

EXECUTIVE SESSION  
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF: ROGER J. STONE, JR.

Tuesday, September 26, 2017

Washington, D.C.

The interview in the above matter was held in Room HVC-304, the Capitol, commencing at 9:41 a.m.

Present: Representatives Conaway, King, LoBiondo, Rooney, Stewart, Gowdy, Hurd, Schiff, Himes, Speier, Quigley, Swalwell, Castro, and Heck.

Appearances:

For the PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE:

KASH PATEL, SENIOR COUNSEL

MARK STEWART, GENERAL COUNSEL

SCOTT GLABE, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL

TIMOTHY BERGREEN, MINORITY DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR

SHANNON GREEN, MINORITY SENIOR INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL

MAHER BITAR, MINORITY GENERAL COUNSEL

LINDA COHEN, MINORITY PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

KRISTIN JEPSON, SECURITY DIRECTOR

For ROGER J. STONE, JR.:

GRANT J. SMITH, ESQ.

ROBERT BUSCHEL, ESQ.

STRATEGYSMITH

Bank of America City Centre

401 East Las Olas Blvd.

Suite 130-120

Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

MR. PATEL: Ladies and gentlemen, if we could begin, please.

Good morning. This is a transcribed interview of Mr. Roger Stone.

Thank you for speaking with us today.

For the record, I am Kash Patel, senior counsel for the majority of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. There are numerous other individuals in the room today, and they will identify themselves as they address you, Mr. Stone.

Before we begin, I wanted to state a few things for the record.

The questioning will be conducted by members and staff. During the course of this interview, members and staff may ask questions during their allotted time period. Some questions may seem basic, but that is because we need to clearly establish facts and understand the situation. Please do not assume we know any facts you have previously disclosed as part of any other investigation or review.

During the course of this interview, we will of course take any breaks that you desire.

We ask that you give complete and fulsome replies to questions based on your best recollection.

This interview will be conducted at an unclassified setting.

If a question is unclear or you are uncertain in your response, please let us know. And if you do not know the answer to a question or cannot remember, simply say so.

You are entitled to have lawyers present for this interview, and I see that you have brought them with you today.

Counsel, if you could please identify yourselves for the record.

MR. SMITH: My name is Grant Smith, attorney for Roger Stone.

MR. BUSCHEL: Robert Buschel on behalf of Roger Stone.

MR. PATEL: Thank you.

This interview will be transcribed. There is a reporter making a record of these proceedings so we can easily consult a written compilation of your answers. Because the reporter cannot record gestures, we ask that you answer verbally to all questions. If you forget to do this, you might be reminded to do so. You may also be asked to spell certain terms or unusual phrases.

Consistent with the committee's rules of procedure, you and your counsel, if you wish, will have a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of this interview in order to determine whether your answers were correctly transcribed. The transcript will remain in the committee's custody.

The committee also reserves the right to request your return for additional questions should the need arise.

The process for the interview will be as follows: The minority will be given 45 minutes to ask questions, and then the majority will be given 45 minutes to ask questions. Immediately thereafter, if you wish, we will take a 5-minute break, after which the minority will be given 15 minutes to ask questions, and the majority will be given 15 minutes to ask questions thereafter. We will continue in this process until the interview is complete.

These timelines will be strictly adhered to by all sides, with no extensions being granted. Time will be kept for each portion of the interview, with warnings given at the 5- and 1-minute marks respectively.

To ensure confidentiality, we ask that you do not discuss the interview with

anyone other than your attorney.

Our record today will reflect that you have not been compelled to appear.

You are reminded that it is unlawful to deliberately provide false information to Members of Congress or staff.

Lastly, the record will reflect that you're appearing under oath. Mr. Stone, would you raise your right hand to be sworn?

Mr. Stone, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. STONE: I do.

MR. PATEL: Thank you, sir.

The witness has been sworn.

Go ahead.

MS. JEPSON: I just want to remind everyone if you haven't left your electronics out front to please do so at this time. That includes BlackBerrys, iPhones, Androids, tablets, iPads or e-readers, laptops, iPods, mp3 players, recording devices, cameras, wireless headsets, pagers, and any type of Bluetooth wristband or watch.

Additionally, I am obligated to remind the witnesses that providing false information to this committee or concealing material information from this committee is a crime punishable by law.

MR. PATEL: Thank you.

A reminder for all: If you are speaking, please use the microphone and make sure it is turned on.

Mr. Stone, before we get to your opening statement, over to the chairman.

MR. STEWART: I have one statement. I'm Mark Stewart, general

counsel for the majority.

I just want to remind the witness that no recordings can take place in this room and that Rule 5 of the House Rules does not permit any recordings of this proceeding.

MR. STONE: I'm fully aware of that. Thank you.

MR. PATEL: Mr. Rooney? Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Stone, welcome.

I just wanted to say to the minority and to Kash, if we could -- because in the past I've sort of gotten the hairy eyeball from some members of the minority when I say that, like, their time is up. And you said in your opening that you're going to give 5- and 1-minute warnings. Could you please do that verbally regardless of what's going on so I'm not the bad guy? I mean, like, "Jackie, your time's up, you're not talking anymore, sorry," you know, I don't want to do that anymore. So --

MR. PATEL: Yes, sir.

MR. ROONEY: -- if you could be the bad guy from now on, I'd appreciate that. Five- and 1-minute warnings I think would be good.

MR. PATEL: Yes, sir.

MR. ROONEY: Thank you.

MR. CONAWAY: Mr. Stone, thank you for coming this morning. Typically, we just start with the questions, but I understand you have a statement you would like to make.

MR. STONE: I would, sir.

MR. CONAWAY: Under your committee rules, you have 5 minutes to say to us whatever you'd like to say. With that, you're recognized.

MR. STONE: Thank you.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member, members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the staff. My name is Roger Stone.

I am most interested in correcting a number of falsehoods, misstatements, and misimpressions regarding allegations of collusion between Donald Trump, Trump associates, the Trump campaign, and the Russian state.

I view this as a political proceeding because a number of members of this committee have made what I consider to be irresponsible and indisputably and provably false statements in order to create the impression of collusion with the Russian state without any evidence that would hold up in a U.S. court of law or the court of public opinion.

I am no stranger to the slash-and-burn aspects of American politics today. I recognize that because of my long reputation and experience as a partisan warrior I'm a suitable scapegoat for those who would seek to persuade the public that there were wicked international transgressions in the 2016 Presidential election.

I have a long history in this business. I strategize, I proselytize, I consult, I electioneer, I write, I advocate, and I prognosticate. I'm a New York Times best-selling author. I'm an opinion journalist. I have a syndicated radio show and a weekly column. And I report for Infowars.com at 5 o'clock eastern every day.

While some may label me a dirty trickster, the members of this committee could not point to any tactic that is outside the accepted norms of what political strategists and consultants do today. I do not engage in any illegal activities on

behalf of my clients or the causes in which I support. There is one trick that is not in my bag, and that is treason.

My colleague Michael Caputo voluntarily sat in this chair a few months ago, gave what I believe were candid and truthful answers to those who cared to sit in on the interview. And yet, when he was done, he was accused of perjury by a member who did not even have the courtesy to show up for his interview. He was eviscerated by some committee members and then subsequently by the press.

The most unfair aspect of this turn of events and behavior by some members is that the committee refuses to this day to release the transcripts of his testimony for the world to read and judge for themselves.

Multiple members of this committee have made false allegations against me in public session in order to ensure that these charges get maximum media coverage. However, now you deny me the opportunity to respond to those very same charges in an open forum. This is cowardly.

Fortunately, we will have the opportunity today to take the exact words of some members of the committee and examine them in order to uncover some lies.

Given this committee's consistent refusal to allow me to testify in public session, in the interest of compromise I have repeatedly requested that the transcript of my testimony here today be released immediately upon the conclusion of today's session. Even this constructive suggestion has been rejected. What is it you fear? Why do you oppose transparency? What is it you don't want the public to know?

These hearings are largely based on a yet-unproven allegation that the Russian state is responsible for the hacking of the DNC and John Podesta and the transfer of that information to WikiLeaks. No member of this committee or the



intelligence agencies can prove this assertion. Because the DNC steadfastly refused to allow the FBI to examine the computer servers, this entire claim is based on a self-serving report by CloudStrike (sic), a forensic IT company retained, directed, and paid for by the DNC.

I recognize that there are those who believe that there was collusion between the Trump camp and the Russian state who now say, "Well, Stone must have been involved," but that is not based on one shred of evidence. There is nothing more than conjecture, supposition, projection, allegation, and coincidence, none of it proved by evidence or fact.

