'cause it's a bit more serious than that, but ma-, managing these um interests er within individuals associated with the mainstream media.
	INTV	Yeah? And for you personally does it matter legally?
18.48.32	JULIAN	Legally some of it matters, for instance David Leigh in his obsession to destroy us before we can sue him um has made statements um that are very harmful to er us, to me, er and to-, and our alleged source, Bradley Manning. So for instance he stated in his book, against all journalistic ethics, that Bradley Manning was our source, not allegedly, but just was. Um now he doesn't have any information on which to judge that, but nonetheless he makes the claim and the claim will be presumably used by er Bradley's prosecutor when it comes to trial. He has stated that I um didn't-, said that informants deserve to die, um although that is not true and other witnesses at the event have also said that that is not true, but nonetheless he has repeated it constantly, including to American audiences. Um so that's-, that affects us legally and um just the-, the continual smears and innuendo, bringing out every pl-, every possible aspect that he could find about er the security of our organisation and different people and so on, when we're all under er threat of um being extradited to the United States for espionage. So, I mean, you know, e-, every good story needs a Judas and this story has two.
18.49.34		
	INTV	And they are?
18.50.09	JULIAN	Oh they are um David Leigh and Domscheit-Berg.
	INTV	In what-, in what sense Judas? Not-, is this not just a falling out

TITLE: WikiLeaks Secrets and Lies
 INTERVIEWEE: Julian Assange
 TAPE NO or FILE No: 40 - 46

		amongst sort of highly strung egos? Why Judas?
18.50.21	JULIAN	No I-, I mean we can look at um Nick Davies for example, that's just a falling out, and Nick is, you know, he's not doing that anymore, he's-, I wouldn't say that h-, he's seen-, seen the light or seen everything our way in that dispute over Channel 4 but, you know, he-, he's gotten things in perspective, which is right. Um we've gotten things in perspective, I mean we tried to do another deal with The Guardian and patch things up and I met Alan Rusbridger on August the fourth and we set up a new project in relation to Afghanistan, under the proviso that his brother-in-law would not be a part of it a-, at all. But that has-, was destroyed as a result of the revelations of the password book, um so the revelation of the Cablegate password. Um and not because we became angry but simply because it-, it was to do with the Afghan data and we had sent people to Afghanistan that-, and set up Afghani journalists, it's the hardest publishing environment in the world er for diplomatic cables, the most dangerous in the world is in Afghanistan, um so difficult sending people there, finding the right people, forming their Western cover. Um and The Guardian was going to be one of the organisations involved in that Western cover and of course that is now no longer going to happen, and so the West will be deprived of this understanding of how difficult it is to do journalism er in Afghanistan.
18.51.13		
18.51.57		
	INTV	Right. And so how, I mean-,

TAPE NO or FILE No: 45

TIMECODE	NAME	Dialogue
	INTV	So what is your legal status, [variously], currently?
18.52.39 18.53.42	JULIAN	So-, so right now there are three issues, um there is the most serious one, the US Grand Jury process in Alexandria, Virginia, that is six kilometres from the centre of Washington. 18 to 23 individuals from that area, which has the highest density of government employees in the United States, are empanelled onto a jury to consider how to indict me for espionage, and perhaps others. It is held in secret, there are four prosecutors present from the Department of Justice and FBI agents, there is no judge, there is no defence counsel. Just the jurors who are government employees or the wives of government employees, or husbands of government employees, and the prosecution. And since um last year, mainly December or so last year, that jury has been investigating um, trying to pull together enough evidence to indict me and um our supporters or volunteers, um or others who support us, um with espionage.
	INTV	And if you were a betting man what would you give the chances of them dragging you over there?
18.54.05 18.55.04	JULIAN	Well, a Grand Jury would indict a ham sandwich because of that situation, it's a well known fact, and that is why-, it is no-, it is no consequence that it is in this location. All national security cases are deliberately investigated using Grand Juries in that location. A Grand Jury is a mechanism to remove the separation from the executive and judiciary, so executive being the government that tells particular departments to carry out orders, and the judiciary which is meant to independently judge the actions of people under the law, which is constructed by Congress. The Grand Jury is nominally a judicial instrument because it's a-, a judging instrument, the jurors judge, but there's no judge, there's no defence counsel, so it's a kangaroo court um and it is used by the Department of Justice to issue subpoenas for coercively er force people to testify, er telephone taps, etc, etc. Um and a number of those have been issued, er they have been issued on wikileaks.org, the domain name, seeking information based er on me, has been issued on Twitter seeking information on me er and on Bradley Manning, it's issued er and a number of other people, volunteers er for WikiLeaks, um most of the prominent volunteers, except for one.
	INTV	Shit, I didn't appreciate that they got that far.
18.55.33	JULIAN	And-, and the one exception, the one name that is never on those subpoenas is Daniel Domscheit-Berg.
	INTV	Alright, so number one. Number two and three, where are you on um-,
18.55.48	JULIAN	Num-, number two, the er extradition case to Sweden. I have not been charged, um I have not been indicted, er I have been detained here under house arrest for 274 days, um and I am fighting extradition um for the usual reasons, er to prevent onwards