I understand the committee's interest in me. I use all the clauses of the First Amendment to achieve my goals. I am out there; I am provocative and unpartisan. But let's be clear, I have no involvement in the alleged activities that are within the publicly stated scope of the committee's investigation. That would be collusion with the Russian state to affect the outcome of the 2016 election. I have every right to express my views in the public square. I actively participate in matters of great public concern.

The mantra-like repetition of the claim by our vaunted 17 intelligence agencies that the Russians colluded with the Trump campaign to affect the 2016 election does not make it so. These are, after all, the same entities who insisted the North Koreans would not be able to launch a viable rocket for 3 to 5 years. They insisted that Saddam Hussein was in possession of weapons of mass destruction, that there was no torture at Abu Ghraib prison, and that the government had no bulk data collection program -- that is, until Edward Snowden revealed otherwise.

Sadly, our intelligence agencies have been politicized. I realize they are

deeply upset over President Trump's refusal to expand the proxy war in Syria and their failure to obtain the no-fly zone promised to them by Hillary Clinton, which would, in my view, have been an open invitation to World War III. That the intelligence agencies have continued to leak, to the detriment of President Trump, in violation of law, is proof positive of this politicization.

Members of this committee have made three basic assertions against me which must be rebutted here today: the charge that I knew in advance about and predicted the hacking of Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta's email; that I had advance knowledge of the source or actual content of the WikiLeaks disclosures regarding Hillary Clinton; or that my now-public exchange with a persona that our intelligence agencies claim but cannot prove is a Russian asset is anything but innocuous and are entirely false.

Again, these assertions are conjecture, supposition, projection, and allegations, but none of them are facts.

For example, Mr. Schiff, the ranking member of the committee, asked: Is it a coincidence that Roger Stone predicted that John Podesta would be a victim of a Russian hack and that his private emails would be published and did so even before Mr. Podesta himself was fully aware that his private emails would be exposed?

I want to know where I predicted this, because I never said anything of the kind. Could Mr. Schiff read us the exact quote and source where I predicted the hacking of Mr. Podesta? Can Mr. Schiff come up with a documented quote where I used "Podesta" and "email" in the same sentence before it happened?

My tweet of August 21st, 2016, in which I said, "Trust me, it will soon be Podesta's time in the barrel, #crookedHillary," must be examined in context. I

posted that at a time that my boyhood friend and colleague, Paul Manafort, had just resigned from the Trump campaign over allegations regarding his business activities in Ukraine. I thought it manifestly unfair that John Podesta not be held to the same standard.

Note that my tweet of August 21st, 2016, makes no mention whatsoever of Mr. Podesta's email but does accurately predict that the Podesta brothers' business activities in Russia with the oligarchs around Vladimir Putin, their uranium deal, their bank deal, their Gazprom deal, would come under public scrutiny.

MR. CONAWAY: Mr. Stone, you're at the 5-minute mark. Your full statement will be made a part of the record. And if there are closing comments you would like to make in the last -- and we all have it -- the last 10 pages.

MR. STONE: I am happy to answer your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Stone follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

MR. CONAWAY: All right. Thank you, sir.

With that, we'll turn to the minority.

MR. STONE: I read as fast as I could.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I'm going to yield to Mr. Swalwell.

MR. SWALWELL: Thank you.

Good morning. Welcome, Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Thank you.

MR. SWALWELL: First, congratulations are in order. You have known Donald Trump for about 40 years. Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And going all the way back to 1988, your friend Donald Trump you have encouraged to run for President?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And even in 2000, you had encouraged him to consider running under the Reform Party.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And as recently as 2015, when he emerged as a likely candidate, you had stayed in contact with your friend Donald Trump.

MR. STONE: I actually worked as a consultant to his brief exploratory examination of the race in 2012 and then again in 2015.

MR. SWALWELL: And he listened to you in 2015, as you advised him before he made the decision? It's fair to characterize it as you were one of the few people he would listen to?

MR. STONE: Sometimes.

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah. He was somebody that trusted you?

MR. STONE: I believe that's true.

MR. SWALWELL: And you trusted him.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: You were loyal to him?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: He was loyal to you?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: He devoted a lot of time in a documentary about you, "Get Me Roger Stone," saying pretty nice and flattering things about your work.

MR. STONE: I don't know how much time he devoted, but he did say nice and flattering things.

MR. SWALWELL: And he won.

MR. STONE: Yes, he did.

MR. SWALWELL: Mr. Stone, do you have any recording devices on you today?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. SWALWELL: And Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: No.

MR. SWALWELL: And Mr. Buschel?

MR. BUSCHEL: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Mr. Stone, have you been interviewed by the Department of Justice or FBI with respect to your role in the 2016 campaign?

MR. STONE: I have not.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you been asked to come in for an interview or --

MR. STONE: I have not.

MR. SWALWELL: -- schedule an interview?

MR. STONE: I have not.

MR. SWALWELL: And can we agree that the 47-page statement that you issued through WikiLeaks today is accurate?

MR. STONE: I didn't issue it through WikiLeaks. I gave it to the Associated Press.

MR. SWALWELL: Were you aware that WikiLeaks published it this morning?

MR. STONE: I was not.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. But the 47-page statement that you have issued, we can agree that, under oath, every word in it is accurate?

MR. STONE: I believe that to be the case.

MR. SWALWELL: All right.

Mr. Stone, with respect to Donald Trump, in the time that you have worked with him before the 2016 election -- so we'll kind of carve this up pre-2016 and post-2016 -- how much money had Mr. Trump paid you for your services prior to the 2016 election?

MR. STONE: From the beginning of time?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah.

MR. STONE: I really have no way to estimate. I can tell you how much he paid me for my work pertaining to the 2016 election, which would actually have been in 2015.

MR. SWALWELL: But prior to that, could you give us an estimate? Is it

more than \$100,000 or less than \$100,000?

MR. STONE: It would be more than \$100,000. I represented him or represented The Trump Organization or at one time Trump Hotels and Casino Resorts going back to 1981. So, over that period of time, I would say probably several hundred thousand dollars, but I could not put a precise number on it.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you think it was more than a million dollars?

MR. STONE: No, definitely not.

MR. SWALWELL: So somewhere between a couple hundred thousand dollars and a million dollars.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay.

And you had founded a lobbying practice in 1980 with Paul Manafort, Black, Manafort and Stone. Is that correct?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And that lobbying practice had foreign clients. Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Which foreign clients did you have with respect to the Soviet Union?

MR. STONE: None that I'm aware of.

MR. SWALWELL: How about Ukraine?

MR. STONE: None that I'm aware of.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you ever had Ukrainian clients?

MR. STONE: I represented a splinter party in Ukraine long after Black, Manafort and Stone had been sold. I think Black, Manafort and Stone was sold to

Burston Marsteller or the parent company, Young and Rubicam, in 1989.

I worked in one cycle for the splinter party of Volodymyr Lytvyn, a pro-Western candidate who opposed Paul Manafort's candidate, Viktor Yanukovich, in the 2006-2007 parliamentary elections in Ukraine.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever work with Paul Manafort on any Ukrainian campaigns where the two of you were on the same side?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay.

You said that you were the father of the yard sign in Ukraine. Is that right?

MR. STONE: Yes. That was kind of a running joke. As you may know, American campaign technology is not widely known in Eastern Europe, and, therefore, putting a yard sign in your yard was a revelation to them.

MR. SWALWELL: In the Ukrainian elections that you worked on, did you ever work with, interact with, receive money from any Russians who had interest in the Ukrainian elections?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever have contacts with Rinat Akhmetshin.

MR. STONE: No. I don't know who that is.

MR. SWALWELL: How about Oleg Deripaska?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: How about Dmitry Firtash?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: What was your role when you joined the Trump campaign in 2015?

MR. STONE: Just a general strategic consultant.



MR. SWALWELL: And what were your responsibilities?

MR. STONE: To try to structure a campaign for President of the United States. I had been through nine previous Presidential campaigns, going back to Nixon, Reagan, Bush, Dole. Therefore, I had extensive experience in campaign structure.

MR. SWALWELL: And you had been paid, at least in public records, \$50,000 by the Trump campaign. Is that right?

MR. STONE: Over a 5-month period, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Is there any other moneys that came in to you from the Trump campaign?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: When you were an adviser, how often would you interact during that 5-month period with Donald Trump?

MR. STONE: A couple times a week. Two, three times a week.

MR. SWALWELL: And were these interactions by phone, in person, by email?

MR. STONE: Sometimes in person at Trump Tower, sometimes by phone.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Did you ever email with him?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Ever communicate electronically at all with him?

MR. STONE: No. He doesn't use email.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you ever email with somebody who needed to pass a message to him?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you know Rhona Graff?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Would you ever send a message to Rhona, and then she would send a message to Donald Trump, and then you would get correspondence back from Rhona?