		extradition to the United States, but especially um because I have not been charged with a crime and therefore I should not be extradited anywhere.
	INTV	But you ain't going to get extradited, I mean you can get extradited from England as fast as you can from Sweden.
18.56.29 18.57.22	JULIAN	That's possible, to the United States, yeah, so neither situation is good, both situations are bad. Um the situation in England is a little bit easier for me to manage because I speak English, so I-, the Swedish legal system is alien to me, I don't speak the language, um so it's quite hard to deal with. Er there's also some precedents here in the UK that for instance Gary McKinnon, um who's a-, alleged to have hacked um some Pentagon sites about ten years ago, is still resisting his extradition, so he's been able to do that. So, although the law in the UK is not especially favourable concerning the United States, the process is much more favourable, there's sort of many more appeal-, appeal layers, the courts are much more open, they're not closed, [they're secret] courts generally, er and I know the language. So it's-, it's better from that position to fight it here. Um Sweden also has something called a temporary surrender where they don't actually extradite you, it's a legal fiction er to say they just loan you to another state, and the United States are-, is quite fond of using this legal fiction.
	INTV	Right, so-,
18.57.46	JULIAN	You're not actually extradited, you're just loaned for some law enforcement purpose.
	INTV	But, I mean, I'm going to start again I'll ask the original question, did you not see this coming when you started out?
18.57.56	JULIAN	Of course, yeah.
	INTV	And is it frightening?
18.58.03	JULIAN	It's-, it takes time and resources to manage, it's-,
	INTV	Go on, that's not-, go on, what do you feel about it, you can't be thrilled about it?
18.58.10	JULIAN	Well, I'm not thrilled about it, I-, it's extremely interesting, um it-, it's revealed a whole lot of relationships, it's revealed a-, a really extraordinary relationship between Sweden and the United States um that I wasn't aware of, um even my most cynical interpretations of Swedish geopolitical behaviour didn't encompass what the rea-, what the actuality is. Um it's revealed interesting relationships about the EU, um that essentially the elite in one country in the EU and the elite in the other countries in the EU all agree to crush their respective populations for each other.
	INTV	Right, I meant more-,
18.58.52	JULIAN	Very interesting power dynamic.
	INTV	Sure, I meant more that you must've seen that when-, irrespective of the immediate Sweden er England thing, I meant more that when you take on the United States they're going to come after you.
18.59.04	JULIAN	Yeah, sure. But, I mean, look at it from another perspective. Um we

18.59.38		continue to publish every day, we got everything out, all of Cablegate, the whole thing, despite a 120-man Pent-, public-, despite a publicly declared 120-man Pentagon taskforce, similar er publicly declared taskforces at the CIA, FBI, Department of Justice, er White House, Australian government had its equivalent, er it's come out that the Canadian government had its equivalent and we must assume also, whilst not publicly revealed yet, that the British government had its equivalents. Um despite all that pressure um our arrangements have worked to the degree that we've kept to our commitment to our sources and got the material out to the public, and done so in a way that has a lot of impact. And you maybe think 'well it's-, what about your position, it's rather difficult', it's not that difficult. I'm not dead, um I have been imprisoned for ten days, but only ten days. Yes it wasn't very nice, not dignified, but it was only ten days. Um yes I'm under house arrest and it's um not a dignified state to be in, but um I can still do some work, um and other people such as Bradley Manning are in worse positions. Um and others were in worse positions, Egypt had 20,000 political prisoners in Cairo until the revolution, it doesn't have 20,000 political prisoners anymore.
19.00.33		
	INTV	Cool, right.
		Change of location Time Code break
	INTV	Back at diplomatic cables.
19.03.30	JULIAN	Yeah.
	INTV	Most important of them, what-, well, what were the ones that you-, struck you as significant and what was the significance of them as a whole?
19.03.39	JULIAN	Ah, so, when-, whenever we look at the individual we run the risk that we'll exclude the big picture. So I quite like this question as well. Um-,
	INTV	Good.
19.03.55	JULIAN	There's 251,000 diplomatic cables that if printed out would be 3,000 volumes of history about the last six years of the world, that is the history, the recent history, of how to run an empire the likes of which the world has never seen, the largest empire ever, how to run it. Another way of looking at it, it is half the State Department's brain, um was their internal resource of how they saw the world, information they knew about the world the past six years. The reason I say only half is because it doesn't include the top secret information, so it's secret, classified, confidential, sensitive, but unclassified, there's serious information there um but not everything that the State Department does or the US government is aware of is in that material. Important to remember. Um sometimes we see a shadow of top secret activities, much more clandestine activities trickling down into the secret material that we released, and a good example of that is the tasking order to spy on the United Nations er and NGOs in South America and a few other countries. Those tasking orders to me are the most significant descriptions and the most rev-, rev-, the most revelatory individual documents, although they didn't end up to go on to have the largest effect.
19.05.01		