MR. STONE: No. You could leave a phone message with her if you wanted to speak to him, and he would call you back.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay.

MR. STONE: It's possible that I emailed her along those lines, but I don't specifically recall.

MR. SWALWELL: So during the 5-month period when you say you spoke with the President a number of times, do you think it was more than 10 or less than 10, in person?

MR. STONE: Probably more than 10.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you think it was more than 20?

MR. STONE: Over a 5-month period?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah.

MR. STONE: Probably.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Do you think it was more than 50?

MR. STONE: Probably not.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And how about by phone?

MR. STONE: Very difficult to say.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And can you give us the months that -- so we're talking about the 5-month period in August 2015 when you first joined. Is that --

MR. STONE: No. I actually left in August of '15. So if you counted 5 months back, it would be March, April.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So March to August 2015.

MR. STONE: Sounds about right.

MR. SWALWELL: When you were working with the campaign, did you have any contacts at all with any officials from the Russian Federation?

MR. STONE: None whatsoever.

MR. SWALWELL: How about Russian citizens?

MR. STONE: None whatsoever.

MR. SWALWELL: People presented to you as Russian?

MR. STONE: None whatsoever.

MR. SWALWELL: Now, having worked with Mr. Trump since at least 1981 in a business relationship, were you aware or what was your knowledge of Mr. Trump's business dealings or friendships with the Russians?

MR. STONE: I had no knowledge of -- I knew that he took the beauty pageant to Moscow. That would be the extent of it.

MR. SWALWELL: So other than the 2013 beauty pageant in Moscow, it would have been a complete surprise to you to learn that Mr. Trump had friends in Russia and had sought to do business in Russia.

MR. STONE: I was unaware of any of that.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. Did you ever see Mr. Trump interact in 2015 with any Russians?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever hear any people on the campaign talk about his interactions with any Russians?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: How about -- I'm assuming you're familiar with Jared

Kushner.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And, obviously, your friend Paul Manafort.

MR. STONE: Yes. Although I should make it clear, I have met Mr. Kushner once in my life.

MR. SWALWELL: When was that?

MR. STONE: It would have been in the period that I was working for Donald Trump, so sometime between April and August. He was leaving Donald's office when I was coming in, and we shook hands.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you have an office --

MR. STONE: We've never had a substantive conversation.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you have an office at Trump Tower?

MR. STONE: I did not. I did in 2000. I did not in 2015 it would've been.

MR. SWALWELL: So you left on August 10th, 2015. Is that right?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Donald Trump said he fired you.

MR. STONE: Yes, he did. He said that he fired me.

MR. SWALWELL: He said he wasn't using you anymore.

MR. STONE: Yes, he said that.

MR. SWALWELL: He said that you were seeking media attention and he didn't like that.

MR. STONE: Yes. He was unhappy that I had resigned the day before.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay.

MR. STONE: So I presented a copy of my resignation letter to a reporter from both Politico and The New York Times to memorialize them. So we

disagreed on that.

MR. SWALWELL: Well, he made a statement that you were fired, and you're saying today that you resigned the day before that.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: So Donald Trump was lying.

MR. STONE: That's a question you'd have to ask Mr. Trump. He may believe that he fired me.

It became very clear to me that he would be his own strategist. Now, this is a campaign that never took a poll for the entire period of the nomination phase because he does not believe in them, at least doesn't believe in paying for them and doesn't believe in utilizing them as a strategic tool. They interest him in the horse-race aspect.

But it was very clear that he had a model of the campaign in mind that revolved around these set piece rallies, that he believed that the cable news networks would give them wall-to-wall coverage. I was skeptical about that.

MR. SWALWELL: But I just want to be clear --

MR. STONE: He was right; I was wrong.

We had a -- but there cannot be two strategists in a campaign. It was his name, his money, his future. He was entitled to do it his way. I resigned.

MR. SWALWELL: And there also cannot be two versions of the truth. So your position is that the truth is you resigned.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: So if his statement is that you were fired, then he's not telling the truth.

MR. STONE: Well, I don't know how my resignation was presented to him,

because he was on the road. I have no idea what Mr. Lewandowski or anyone else in the entourage may have told him. So it's impossible for me to say.

MR. SWALWELL: Other than this instance where he said you were fired and you said that you resigned, are you aware of any other times where Donald Trump has publicly not told the truth?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: With respect to your communications with other people on the campaign, how would you typically communicate with, say, Paul Manafort once he joined the campaign?

MR. STONE: Telephone --

MR. SWALWELL: Okay.

MR. STONE: -- mostly.

MR. SWALWELL: How about text message?

MR. STONE: Occasionally.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And do you use an iPhone?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And would he use an iPhone?

MR. STONE: Don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: What about any apps, like WhatsApp or Viber or --

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: -- Telegram?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you use any messaging apps?

MR. STONE: I do, but I never used them in that time period, and I never used them with Paul Manafort.

MR. SWALWELL: We know you used direct message on Twitter.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you communicate with any campaign officials through direct message on Twitter?

MR. STONE: Not that I know of.

MR. SWALWELL: Tell me how Paul Manafort became campaign chairman.

MR. STONE: There came a period in the campaign where Donald Trump had lost the Wisconsin primary, had lost the Colorado caucuses, had lost the North Dakota caucuses, and in that same time period, even though he had swept the Louisiana primary, the delegates were taken from him in Louisiana under their party rules.

The Trump campaign, not having at that point any people who were experienced in nomination politics, had spent no attention – pardon me – paid no attention to the appointments by each State chairman to the convention rules, credentials, and platform committee.

As you probably know, both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions are governed not by Federal law, not by State law, but by their own rules.

There is a precedent in our party, in 1952, when Senator Robert Taft arrived at Chicago with enough votes to be nominated, and then, in the credentials committee for that convention, the Texas and Louisiana delegates for Taft were unseated, they were replaced by Eisenhower delegates, and Eisenhower was nominated. Consequently, the nomination can be stolen from a candidate who has the majority of the delegates.

MR. SWALWELL: So you brought Mr. Manafort, or you --

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: -- recommended Mr. Manafort.

MR. STONE: Well, I was among those who recommended Mr. Manafort.

MR. SWALWELL: Who did you recommend Mr. Manafort to?

MR. STONE: Donald Trump.

MR. SWALWELL: And what month was this?

MR. STONE: I'm not --

MR. SWALWELL: March 2016?

MR. STONE: When did Manafort join the campaign? I'm really uncertain.

MR. SWALWELL: Does that sound about right? March?

MR. STONE: Sounds about right.

MR. SWALWELL: And, clearly, in March 2016, if you're recommending Mr. Manafort and Mr. Trump puts him on the team, you're still quite influential, Mr. Trump is listening to you.

MR. STONE: Immediately upon resigning from the campaign, I did a number of surrogate speaking, media appearances, and so on, and I continued to advocate for the election of Donald Trump. He's been my friend for 40 years. I took no umbrage at the notion that he said I was fired, I pretty much ignored it, and I worked as hard as I could on my own to support him. I think that surprised him, but it held our relationship together.

I would hear from him less after I had resigned, but he did ask me point-blank, can this nomination be stolen from me? And I said, yes, it can be, there's a precedent for that. He said, what should I do about it? I said, you need a convention manager. He said, who could do that? I recommended Paul



Manafort, who he knew and had met at the 1988 Republican National Convention while Manafort was running the floor operation for then-Vice President Bush.

MR. SWALWELL: Now, did you tell Mr. Trump about your knowledge of Mr. Manafort's past ties with foreign political campaigns?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Did Mr. Trump have knowledge of that?

MR. STONE: I don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: And your knowledge included that he had worked for essentially pro-Russian Ukrainian political parties.

MR. STONE: He had worked for a democratic political party in an election in Ukraine in which our State Department recognized the result.

MR. SWALWELL: And he --

MR. STONE: I believe that activity to be entirely legal.

MR. SWALWELL: And he also had close ties to businesspersons or oligarchs who were close with President Putin. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I was unaware of that.

MR. SWALWELL: Had you known that, would you have found that disqualifying?

MR. STONE: At that time? No.

MR. SWALWELL: Why not?

MR. STONE: Well, it would've been before the claim, which I believe was political, that the Russians had interfered in this election.

MR. SWALWELL: Are you familiar with any of the following companies?

Stonefel? S-t-o-n-e-f-e-l.

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Kingstone?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Andumstone? A-n-d-u-m-s-t-o-n-e.

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Sunstone?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SMITH: Can you just read back the second one?

MR. SWALWELL: Yes. Kingstone.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you ever text message with the President, candidate Trump?

MR. STONE: No. I don't know that he even has text-message function.