19.05.53		Documents about Tunisia for example ended up to have much larger effects, documents about Suleiman er had much larger effects in-, in Egypt. Er but as a single document that tells you something about a large section of the world, the US empire, that you didn't know before, er I find that document to be the most significant. It-, it is a tasking order put out by Hillary Clinton on behalf of the National Security Agency and the CIA to collect DNA, um voice prints, eye, iris scans, credit card, frequent flyer numbers, er VPN passwords, passwords that pe-, people use for their mailbox and so on. So, in other words the full espionage kit, and why should US diplomats be collecting this information? Well first of all it's illegal under UN law for diplomats to be directly operating like spies . Everyone knows that they talk to spies, but to actually be doing the spying themselves in this manner is illegal. But it-, it shows you the-, the entrance to the vast hoovering apparatus which is the National Security Agency. So why does the United States government want the genetic information of Ban Ki-moon? Why does it want iris scans? Why does it want these passwords? Well the answer is because DNA can be used for DNA authenticating, so when someone goes to a secret computer system some of them have locks that require your sweat or something, you know, to-, to open them, others have iris scans that they need to open them, um others have passwords, and the Uni-, United States and the National Security Agency er spies all over the world by remotely en masse hacking into computer systems, spying on undersea cables, on satellite telephone traffic, on internet traffic er and so on. And so, that's a-, a shadow of a top secret activity that is really one of the defining parts of power now, it is this bulk spying conducted by the National Security Agency and similar agencies in other countries, but the National Security Agency um dwarves that of all the other countries combined.
19.07.03		
19.08.05		
	INTV	We've had two semi-official responses to that, which is one, so big surprise, and two, well hey, maybe the diplomats just chuck the order in a waste paper basket.
19.08.28	JULIAN	Well I, you know, if-, if diplomats chuck all the correspondence of Hillary Clinton in a waste paper basket we might as well fire them all, and Hillary as well, right? Of course not. I mean, those are serious tasking orders put out for serious reasons. It doesn't mean every diplomat is-, is obeying them, but it means that someone wanted them to obey.
	INTV	And the first?
19.08.48	JULIAN	Oh, you mean the 'of course'?
	INTV	Yeah.
19.08.52	JULIAN	Um of course embassies are involved in spying, of course, it's, I mean, um every-, every large embassy has [signals and] intelligence equipment listening into local radio traffic and telephone calls, and it has its CIA section and so on, um that's not unusual. It's-, it's the particular methods that are interesting. It's not interesting that diplomats are on the borders of intelligence activity, it's been known for many years, what is interesting is what are the particular methods and who are they directed against, er and the level of detail for instance in a tasking order against the Palestinian authority, the le-, level of detail of the tasking of all

19.09.51		different points of the peace process and-, and individual cyber systems and communications and so on er being sent out. It-, it shows you um the er the-, the prevalence and the resources, and abilities, of the National Security Agency.
	INTV	Completely. And the other sort of, again, slightly ... well the State Department when they were trying to get these shoved under the carpet were saying, "Well look, it's not your right to make these public, it's our right to make the decision. We're the people."
19.10.05	JULIAN	Well they abrogated-, they abrogated their rights-, well, first of all some basic political philosophy, governments do not have rights, people have rights. Governments have the duty to enforce the rights of the people. Now, in their duty of enforcing individual rights they may need sometimes to keep information secret, for example if um you are investigating um money laundering, um or if you're investigating arms trade and you want to set up a fake deal to try and nab an arms dealer, you want to keep part of that secret until you nab the person. Um I've never said that secrecy doesn't have its place, in fact it's a cornerstone of WikiLeaks, is secrecy. It is protecting the identity of our sources , so it's a cornerstone of our operations. Privacy or secrecy gives organisations an edge over actors who are hostile to them, so it is important for small organisations that are acting in the public's-, public interest to have secrecy. Equally it is important that large and powerful organisations never believe that they have absolute secrecy. It's not important that everything be revealed instantly from them, but it is important that they never feel secure that any particular piece of information will never be revealed. Because it is that fear that some plan will be revealed that keeps them accountable to the degree that they are accountable at all. Um now the-, the State Department and other branches of the US intelligence industry, national security industry, have not given the people the information that they should receive, so they have abused the classification process again and again, everyone says that there's too much classification. Barack Obama says there's too much classification, Hillary Clinton says there's too much classification, everyone says that there is over-classification er and that information that should be public is classified and kept secret. Um because of the failure of the State Department and others to address that problem there must be other means to pull information out, and we are part of that process. And um there simply is no other process to do it, so i-, it would be-, in some Utopia um we might imagine that a hypothetical State Department would in fact police itself and be completely honest, and reveal its most embarrassing debaucheries, but, you know, un-, until um 2099 I think we will just have to rely on inside whistleblowers.
19.11.17		
19.12.15		
19.13.08		
	INTV	Very good, alright. Okay, so come on, um but the run-up to this serious thing was clouded by the worst row with a-, amongst your partners.
19.13.25	JULIAN	Which thing?
	INTV	Well, the run-up to the publication of the diplomatic cables you were having terrible rows with The New York Times. What's that all about?
19.13.32	JULIAN	There wasn't rows with our partners, there is simply one incident,