MR. SWALWELL: What is your knowledge of Mr. Manafort's business dealings with Russian oligarchs? Not what you read in the paper, but what you've observed personally.

MR. STONE: I've observed nothing personally. I read about a business relationship with Oleg Deripaska. Prior to reading that, I had never heard of Mr. Deripaska.

MR. SWALWELL: In your opening statement, you referenced that the DNC would not turn over its server to the FBI.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: That's frustrating to you.

MR. STONE: Well, I read the piece in The Nation last week in which a number of counterintelligence experts, veterans from our own services, make the case that it was more likely that the DNC material was stolen through a download

to some kind of a, you know, thumb drive or portable device and that the science tends to prove that theory as opposed to the hack.

MR. SWALWELL: You think that they could have been more forthcoming.

MR. STONE: Yes. I think that would be fair to say.

MR. SWALWELL: So, Mr. Stone, what is your Twitter password?

MR. STONE: My Twitter password?

MR. SWALWELL: Yeah.

MR. STONE: I'm uncertain, to tell you the truth.

MR. SWALWELL: Can we access your Twitter account?

MR. STONE: You can, sure.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So you wouldn't have a problem if we wanted to follow up to review your direct messages and the history of your tweets and retweets.

MR. STONE: I'd like to review them before I allowed that, but --

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And, Mr. Stone, are you aware that we have asked you to turn over your Twitter account to us to review not only your public tweets but also to review your private direct messages?

MR. BUSCHEL: I don't know about that.

MR. STONE: No. That's unfamiliar to me.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So it sounds like, today, after reviewing them yourself, you are open to turning those over to us?

MR. BUSCHEL: There are private conversations that we would want to review. I don't think it's fair to say, "Turn over all your communications." So we'd review your request --

MR. SWALWELL: Sure.

Mr. Stone -- thank you, and I appreciate that, Mr. Buschel.

If we were to send you a request asking for any direct messages with respect to the 2016 campaign, particularly around Guccifer 2.0 and WikiLeaks, you would be cooperative and turn that over to us?

MR. STONE: Well, I attached the exchange with Guccifer as an exhibit, and you're welcome to look at it. Beyond that, we'd have to go review the material. I don't know what's there.

MR. SWALWELL: In 2016, August of 2016, you and the American public are aware from press reporting that Russia is accused of hacking Democratic emails. Is that --

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And you're also aware that there are no other suspects out there, that no other country or entity or person is accused of conducting the hacking. Whether it's true or not, the press reporting is all around Russia. Do you agree?

MR. STONE: Yes. I guess that's true. Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And on August 5th, 2016, you write a column for Breitbart entitled "Dear Hillary, DNC Hack Solved, Stop Blaming Russia." Is that right?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: When did you first become aware of the online persona Guccifer 2.0?

MR. STONE: At the time that I wrote that piece, only because Guccifer 2.0 actively predicted and took credit for the hack in the material that was subsequently published by WikiLeaks. That, to me, gave some credibility to his

claim.

MR. SWALWELL: And we agree that your Twitter persona, RogerJStoneJr, that's you. You're your own man. You write those tweets. You do the retweets.

MR. STONE: Took me a very long time to get verified, but yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Congratulations.

MR. STONE: It's not easy.

MR. SWALWELL: It took me a while too.

Were you aware when you wrote that article, the Breitbart one, that Guccifer 2.0 was assessed by the Intelligence Community as a cutout for the Russian intelligence services?

MR. STONE: I was aware of that claim, but I don't subscribe to it. There's a substantial amount of information you can find online that questions that. I realize it's an assertion, but, as I said in my statement, our intelligence agencies are often wrong.

MR. SWALWELL: And in your career --

MR. STONE: In retrospect, I'm not sure that he hacked -- at the time, I believed he did hack the DNC. Today, given the VIPS report, the piece in The Nation, I'm not sure that that's correct. But I did believe it at the time.

MR. SWALWELL: You're somebody who has done a lot of business, not just with U.S. citizens but also, as you said earlier, with foreigners.

MR. STONE: Actually, that's not true. I think --

MR. SWALWELL: Well, Ukrainians. You've worked with Ukrainians.

MR. STONE: I did one election cycle in Ukraine.

MR. SWALWELL: And I'm assuming those Ukrainians spoke English or at

least broken English?

MR. STONE: They spoke English.

MR. SWALWELL: And when they communicate with you in broken English, there's a difference between the English that you and I would communicate with each other and a nonnative English speaker trying to speak English talking to an English speaker. You would agree, right?

MR. STONE: It would depend on the individual. Some of them spoke perfect English, as well as you and I or maybe even better. In other cases, people's English was not so good.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever consider -- considering the exchange that you had with Guccifer 2.0, the back-and-forth, the typos in Guccifer 2.0's writings, it kind of reads like a foreigner is writing it, right?

MR. STONE: The VIPS report believed it had been pasted to a Russian -- not format, but -- I'm sorry, I'm not coming up with the right technical word.

MR. SWALWELL: I understand. What did you believe?

MR. STONE: I didn't believe anything one way or another.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever give any thought that this person might be a foreigner?

MR. STONE: I'm not even sure that this person exists, or I'm not even sure it's one person. We don't know that. It is, after all, Twitter, so -- many times, the people on Twitter aren't who they say they are.

MR. SWALWELL: And you've never reported your interactions with Guccifer 2.0 to any U.S. law enforcement officials?

MR. STONE: Well, let's be clear of the timeframe. I write the Breitbart

piece on August 5th. My exchange with Guccifer begins on August 15th and goes through, I think, September 9th. But the publication of the DNC documents had been in late July.

So I believe, on the basis of the content, the context, and the timing of that exchange, it's benign, it's innocuous. I've turned it over to the committee. He offers to help me in several ways. I ignore that. He sends me some voter targeting thing that I took a glance at and thought was worthless, did nothing with --

MR. SWALWELL: Did you think it was unusual that somebody who was clearly involved in a hack of emails was also talking specifically about how you would communicate with voters?

MR. STONE: Recognize the context for the beginning of our exchange. I had read online that he had been suspended at Twitter. I don't believe in censorship by anybody. I don't care whether you're right, left, center, you should have a right to speak in the marketplace. And, therefore, I tweeted in opposition to his suspension.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you deleted any tweets? And I'm talking public tweets with respect to what you were saying about Guccifer or WikiLeaks --

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: -- in that summer.

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: So you never posted something and then immediately deleted it or deleted it sometime after.

MR. STONE: I don't recall doing that. I don't believe so.

MR. SWALWELL: And you're aware that with direct messaging that you're

also able to send a message to person A or person B and then you can go back and delete those messages, those communications.

MR. STONE: I was not aware of that, but I have never done that.

MR. SWALWELL: So you have never deleted a direct message that you have sent.

MR. STONE: Not that I'm -- not that I ever recall. I didn't know that you could do that.

MR. SWALWELL: How many people other than Guccifer 2.0 have you direct messaged on Twitter?

MR. STONE: I have no way of knowing. I have 250,000 followers --

MR. SWALWELL: That's a lot.

MR. STONE: -- any one of whom can send you a direct message.

MR. SWALWELL: But you don't write back to all of them, right?

MR. STONE: I try to. It's difficult.

MR. SWALWELL: On August 13th, 2016, you replied to a tweet from WikiLeaks about Twitter suspending Guccifer 2, writing: "Outrageous. Clinton needs to now" -- n-n-e-d -- "to censor their critics to rig the upcoming election." Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And on August 14th, 2016, you tweeted from @RogerJStoneJr: "First #Milo, now Guccifer 2.0. Why are you exposing the truth? Banned? @realAlexJones @Infowars #FreeMilo." Is that correct?

MR. STONE: Correct. I do not believe in censorship of anybody.

MR. STONE: And on August 14th, 2016, once Guccifer 2.0's account had been reinstated, you sent that account a private message stating, "Delighted you



are reinstated. Fuck the state and their MSM lackeys." Is that right?

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And "MSM" is "mainstream media"?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: On August 15th, 2016, Guccifer 2 responds to your private message with a private response: Quote, "Wow. Thank you for writing back and thank you for an article about me" -- multiple exclamation points. "Do you find anything interesting in the docs I posted?" Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And on August 16th --

MR. STONE: Notice that I ignored that question.

MR. SWALWELL: -- a day later, you write an op-ed for The Hill entitled "Can the 2016 Election Be Rigged? You Bet." And you tweeted that article from your Twitter account. Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: On that same day, August 16, you privately messaged Guccifer 2 on Twitter, referencing your Hill column and asking Guccifer to retweet. You write, "PLZ RT." Is that right?