<p>19.14.46</p> <p>19.15.42</p> <p>19.16.36</p>		<p>one incident, and that was the deliberate-, so, start from the beginning. Um we knew the significance of the diplomatic cables as an instrument of reform, and we also knew its significance as an input to a news organisation, we knew its significance. We also knew that we had a CIA taskforce assigned to us, some 120 people working in the Pentagon against us, er and other organisations. We knew that they knew that we had 251,000 diplomatic cables, over a 100,000 which were classified. So, I personally was in a very precarious position, and others. We made various encrypted copies of this material in many different localities, but we were still worried about a surprise sneak attack simultaneous across all the continents where our people were. So, under that basis we were willing to give The Guardian a copy of the material for safekeeping, in the-, as an interim measure, and then we would discuss the precise mechanisms by which it may or may not be published through The Guardian, and to do that, to enforce that, we had Alan Rusbridger, the editor, sign a contract with three points. Number one, no cables would be published at all, no stories from cables would be published, until we gave further agreement, number two, that the cables would not be given to any other organisation and would be held securely, and number three, that the cables would be kept off any internetted-, connected computer system in order to protect them from computer hackers and in a-, inadvertently quoted while we did this delicate manoeuvre of putting out the Iraq war logs, dealing with the legal situation, dealing with financial situations, dealing with potential sourcing, legal issues, um and moving our people into the correct locations. So we were intending to publish in January 2011. The Guardian, and David Leigh personally, secretly and knowingly violated every single point in that contract, took all the material in September or before and gave it to The New York Times, knowing that we did not want to deal with The New York Times anymore because of their jour-, journalistic failures previously and attacks on this organisation and one of our alleged sources. They knew that we wanted to work with the Washington Post and McClatchy instead, um so it's not like there would not be a US partner involved, rather there would simply be-, be a different one. Er but in order to speed up the publication, Leigh was going to retire at the end of the year, to speed up the publication and to keep their business alliance with The New York Times strong they decided to knowingly break every point of that contract and smuggle the material out to The New York Times, to publish it without telling us at all.</p>
	<p>INTV</p>	<p>Hmm-hmm.</p>
<p>19.17.08</p>	<p>JULIAN</p>	<p>So our people would be in the United States, in the UK, in various jurisdictions where it would be dangerous for them, um we would not be re-, ready to publish it ourselves, etc. And they did that entirely for their own self-perceived personal and institutional benefit, to no higher purpose whatsoever.</p>
	<p>INTV</p>	<p>They say, "Well we're holding to the deal-,"</p>

TAPE NO or FILE No: 46

TIMECODE	NAME	Dialogue
	INTV	Yeah, don't you think
	JULIAN	Yep
	CREW	Alright guys
	INTV	Ah, so ok. Er...um
	INTV	So quickly and honestly, what was your beef with The New York Times?
19.18.44 19.19.42 19.20.46 19.21.35	JULIAN	Our beef with The New York Times was number one, they produced the hit story on Bradley Manning um where-, where they stripped him of any sort of um any admirable er motivation at all, stripped him down and talked about his homosexuality, I mean it was just-, just dirty tabloid crap, um number two, that they killed the Taskforce 373 story, even though it had been written for them, and then number three, that they produced a story the day after um our collaboration with them on the Iraq war logs, um a sleazy hit piece targeting me personally, and WikiLeaks as an organisation, full of factual-, factual inaccuracies that could've easily been checked. It was a sleazy tabloid hit piece. It is not that we don't deserve to be criticised in some way, all organisations that do anything have their faults and deserve to be criticised, it was that the criticisms were inaccurate, and then the style was sleazy. And so, those three things combined, plus we weren't that impressed with their story selection, not just that they had killed stories, but they had overly focussed on particular-, on particular things. For example, one of the big findings that we're proud of for the Iraq war logs is that we um noted more than 1,000 cases of torture, documented by the US military, conducted by the Iraqi military, or the US military, um several hundred in the case of the US military. The US military had tortured detainees, er or physically abused them in some manner. And all the other papers, and all the secondary press, picked up um torture in Iraqi hands, US torture of troops, US moves detainees over to um Iraqi hands where they're tortured knowingly, etc, um so torture, torture, torture, torture and that is the-, the common parlance, that is the correct way to describe it when um someone is physically damaged by putting a screwdriver in them or deliberately beating them in order to get them to say something as well. That is torture, that is the common English definition of the word, it's the natural word to use, and the big headline in The New York Times was 'some detainees fared worse in Iraqi hands'. To word torture did not appear in any of the articles, although there were many torture-related articles to have come out of this in the work that we did and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism and-, and the other media partners that we worked with. So, we saw The New York Times as, yes, influential within its market, but on the other hand so corrupting of the material that we were trying to get out, and so hostile to us as an organisation in order to save itself, in order to distance itself, um