MR. STONE: Yes. I sent that to dozens of people --

MR. SWALWELL: So you --

MR. STONE: -- on Twitter because I was seeking to get as much exposure for the article as possible. Because of the many media interviews he has given, he has a large following on Twitter.

MR. SWALWELL: And it looks like --

MR. STONE: He or they.

MR. SWALWELL: -- at this point you have a pretty sophisticated understanding of Twitter. You're using hashtags, and you're saying "RT" instead of "retweet." You understand how Twitter works and what the shorthand is.

MR. STONE: I'm getting better at it, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. So it's also clear that you're asking Guccifer to do something for you, to retweet. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I sent the retweet -- I sent the retweet request to dozens of people, and he was just among them.

MR. SWALWELL: And you knew that Guccifer was working to undermine Secretary Clinton's campaign.

MR. STONE: I -- let's see. It is August 16th. I had written my piece on August 5th. I believe that he is responsible for the hack. I also believe that the material that has come to light is all authentic and accurate.

MR. SWALWELL: Sure. But it's also undermining of Secretary Clinton's campaign. We can at least agree on that.

MR. STONE: I would say yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And you two now have on August 16th established a working relationship, in that you have asked him to do something and he does it. Is that right? Or she does it. He or she.

MR. STONE: I think that might be a bit of an overstatement, but we have an innocuous exchange. He retweets something that I suggest he retweet, which I do solely because he has a large following and I'm interested in the maximum number of readers.

MR. SWALWELL: And he writes back, "Done. And I read he'd been hacked." Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And then he writes on August 17th to your original tweet of The Hill article, "@RogerJStoneJr, paying you back." Is that right?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Then he sends you three private messages that day, first saying, "I'm pleased to say you're a great man"; then, "And I think I'm going to read your books"; and then finally, "Please tell me if I can help you anyhow. It would be a great pleasure to me." Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct. You'll note that I ignore that request.

MR. SWALWELL: And then it's about 3-plus weeks later, on September 9, when he privately messages what you referred to earlier, those HelloFLA.com websites about Democratic voter turnout. Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: Every one of these tweets that I referenced you wrote yourself?

MR. STONE: Yes. My response to the targeting thing that he sends is pretty standard.

MR. SWALWELL: And at this time, you're also, as you mentioned earlier, still in routine contact with Donald Trump.

MR. STONE: I am, but I forward that program, that information to no one, because I don't find it all that impressive or interesting.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you tell anyone in the world about your interaction with Guccifer 2.0 before it became public?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Why not?

MR. STONE: On what basis? He's talked to dozens of journalists. I'm writing a weekly column. I have a syndicated radio show. I'm writing for Infowars at that point. I'm talking to as many sources as I can. I just consider him to be a source.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you ever had your emails hacked?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you agree that it is an unpleasant experience?

MR. STONE: It most certainly is. In my case, someone was able to access my bank account and remove about \$15,000. So it was a major pain in the neck. It also made it -- I lost my entire contact list, the people that I regularly communicated with. I had to reconstruct that.

MR. SWALWELL: You've also never met John Podesta. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I don't believe I have. No.

MR. SWALWELL: And as we said earlier, you have tweeted a lot in the last couple years.

MR. STONE: Yes. I like Twitter.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you agree that you've sent over 30,000 tweets?

MR. STONE: I have no idea how many tweets I've sent.

MR. SWALWELL: And that you have, actually, more than you thought, 269,000 followers, as we sit here today?

MR. STONE: Well, I think maybe it's increased in recent days.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And during the campaign, 2015-2016, you were tweeting mostly about your support for Donald Trump. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I'm a political commentator. That's what I do, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And your opposition to Hillary Clinton.

MR. STONE: That is also accurate.

MR. SWALWELL: And it wasn't just Hillary Clinton. You also would reference other individuals in the Clinton team, like former President Bill Clinton. You've tweeted about him.

MR. STONE: That would be fair to say.

MR. SWALWELL: You've also --

MR. STONE: I have written a book about the Clintons. I'm certainly a critic of theirs.

MR. SWALWELL: But as far as your tweeting, you not only tweeted about Hillary, you also tweeted about former President Clinton and also then-President Barack Obama.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: And you would agree that prior to August 21st, in the thousands of tweets that you had posted, you had actually never tweeted a single thing about John Podesta?

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. SWALWELL: On August 21st, 2016, you tweeted: "Trust me, it'll soon be the Podesta's time in the barrel. #crookedHillary." Is that right?

MR. STONE: Sounds right.

MR. SWALWELL: And "in the barrel" is a colloquialism for an unpleasant experience. Is that right?

MR. STONE: For under public scrutiny. At least, that's the way I meant it.

MR. SWALWELL: Or would you also agree it is an unpleasant experience to be in the barrel?

MR. STONE: Again, let's put this in context. Mr. Manafort had just

resigned over his business dealings in Eastern Europe. I thought it manifestly unfair that Mr. Podesta not be held to the same standard.

I had read the Panama Papers published in January of 2016. I had gotten an opposition research briefing from Dr. Jerry Corsi on the extent of Mr. Podesta's business dealings in Russia. I asked him to memorialize that for me in a memo, which he did on August 31st.

My reference is to those business dealings, which did, in fact, come to public scrutiny, covered by The Wall Street Journal, Bloomberg, and many others.

MR. SWALWELL: And I understand that. But, again, you are a prolific and ferocious tweeter. You, you know, don't limit yourself to 150 characters; you'll tweet on top of tweets if you have to.

MR. STONE: Rarely, but --

MR. SWALWELL: And you had actually -- you had the opportunity to put that tweet into context, and you didn't. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I don't think I had an obligation to.

MR. SWALWELL: But you didn't, right?

MR. STONE: What I said was accurate and true, and I just told you what it was based on.

MR. SWALWELL: And, Mr. Stone, one of your rules -- a self-professed Stone rule is: Admit nothing, deny everything, launch counterattacks. Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is correct. You'll be able to read the whole book in late October.

MR. SWALWELL: Another rule is: Attack, attack, attack, never defend. Is that right?

MR. STONE: That is also correct.

MR. SWALWELL: And Julian Assange is your hero. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I think he is a hero. I think he's a journalist. I recall that he released information embarrassing to the Bush administration, the Obama administration. I don't think he is a partisan. I think he is an opponent of the deep state.

MR. SWALWELL: Thank you. I'm going to yield back to Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: And I'll yield to Mr. Quigley.

MR. QUIGLEY: Thank you.

Good morning.

Have you ever met with Julian Assange?

MR. STONE: I have not.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever told anyone that you had met with Mr. Assange?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever told anyone that you had communicated with am?

MR. STONE: No. I had a number of reporters who kept asking me if I had traveled to London to meet with Julian Assange. I don't know where that came from. Examine my passport. I have not been to London in many years.

MR. QUIGLEY: On August 8th, 2016, you gave remarks at the Southwest Broward Republican organization, in which you said, and I quote: "I've actually communicated with Julian Assange. I believe the next tranche of his documents pertain to the Clinton Foundation, but there's no telling what the October surprise may be."

MR. STONE: I did say that, but then later in that speech and also in numerous interviews around that time, I clarify that by saying the communication I refer to is through a journalist who I ask to confirm what Assange has tweeted, himself, on July 21st, that he has the Clinton emails and that he will publish them, and that journalist confirms that for me. That is what I'm referring to.

MR. QUIGLEY: And so, just to reiterate, in an August 12th, 2016, interview with Alex Jones on Infowars, you reiterated your contact with Julian Assange, quote, "in communication with Assange," adding, quote, "I am not at liberty to discuss what I have." That was correct too?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: But you were referencing the same thing you pointed to before?

MR. STONE: Again, I have sometimes referred to this journalist as a go-between, as an intermediary, as a mutual friend. It was someone I knew had interviewed Assange. And I merely wanted confirmation of what he had tweeted on the 21st. And that's what I refer to.

MR. QUIGLEY: So who was this contact?

MR. STONE: I decline to say.

MR. QUIGLEY: Because?

MR. STONE: Because he is a journalist and because that conversation was off the record. I am also an opinion journalist, and I honor that commitment.

MR. QUIGLEY: But he was a journalist at the time. So what privilege are you asserting today?

MR. STONE: My privilege not to answer the question because I'm not here under oath -- under subpoena. I decline to answer the question.



MR. QUIGLEY: Well, I just -- don't you find that odd, given that, as you suggested, you wanted the transcript of this, you want the American public to know everything? You wanted the transcript to be revealed, this to be a public hearing. So perhaps the most important question anyone can ask you today is who was the intermediary, and you can't answer it.

MR. STONE: I'm prepared to let the people decide whether that's a good decision or not, but I'm not going to burn a journalist who I have agreed not to reveal their identity, nor would I want them to do the same to me.