19.22.29		that we were not only er betraying the impact of the material, but we were er shooting ourselves as an organisation every time we work with The New York Times because the way they try to save themselves from the lash-back by military apologists in the United States was by attacking us, and therefore increasing the perceived separation. So for-, for self-preservation and to achieve greater impact we decided The New York Times would have to go.
	INTV	But um The Guardian claim that all they're saying is, "Well look, we've had a deal, we've got a deal, we work together, that's-, that's what we want to do."
19.22.40	JULIAN	There was no deal. The de-, the deal was we do the Iraq war logs, sorry, the Afghan war logs, and then partway into that deal was let's-, because the diaries are very similar we will do both at the same time, we'll stagger that, um but certainly no deal about anything else. The-, the line that we took all along is th-, which is the only strategic line, is if you do a good job with this then we will see whether further projects are amenable. So we-, we um held out um any future information we might have as a carrot for them to do good journalism. Um and in fact we started to see that they weren't going to do good journalim-, good journalism with the Iraq war logs, that basically they were burnt out after Afghanistan er but they wouldn't-, but, you know, they're-, they're covetous so that they wouldn't assign other journalists, they wouldn't go, "Okay, now we need a fresh team in The Guardian, a fresh team in The New York Times," they wouldn't do that, um rather they insisted it was the same team that had worked on the Afghan war logs and that-, those teams were completely burnt out. So when they did the Iraq material um it was very, very poor and er the-, the early results in-, so as a result um I negotiated, although we shouldn't have needed to negotiate because the agreement was we'd have control over the embargo date, but I negotiated a six week extension and we used that six weeks to bring in um Channel 4, to bring in Al Jazeera, to bring in the Bureau of Investigate Journalism, to bring in Iraq Body Count, to bring in Phil Shiner's lawyers group and we did a really very good job. Er I think of all the-, of all the things we did-, we have done that was in fact the tightest job that we had, in part because we controlled precisely the deadline, we made the deadline according to when the work was good as opposed to um a deadline that had to do with some ex-, extracur-, um some external events that we didn't control.
19.23.34		
19.24.25		
	INTV	But eventually you do say, "Oh okay, alright, we'll-, alright, alright, we'll do the three of, you know, we'll stick with you three."
19.24.58	JULIAN	No we don't say that, we never said that.
	INTV	Didn't you? Well I mean it was The New York Times, Der Spiegel and The Guardian that eventually publish it together.
	JULIAN	Publish what?
	INTV	On November the first.
19.25.05	JULIAN	Publish what? No-,
	INTV	The cables.
19.25.07	JULIAN	Cables. No, for-, for the um so we found out that The Guardian