MR. QUIGLEY: As a journalist.

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: So bear with me putting all this just on the record, so you can be quick.

*You never met with Julian Assange.*

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: You never communicated directly with him.

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: You've never spoken to him on the phone.

MR. STONE: I never communicated directly with him during the election, correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you ever communicate with him outside of that timeframe?

MR. STONE: We had some, I think, direct message responses in April of this year.

MR. QUIGLEY: You and Julian Assange?

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: Can you make those available to the committee?

MR. STONE: Yes, we can.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. Had you ever communicated with him before the campaign?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: So, back on this other streak, you've never emailed with him.

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever sent or received texts/SMS to and from Mr. Assange?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever communicated with Mr. Assange over any other social media platform or encrypted application --

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: -- like Twitter, LinkedIn, anything?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have any of your employees, associates, or individuals acting on your behest or encouragement been in any type of contact with Julian Assange?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever met a member of the WikiLeaks organization?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you ever been in direct contact with a member of WikiLeaks, whether by phone, email, text, Twitter, encrypted message platforms,

other social media platforms, or other means of communication?

MR. STONE: I'm not certain, but I don't think so.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, you were very certain about almost everything asked today. This seems to be --

MR. STONE: I'm just -- I'm trying to respond to your question.

MR. QUIGLEY: You said you hadn't traveled to London anytime -- but have you ever been to the Ecuadorian Embassy in London?

MR. STONE: I have not.

MR. QUIGLEY: Do you know anyone who has been there?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: And who is that?

MR. STONE: The journalist that I made aforementioned to.

MR. QUIGLEY: And what was the extent of the communication with this journalist?

MR. STONE: I asked him to confirm --

MR. PATEL: Five minutes.

MR. STONE: -- that the tweet of Assange of the 21st was accurate, that they did in fact have DNC emails and that they would release them -- or, pardon me, Hillary Clinton emails and that they would release them.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you ask him to communicate anything else to Mr. Assange?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you ask him to do anything on behalf of the Trump campaign?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did you ask him to do anything on your own behalf?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did he suggest that he was going to do anything else that you haven't described?

MR. STONE: He did not.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did he communicate anything about what Mr. Assange was planning to do in the campaign?

MR. STONE: Only that he had material that he would release in October.

MR. QUIGLEY: And did Mr. Assange, through this intermediary, ask for any assistance in terms of what he was going to do and how he was going to go forward in this campaign?

MR. STONE: He does not -- he did not. Pardon me.

MR. QUIGLEY: So what exactly did you say to your intermediary about the campaign?

MR. STONE: Can you confirm that he has this material and he's going to release it in October?

MR. QUIGLEY: And what did he say?

MR. STONE: He came back and he said: Yes, they have bombshell material that they will release in October.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did he tell you what that material was?

MR. STONE: He didn't know.

MR. QUIGLEY: And when exactly did that conversation take place?

MR. STONE: Would've been, I believe, the end of August.

MR. QUIGLEY: And was that over the -- how did you communicate with the intermediary?

MR. STONE: Over the phone.

MR. QUIGLEY: And did you have any other means of communicating with the intermediary?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: No text messages, no -- none of the list, right?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Nothing direct?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Have you met the intermediary?

MR. STONE: Met him personally?

MR. QUIGLEY: Yes.

MR. STONE: Yes. He's a journalist that I know.

MR. QUIGLEY: He's a journalist where?

MR. STONE: In the United States.

MR. QUIGLEY: And how long have you known him as this mutual acquaintance, as you describe?

MR. STONE: Since maybe 2000, 2002, in that period.

MR. QUIGLEY: And he works for?

MR. STONE: A media organization.

MR. QUIGLEY: Is it a print media organization? I feel like we're playing a --

MR. STONE: I'm not going to characterize it beyond that.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. And, again, how long have you known him?

MR. STONE: Since 2000, 2001, that period.

MR. QUIGLEY: So it's a him.

MR. STONE: Yeah. But I've said that previously.

MR. QUIGLEY: Yeah. Well, we're at least narrowing down half the population.

MR. STONE: Yes. That narrows it down to several million people.

MR. QUIGLEY: And I just want to reiterate, you believe that he has some sort of -- you're helping him with his privilege, right?

MR. STONE: It goes both ways.

MR. QUIGLEY: How does it go both ways that you don't have to answer a question here?

MR. STONE: I decline to answer the question. I told you why.

MR. QUIGLEY: Again, please explain, though, why, if this information is so important that you want a public hearing or you want the testimony revealed, that you can't answer the question which has to be on absolutely everyone's mind.

MR. STONE: Everything he told me was correct. There's nothing improper or illegal with --

MR. QUIGLEY: And how does that --

MR. STONE: -- confirming something that has been posted in the public.

MR. QUIGLEY: And how does the fact that it's the truth, in your mind, make it privileged? If it was fake, it was false, would it make it privileged?

MR. STONE: It's privileged because the conversation was off the record, and I agreed to honor that, and I will.

MR. QUIGLEY: How does the fact that something was off the record, in your role and what you were doing for the campaign --

MR. STONE: I was not doing anything for the campaign during this period.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, you were helping the campaign.

MR. STONE: I have every right as an American citizen to support a candidate for President. I had no formal --

MR. QUIGLEY: So, whatever role you were taking, how does that legally allow you to not answer a question here, under any basis in anything that you understand with the Constitution?

MR. STONE: I have been assured by my attorneys I am not obligated to answer every question here today. I've tried to answer most of them.

MR. QUIGLEY: So, if you follow that, if you were subpoenaed and asked to name the intermediary, would you refuse to answer that question and risk contempt?

MR. STONE: I'd have to consider that.

MR. QUIGLEY: Would you plead the Fifth?

MR. STONE: I'd have to consider that after consulting with my attorneys.

MR. QUIGLEY: Is your belief today if you were under the -- if I was asking you this today and you were under subpoena, right now I'm asking you, would you refuse and risk contempt?

MR. STONE: Sorry. I'm not going to answer a hypothetical question.

MR. QUIGLEY: Would you plead the Fifth?

MR. STONE: I'm not going to answer a hypothetical question. I would have to consult with my attorneys at that point and make a decision. I cannot tell you what I would do under those circumstances.

MR. ROONEY: Thank you.

I have just a few brief questions, and then I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Gowdy.

Mr. Stone, in your role while you were with the campaign, the Trump

campaign, did you collude with the Russian Government in any way to assist the Trump campaign against Secretary Clinton?

MR. STONE: No, absolutely not.

MR. ROONEY: Did you conspire with the Russian Government in any way to assist Donald Trump's campaign against Hillary Clinton?

MR. STONE: No, absolutely not.

MR. ROONEY: And did you coordinate in any way with the Russian Government in any way during your time with the campaign to help Mr. Trump defeat Hillary Clinton in the Presidential campaign?

MR. STONE: No, absolutely not.

MR. ROONEY: Do you regard -- I think Mr. Swalwell was asking you about retweeting. I don't use Twitter, so I'm a little bit ignorant here. But when you were retweeting information or articles or whatever from I think it was Guccifer, do you regard that as coordinating with the Russian Government to help Donald Trump defeat Hillary Clinton?

MR. STONE: I don't think I ever retweeted anything that --

MR. ROONEY: Or asking him to retweet.

MR. STONE: No, I don't, because I don't accept the claim that he's a Russian asset. I believe that to be unproven. Again, as I said in my statement, just because our intelligence services, which I believe have been politicized, say something over and over again as a statement does not make it true. I have not seen proof of that. I don't accept it.



[10:40 a.m.]

MR. ROONEY: You talked about in your opening statement -- and you were sort of cut off when you were kind of in the middle of the, I think, what most Americans sort of -- you know, if there's a question about what your role was during the campaign, it was this whole idea that you put out on Twitter, before WikiLeaks released information about Mr. Podesta, that somehow you had kind of a heads-up on that --

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. ROONEY: -- and that you were predicting that something was going to happen, and, therefore, you must have known because you must have coordinated that release. You were kind of in the middle of that statement in your opening statement. Can you finish that thought?

MR. STONE: Sure. That claim would be conjecture, supposition --

MR. ROONEY: Why is that?

MR. STONE: -- projection.

Because, as I have told you, my knowledge of Mr. Podesta's business dealing comes from the Panama Papers published in January 2016 and from a comprehensive opposition research report from Dr. Jerry Corsi, which I asked him to then put in writing. It was initially a briefing.

That's dynamite material. Remember the context: Manafort's involvement in Eastern Europe is forefront in the news. The Clinton operatives are very aggressively pushing this with reporters. That's what political operatives do. But I have no advance knowledge of the hacking of his email. I learned that his email was hacked when I read it online when it's published and not before.

MR. ROONEY: So it's your testimony here today that you didn't coordinate

with the Russian Government to know that that release of those emails was going to happen and that's why you tweeted it, because you were coordinating with the Russian Government to know that information?

MR. STONE: Hold on a second. No, I was not coordinating with the Russian Government to retweet that information. I was predicting it on the basis of my own knowledge of his business activities, which I knew in this context would be newsworthy, and indeed, they were.

MR. ROONEY: Did you think at that time or did you ever think that Julian Assange or WikiLeaks was working in coordination with the Russian Government?

MR. STONE: No, and I still don't believe that that's the case.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Gowdy.

MR. GOWDY: Good morning, Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Good morning.

MR. GOWDY: I want to go back to the words that Mr. Rooney just used to make sure you and I have the same definition of the words. He used the words "conspiracy," "collusion," and "coordination." Do those words have the same meaning to you, or would you define them differently?

MR. STONE: I think I have a clear understanding of what they mean, but I have been involved in no conspiracy. I've colluded with no Russians. What was the third one?

MR. GOWDY: Coordinate.

MR. STONE: I have not coordinated with them either.

MR. GOWDY: Before we get to that -- we'll get to that; I promise -- those three words, do they mean the same thing to you, or do they each have an independent meaning?

MR. STONE: I think --

MR. GOWDY: Are they synonyms, or are they --

MR. STONE: "Coordination" may be different than the other two.

"Conspire" and "collude" seem to me to be the same thing.

MR. GOWDY: All right.

MR. STONE: I could see circumstances under which "coordination" could be the same thing.

MR. GOWDY: All right. I'm going to group "collude" and "conspire" together, and then we'll do "coordinate" separately.

MR. STONE: Fair enough.

MR. GOWDY: Are you aware of any evidence, no matter the source, no matter the form of evidence, that Donald J. Trump colluded and/or conspired with the Russian Government to impact or interfere with the 2016 election?

MR. STONE: I am not.

MR. GOWDY: Are you aware of any evidence, no matter the source, no matter the form of evidence, that Donald J. Trump coordinated with the Russian Government to impact the 2016 election cycle in either the primary or the general election?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: Do you have any evidence, regardless of the source or the manner in which that evidence manifests itself, that anyone in the official Donald J. Trump for President campaign colluded or conspired with the Russian Government to impact either the primary or the general election?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: Do you have any evidence -- and I'm going to keep

repeating this, just for my friends on the other side so it gives them less things to quarrel with -- regardless of the source of that evidence, regardless of the manner in which that evidence manifests itself, do you have any evidence that anyone connected with the Donald J. Trump for President either at the primary or general election level coordinated with the Russian Government to impact either of those two elections?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: All right. I'm going to ask you that same bifurcated question for people not officially connected with the campaign. Any evidence, regardless of the source, the manner in which the evidence manifests itself, colluded, conspired with the Russian Government -- nonofficial campaign workers?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: Do you know who Carter Page is?

MR. STONE: I know who he is.

MR. GOWDY: Did he have an official role or an unofficial role with the campaign?

MR. STONE: I don't know because he came after I left.

MR. GOWDY: All right.

MR. STONE: He did, evidently, go to one of my book signings, and I signed a book for him, but I was unaware of who he was at that time.

MR. GOWDY: Last question: Coordination. Any evidence of coordination between nonofficial campaign workers, nonofficial campaign participants, hangers-on, wannabes, whatever phrase you want to use, with the Russian Government to impact the 2016 election cycle either at the primary or

general level?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: Do you have any evidence that President Obama wiretapped candidate Trump?

MR. STONE: I'm familiar with the FISA court findings in November which indicate that 30,000 Americans were illegally, unconstitutionally surveilled by the NSA.

I'm aware of the testimony in May of -- I believe it was -- 2016, in which Mr. Clapper, James Clapper, said that British intelligence had surveilled individuals at Trump Tower and that had informed Americans of that. And then, when pressed by Senator Feinstein, he said it was too sensitive, and he could not talk about it. Those lead me to believe that it is a very real possibility.

MR. GOWDY: All right. That was a somewhat lengthy answer to a question that I don't think I asked, which was, do you have evidence that President Obama wiretapped candidate Trump?

MR. STONE: Direct evidence, no.

MR. GOWDY: All right. You used the word "unlawfully" obtained information about Americans. What caused you to use the word "unlawfully"?

MR. STONE: I've read the actual FISA court document. They said it was troubling and it violated the Fifth Amendment. This is a public document.

MR. GOWDY: Which FISA document are you referring to?

MR. STONE: In November of last year, shortly before the election, the FISA court admonished the NSA over a series of surveillances which entailed American citizens and foreign nationals.

And in that document, they estimated that 1 out of every 20 surveillances

had been improper and that there were 30,000 of them over the previous year. It was covered by Circa News, which is where I read the article, and then I subsequently was able to get the document because it's a public document.

MR. GOWDY: But you haven't read the application in support of any FISA warrants?

MR. STONE: No, I have not.

MR. GOWDY: Okay. I meant to start with this, but it's not too late: Our committee really is only looking at four things. You wouldn't necessarily be able to tell that from some of the questions you were asked this morning, but we're only looking at four things: What did the Russians do during the 2016 election cycle? With whom, if anyone, did they do it? What was the U.S. Government's response to those Russian measures? And then on the issue of unmaskings and leaks. Those are the four pillars of our jurisdiction.

With respect to pillar one, what did the Russians do, you said something in your statement that I'm going to have to take exception with, but I'm going to give you a chance to explain it before I take exception with it.

The mantra-like repetition of the claim by our vaunted 17 intelligence agencies that the -- in quotes -- Russians colluded with the Trump campaign to affect the 2016 election -- comma -- does not make it so.

I am not aware of any of our intelligence agencies that have actually alleged collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians.

MR. STONE: I think Mr. Brennan has said that.

MR. GOWDY: Can you point to me where he said it or what evidence he is relying on that there has been -- because I've been pretty precise in asking the witnesses the same questions I ask you?

MR. STONE: I could not do so today, but after some research, I think I could do so.

MR. GOWDY: Other than Brennan, who among the 17 has alleged, as your words did, the Russians colluded with the Trump campaign?

MR. STONE: I'm under the impression that several of them have done so. Perhaps it would have been better to say that the agencies have alluded -- have said that the Russians interfered with our election.

MR. GOWDY: I think that is accurate.

MR. STONE: Well, I am not certain that that's accurate either, but --

MR. GOWDY: No. No. No. I think it's accurate that they have said that.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: We'll get to the accuracy of what they said, but it is accurate that they have said the Russians attempted to interfere with and/or influence the 2016 election.

I don't think it's accurate that the 17 intelligence agencies have alleged collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians. If you have evidence that I do not have, this would be a great time to share it because we have to write a report on this very point.

MR. STONE: I would have to go back and examine a number of leaks that could only have come from the intelligence agencies because of the nature of the information, but that's where I get that impression.

MR. GOWDY: All right. You take exception to the conclusion of the intelligence agencies that the Russians attempted to interfere with the 2016 election?

MR. STONE: I just have yet to see that evidence. I've seen the claim.

MR. GOWDY: Give me a general sense of what evidence would convince you that the Russians attempted to interfere with our 2016 election process.

MR. STONE: Some proof that would hold up in a court of law, other than just the claim, the flat statement that this happened. That's not sufficient for me.

MR. GOWDY: When you say "proof that would hold up in a court of law," you want proof beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. STONE: Documents. Let me make this point, if I may: On August -- pardon me -- on January 20, The New York Times wrote the page 1 story that said the intelligence agencies had emails, records of financial transactions, and then, later, on the 31st, they would add transcripts of intercepted phone calls that show that Roger Stone, Paul Manafort, and Carter Page had colluded with the Russians on behalf of the Trump campaign.

I cannot speak for Manafort and Page, although I don't believe that's true or I choose to believe their denial. I don't know Page. I know Manafort very well. Speaking for myself, however, there are no such documents. They have never been produced.

MR. GOWDY: You would agree with me that The New York Times would not be one of our 17 intelligence agencies?

MR. STONE: No. But the source that they cite are -- or quote are an intelligence agency.

MR. GOWDY: But you are assuming things, and you mentioned the court of law. There's a reason that we don't allow newspaper articles in a court of law because you can't cross-examine the source. You can't even cross-examine whether or not there really was a source, which is why in no court anywhere in the



country is a newspaper article allowed as evidence.

MR. STONE: I only, again, cite The New York Times as saying that intelligence agencies had this material, and in that case, I know --

MR. GOWDY: But you will agree with me newspaper articles aren't evidence, there's a reason they are not used as evidence, and The New York Times is not one of our 17 intelligence agencies?