<p>19.26.07</p>		<p>and The New York Times were conspiring to publish all the cables, sorry, The Guardian and The New York Times were conspiring to publish their stories about the cables, to reveal to the world that we had the cables, um without telling us. In breach of all those points of the contract. Um and we were tipped off er that something like that was going down, and Der Spiegel wouldn't come to the table. So The Guardian and New York Times tried to enmesh Der Spiegel into this conspiracy and they said, "We're not coming to the table unless um you speak to WikiLeaks, they have to be at least consulted um about this." And so that was the November the first meeting and we-, we heard what was going on, we brought lawyers in, we made a confrontation er to Alan Rusbridger and others, um which internally inside The Guardian they called the WikiLeaks Ambush, er and "Is it true that The New York Times have-, have got all this material or not, er because we need to understand how we play this out, and is a written contract worth anything with-, with The-, with The Guardian?" And no, it's not worth anything apparently, it's worth nothing at all. Um but being realists we worked out well how are we going to manage this very difficult situation, um they've got the material, they've spread the material, they've broken all these contracts, yes all our people in the Uni-, in the United States and oth-, and other countries are in very precarious positions. Um and alleged source Bradley Manning hadn't yet been indicted um and may well end up er being</p>
<p>19.27.09</p>		<p>indicted, and in fact was indicted um for the release of the cables, um so, how do we play this out? Well, we-, what leverage did we have on these organisations? Not much. The greatest leverage is we could immediately give all the material to AP, Reuters, Al Jazeera, straightaway, and AFP, um to undermine exclusivity. Er the other-, and make them more public. The-, the other leverage um is that we still had a moral attack that we could make, and a hypothetical legal attack. The Guardian's position, David Leigh's position, they believed that they could completely destroy us, so they weren't concerned about the legal attack because they thought, you know, that we would be completely buried by the response by the United States. Um they had the leverage of that they could just go and our people could-, would be rounded up in the United States, even if we pushed everything out through AFP and Reuters um our people in the United States would be arrested and we might face problems, and we weren't ready to publish, and um who knows if all the material would still become public, etc. So, we negotiated a month delay to prepare as fast um impossible timeline, but nonetheless, to do what we could, um that we would bring in er Le Monde and El Pais as-, to make sure that it went into the francophone speaking world in North Africa, er and in France as also still a diplomatic power, and it would also go into the Spanish-speaking world, not Spain so much but it would reach down through Latin America. And um so that was agreed, um we didn't agree that previous behaviour was any-, by any means acceptable but being realists we had to go with this, and so that's what we did. Er also other agreements that um the release of the material would be staggered, er that we would take a backseat role as much as possible, so we would not have a press conference and so on, er because we weren't armoured up enough yet, we needed that time to January to be armoured up er politically and strategically and technically. So we had to</p>
<p>19.28.08</p>		
<p>19.29.07</p>		

19.30.10		reduce our role, we h-, to make the stories not about WikiLeaks releases giant leak of documents but rather the actual individual stories, try and pull us back er for our own protection. That um stories exposing um Israel er not be done at all in the first week er in order to keep this se-, rather beneficial separation between a largely Christian Pentagon and a largely Jewish media er class in the United States, we wanted to keep that as separate as possible, um because when both of those two get together, that's a very aggressive force. So, we did that, um and it was successful, er and we survived.
	INTV	Yeah, and it goes out, and what is the impact?
19.30.35	JULIAN	Well it's-, we can look at, you know, media impact was of course tremendous, um-
	INTV	Political impact? Nevermind media impact.
19.30.43	JULIAN	Media impact was tremendous. The-, the political impact, very interesting, is still being felt, I mean it's still not-, we're still feeling now what is the result of that political impact. Um the most significant and clear changes have been um in the Middle East region, in the MENA region, Middle East and North Africa, um the Peruvian election looks like it was changed also, an anti-corruption movement has sprung up in India, the likes of which we've never seen, there's been over 30 front pages in India since March 17th um through our Indian partner, The Hindu, and many more now as a result of this recent release. Um Anna Hazare, a Ghandi-ist, um has been involved in leading this anti-corruption movement. Parliament walked out eight times as a result of the material released in the cables. Um I mean, it's-, it's quite interesting actually that very few people understand the scale of the impact, because every country has had its own tremendous scandals er inside, and um with a-, with a few exceptions where the scandals have been mild, but most countries have had really quite significant scandals, and some have had scandals that are so significant that they've led to changes in government or some other significant structural reform. There's been many er investigations and prosecutions and inquiries um as a result of the release and they're-, they're continuing on. The-, the latest one was er just four days ago where the Iraqi government announced an investigation into the-, a massacre of five adults and five children um by US troops in 2006.
19.31.47		
19.32.30		
	INTV	And you may also have got rid of Prince Andrew, from his job.
19.32.42	JULIAN	Contributed, yeah.
	CREW	Sorry I'm just going to change my needle
	INTV	Well, I think you did didn't you? I think it was...it may have been the final straw
	JULIAN	Have you read that cable? That's just...very funny. I mean you read that and..well it's the stereotype of the british prat – I mean the worst of all british prat
	TILLY	Exactly how you'd expect him to behave as well..so...total confirmation
	INTV	Alright, now quickly going back cos I think the light's collapsing.

	TILLY	Arab Spring
	INTV	Yeah, well Arab spring well he sort of...well..alright. We'll do Arab Spring again, we'll do it quickly cos we want to get it clean. 373, without children screaming in the background.
	INTV	373, you picked out 373.
19.33.33 19.34.38 19.35.28 19.36.21	JULIAN	Ta-, Taskforce 373 is a US special forces assassination squad operating in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It actually changes its unit code name every six months, but has become colloquially referred to as Taskforce 373. In the Afghan war diaries I discovered a reference to seven children being killed, and I look for the surrounding circum-, the surrounding information, and it concerned a HIMARS missile attack, a secretive ground to ground missile system that was just being deployed by the United States um in Afghanistan and Pakistan. And the classifications were such that not even the British were meant to know about this, um although they are close allies, militarily, with the United States operating in Afghanistan. Um Taskforce 373 was working its way down a kill or capture list which we saw most often was a kill or assassinate list, people were given no opportunity to be captured, um a list that was pulled together by the US military. Some 2,000 entrants on the list, it is called the JPEL, joint priority effects list, and there's a sister list called the PEL, priority effects list. Um people are killed as a result of special forces raids, missile attacks, um and drone strikes and-, so that's a-, a significant story, not just that this is happening, that there is an assassination list, that children are being killed and it's been covered up and so on, but also how do people get onto the list. They are nominated by some governor that doesn't like you, a general in the US military, er one general even threatened Hamid Karzai's brother, saying, "Look, any more shit out of you and I'm putting you on the JPEL." How do you get off the list? Well we saw one case where information turned out to be false about how someone should be put onto the list and they were [arbitrarily] removed. You're not notified on-, if you're on the list. Er the Afghan government is, at least publicly, furious about the list because it is no rule of law, you can be assassinated at will if you're a drug dealer, if you displease one of these people who has capability of putting you onto the list. Um so, I thought that was a very significant story about Afghanistan, amongst a number of others, like that we had discovered the deaths of 20,000 people in individual incidents. Um Der Spiegel also thought so and made it their front cover, the front cover of Der Spiegel is worth seven times that of a newspaper because it only comes out once a week. Er The Guardian thought it was worthy of a significant story within The Guardian. Er Eric Schmitt, national security reporter with The New York Times who was our primary reporter contact with The New York Times, thought it was worthy as well and wrote it up into a story, and then it was killed at an editorial level and did not appear in The New York Times.
	INTV	So what?
19.36.58	JULIAN	So that was one of the reasons that we started to distrust The New York Times, and I asked Bill Keller about it, I was saying, "Well, give us some reasons why we should continue working with The New York Times, you know, wh-, why should we? You produce

		slanderous stories about alleged sources of ours that are in prison in very difficult posit-, positions, um you kill stories that are even written by your own reporters that are extremely significant," um and then later on er they produced slanderous stories about us. Er so, bad journalism but also bad manners.
	INTV	And what did he say?
19.37.39	JULIAN	Well in-, in relation to the-,
	INTV	No, when he said, "Why-," when you say, "Why shall I keep on working with you?" what was his argument?
19.37.45	JULIAN	He-, he said, "Well, just let me come and meet you in person, we can sort all this out," and at-, at that time I was busy hiding from the whole US intelligence apparatus so I was like, "Yeah, well you've got to do better than that."
	INTV	Very good. Flicking through my, thank you Tilly Cowan, ridiculous list. Adrian Lamo, does he have any significance? Does he amount to anything? I mean what-,
19.38.13	JULIAN	He hasn't-, I mean, he doesn't appear-, this character doesn't appear to have any significance other than this minor and what appears to be completely coincidental um role he played in the unveiling of history. I mean, if his claims are-, we know actually that a number of his claims are not true because they're contradictory, but um if some of his claims are true, that um he met Bradley Manning over a chat and collected a chat log and then-, and then ratted him out to the army, CID and FBI, um if that is true er then it's only true by coincidence. It's one of these strange and unfortunate things where um the great wheels of the world can be momentarily frozen by a little grain of sand.
19.38.59	INTV	Great, okay, and talking of the breadth of the world as the light nearly collapses completely, back at Arab Spring, you s-, you must've watched it unfolding, presumably, I mean, and what were you seeing as it started to come into being, and what role was your organisation playing or indeed not playing in it?
19.39.22	JULIAN	We need to go back to-, I think December third was the first um Tunisian information published. Um so, we had brought in Le Monde because we knew that the cables would have significant influence in the Middle East and in North Africa and Tunisia for example speaks French, as well as some Arabic. Um so, actually I was wondering about had we f-, foreseen some of the effects in the Middle East previously, because now-, now there's a sort of bit of a-, a fight on for actually who did this good work in the Middle East, and of course people who really suffered for it and really worked at it for a long time were those activists who were working for years in the Middle East, um but they had been working for years so what was the new factor? Yes, more satellites, yes, Al Jazeera becoming more powerful, yes, more mobile phones, yes, more educated, well-travelled people, all contributing factors to drying the kindling, but why that particular moment? So, there has been a fight on for people to take credit over this. Um but I-, I looked to see that before the publication of the cables, um before um December the third, we had put on our Cablegate frequently asked questions um some critics say that the-, that the pending
19.40.24		

19.41.35		<p>publication of the Cablegate material will destabilise the Middle East', well it turns out those critics were right. We put in a-, a sort of politic response to that frequent criticism, that 'well we would not say de-stabilise we would say re-stabilise the Middle East into a new, more harmonious, democratic system', but um of course in order to re-stabilise you need to destabilise. Um and yes, um it did st-, de-stabilise the Middle East and contributed to, in a significant way um according to um Amnesty International and a number of other peo-, num-, number of other people who looked at it, and some Tunisian professors, what happened in Tunisia, which then became the real sort of um inspiration er for Egypt and-, and other countries. Um if we-, if we look at the-, the tactical blow, blow by blow, of how this started to come out, so, er around December third Le Monde published the Tunisian story, we published the underlying cable, um Al Akhbar in Lebanon er who was also working with the cables published um Tunisian material in Arabic. Um the Tunisian government then responded, it banned Al Akhbar er on its firewalls, out of-, in and out of the country, it banned WikiLeaks. Um as a result computer hackers who were supportive of us, and we have many computer hackers as supporters who support our values, went into Tunisia, redirected Tunisian government websites to our Tunisian material, and Tunisleaks sprang up, it was WikiLeaks sort of Tunisia, dedicated to translating Tunisian cables into French, er the entire cable, so Le Monde had just done stories but to translate entire cables into French, um and those were then spread around using social networks and-, and ...</p>
19.42.33		<p>But it's not that that told the Tunisians something they didn't already know, of course they knew that Ben-, the Ben Ali ring was corrupt and violent, etc, it did actually tell them some details they didn't know, like that members of the family had tigers pacing around their-, their mansions, um but it-, it put it in such a way that you could talk about it, that anyone could talk about it, because they could say, "I'm not making an allegation against Be-, Ben Ali, I'm not going to say anything, but have you seen what the US ambassador has been writing?" And anyone from any class could say that, "Isn't it strange that the US ambassador said that?" So that allowed lots of people to openly start talk-, talking about it, so it was a emperor's new clothes situation where all of a sudden everyone could point out that the emperor was corrupt, everyone, um without too much fear because the US ambassador had secretly pointed it out. But remember, the US and various European countries er had propped Ben Ali up for years and years, they could no longer go, "Well, he's not so bad after all," how could the State Department do that when their own ambassador had been describing his debaucheries? Impossible. So, Ben Ali could not get any support from the United States, er at least no public support, um in his hour of need in Tunisia, and similarly to a slightly less degree with the European support, because that would be to put them at odds with what had been said by US ambassadors. Um then there was a pan-Arab phenomenon, and that's-, once we saw this pan-Arab phenomenon we started stoking it as much as we possibly could, although we didn't-, I think we didn't really see it until the beginning-, the very beginning of January, we didn't understand a pan-Arab phenomenon was going on. Yes, we wanted to destabilise the Mi-, Middle East as a whole in order to bring about democratic reforms, but um we saw that cables had</p>
19.43.13		
19.44.03		
19.45.03		

19.45.56		come out for example about Saudi Arabia, um and in fact one of the many hacking attacks that was directed at Al Akhbar redirected the entirety of Al Akhbar's name, this Lebanese newspaper, er to a Saudi sex site for a period of 24 hours. They had to get the foreign ministry involved and so on to get it back. Eventually a very sophisticated state attack came in and completely wiped out Al Akhbar's pa-, cable publishing operation for four months. Um so the-, the Saudis had to start handing out concessions as a result of revelations in the cables, and the inspiration given by the Tunisians, er to the Shia mino-, to, sorry, to the um Shia underclass. Er similarly, in er Tripoli Gaddafi had to start gathering his people around him and fending off attacks from material that was in the cables, um some just sort of um tabloid stuff like his sexy nurse and so on but others that were much more serious, so serious in fact the US ambassador was expelled um from Tripoli. So the-, these various Arab elites had to turn inwards, and what has kept these um Arab elites in power for so long against the majority rule of their population, has been the support of other-, other Arab elites um across the MENA region, and the support of France, Italy, er the UK and especially the United States, and in some cases also Israel. So, we dealt with this chessboard by trying to get each one of these countries to turn inwards, to direct all their intelligence resources, all their diplomatic resources, all their political resources and all their media resources, to dealing with their own problems. Um and er in um December/January er, maybe it was very early January, Hillary Clinton had what was dubbed an apology tour around all these countries to apologise for WikiLeaks releasing all this embarrassing material about them. Fascinating, it's like s-, so she left a trail of revolutions behind her, um so the apology was not effective in that way, um or it was very effective, I'm not sure what-, what she was actually doing when she was doing this.
	INTV	She-, well you made her life a misery in advance to the publication.
19.48.13	JULIAN	Yeah, um she said that she would be em-, apologising for the rest of her life as a result of that publication.
	INTV	Fantastic. Well look-,
19.48.22	JULIAN	But she should be-, she should be apologising for the rest of her life as a result of the crimes that she's authorised.
	INTV	You think?
19.48.30	JULIAN	Absolutely.
	INTV	Cool, I think we should leave it there 'cause the light seems to have-, but that was a, well, it was a fant-,