MR. STONE: They're indicative of leaks, however --

MR. GOWDY: They could be --

MR. STONE: -- in this case.

MR. GOWDY: -- assuming arguendo that there really was a source for that article. Yes, they could be.

MR. STONE: Yes. That's the point I'm making.

MR. GOWDY: And the only way we would know that would be to identify the source and then be able to cross-examine that source. Agree?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: All right. Which brings me back to your source with Julian Assange.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: We need to be able to examine that source. That source had direct contact with Julian Assange.

MR. STONE: Well, there's an assumption there. That source came back and confirmed. Now, whether he confirmed with Assange himself or whether he confirmed with someone in Assange's entourage, I don't know. Assange himself has denied this, for the record.

MR. GOWDY: So we have a division of perspective. And if -- for

whatever other shortcomings congressional committees may have -- and I don't minimize them -- there are Members that would like to write a report that is reflective of the facts. And the only way to do that is to have witnesses like yourself be willing to come in here and answer questions and withstand examination and cross-examination. That is the single best way to elucidate the truth, is to ask someone directly, give them a chance.

And I'm going to give you a chance in just a minute to respond to allegations that have been made against you. That is the best system we have for elucidating the truth. But if I cannot examine a witness or a source, then I am denied that information.

So, with respect to the journalist -- and I think you referred to him as an intermediary, a go-between, a mutual friend -- is there a legal privilege that you are citing for not producing the name of that intermediary, go-between, mutual friend?

MR. STONE: No. It is a journalistic privilege that I'm asserting. Now, if he released me, I would be more than happy to tell you his name.

MR. GOWDY: Have you asked?

MR. STONE: No, actually, I have not.

MR. GOWDY: Will you ask?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: Can you understand -- lay the politics aside to the extent that you can in this environment --

MR. STONE: Yes, it would be much better for everybody, including me, if I could tell you his name.

MR. GOWDY: It would be better for you, but it would also be better -- you put your finger on the right word -- everyone.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: Because this is someone that can be examined and cross-examined, and we can test and probe the conversation that he may or may not have had with Julian Assange. And, quite frankly, it benefits you because there's an allegation made that you somehow had advance knowledge that this was going to happen. In fact, there's more than that. There's allegations that you colluded, conspired, and coordinated with it.

MR. STONE: All of which I have denied.

MR. GOWDY: All of which you have denied. This witness would be important in either corroborating or contradicting that denial.

MR. STONE: I am willing to revisit the question with him and see if I can reach his agreement. I don't want to violate, you know, a commitment to be off the record, but I am interested in helping the committee get to the conclusions you need to reach and produce a report.

MR. GOWDY: Good enough. Thank you.

Did you know that John Podesta's email account had been hacked before the media reports?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. GOWDY: Did you know the DNC had been hacked before the media reports?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. GOWDY: Using the word that I like to use, which is "evidence," despite a lot of our friends in journalism don't like that word, but I do like that word. And those two guys are former prosecutors. They're used to that word too.

Evidence. We have something of a dichotomy between whether or not the

DNC server was accessed from outside the system in what would constitute a crime, and then there is an assertion that it was an inside job for want of a better phrase, a download by someone who had, arguably, legal access.

If I understood your testimony correctly, you are not convinced that it was an outside intrusion?

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. GOWDY: What is your evidence for believing that it may have been an inside job?

MR. STONE: I read the report from the intelligence veterans who make a very comprehensive case that the science shows other way, based on download times and other things that are discernible.

With all due respect, I would suggest you ask William Binney and Ray McGovern to come before the committee and explain why they believe it. They know far more about this technically than I do.

MR. GOWDY: But they would be expert witnesses as opposed to fact witnesses.

MR. STONE: I'm not an attorney, so I couldn't address your question, but I think they are knowledgeable on this issue based on the report I read.

MR. GOWDY: Are you in possession of any facts that preponderate towards an inside download as opposed to an outside intrusion?

MR. STONE: If you don't consider their report a fact, the answer would be no. All I've done is read the report.

MR. GOWDY: Well, again, this is why people hate lawyers. But -- other than your two. I consider that to be the report of an expert who doesn't have -- they may be relying on certain facts presented to them, but the only way

we can know for sure is to cross-examine them on what the factual basis for their report was.

MR. STONE: Yes. Well, that would be a good idea. I also, when I was sued in the District of Columbia by a group of lawyers who formerly represented President Obama -- they filed suit against me and against the Trump campaign, a suit that is still pending, which we have moved for dismissal -- I provided the expert testimony of Dr. Virgil Griffith, who is an expert in this area. And he opined, based on his research that -- his belief that there was no outside hacking and this was, as you put it, an inside job. So, in that case, I decided to go get my own expert and try to determine what he thought.

MR. GOWDY: Let's assume for the sake of argument only, just for the sake of argument, that there is fact, there are facts supporting an inside download. How did the information make it into the public domain?

MR. STONE: As far as I know, these intelligence agency veterans published a report, and this got picked up.

MR. GOWDY: No, I mean, how did the underlying data on the DNC server or Podesta's email server, how did that make it into the public domain?

MR. STONE: I'm not sure I understand your question.

MR. GOWDY: You're saying that there may be evidence it was an inside job?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: All right. That gets this information in the hands of someone who arguably is not supposed to have it. How does it become public?

MR. STONE: Through their report.

MR. SMITH: What he's asking you is, if somebody took it out of the DNC,

how did it get disseminated from there?

MR. STONE: Oh, well, Craig Murray, who is a British diplomat -- is that what you asked?

MR. SMITH: Is that accurate?

MR. STONE: Craig Murray, who is a British diplomat of some distinction, has said that he received it from an intermediary in a thumb drive format and gave it to WikiLeaks.

MR. GOWDY: Craig Murray?

MR. STONE: Craig Murray. And I admit you won't find it in The New York Times, but you'll find it all over the European press.

MR. GOWDY: I think you read The New York Times more than I do, so I'm going to have to take your word for that.

MR. STONE: What can I say?

MR. GOWDY: Do you know whether Paul Manafort had any communications with the Russian Government during the 2016 Presidential campaign, either the primary or the general election?

MR. STONE: I do not know -- of my firsthand knowledge, having known him for -- since we were kids -- he's a boyhood friend of mine -- I believe him when he says he did not.

MR. GOWDY: Same question, Michael Flynn. Do you know whether Michael Flynn had communications with --

MR. STONE: I would not. I don't know -- I've never met General Flynn. I don't know him.

MR. GOWDY: Do you know of any efforts or have any knowledge, information, regardless of the source, whether it's hearsay or direct, of efforts by

the Trump campaign to coordinate with Russia in the sphere of social media?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: Same predicate, the planting of fake news stories, news stories that are demonstrably false.

MR. STONE: By --

MR. GOWDY: Coordination, collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: All right. How about real news stories?

MR. STONE: I do not.

MR. GOWDY: All right. And your opening statement, if I have it right, on the first page: Members of the committee have made irresponsible, indisputably and provably false statements.

I presume you meant about you?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: What are some of those provably false statements? I said I would give you a chance to do that, and I am.

MR. STONE: Thank you. I cited one before I ran out of time. Mr. Schiff said that I had predicted the hacking of Mr. Podesta's email in advance. I never predicted anything of the kind.

Congressman Swalwell, quoted in Newsmax, said: From Roger Stone, we hope to learn the same things we learned from Paul Manafort, Carter Page, Don Trump Jr., and others who were particularly active in their dealings with Russians during the summer of 2016.

Other than the Guccifer exchange -- and even there I dispute that he is a

Russian asset -- there are no other Russian activities on my part in the area -- in the period of the summer of 2016.

Or Congresswoman Speier, who says to MSNBC, on May 19, 2017: I believe that Michael Caputo is part of this cabal, including Roger Stone, Paul Manafort, and others, who had business relationships with Russia.

I have never had any business relationship with Russia. I've never had any Russian clients. I've never visited Russia. I don't know any Russians. I've never worked for any Russian companies. I've never worked for anyone I thought might be fronting for the Russians. It's an unfair charge.

MR. GOWDY: All right. The last two things I have for you, and they're things I think you have at least tacitly, if not otherwise, agreed to try to help us with. And, again, let me say upfront, having come from another system of inquisition, I understand the frustration with congressional committees, and I understand the fact that a lot of it appears to be politicized.

At the end of this process, I would like a report to be written that is reflective of facts and facts alone. No allegations that are unsubstantiated, no quadruple hearsay citing New York Times articles. Facts from real, live witnesses.

There were two things you said in your statement that I would like you to revisit at some point with your attorneys. Number one is -- and I am all for providing scrutiny to the intelligence agencies. And they've been clear; they do believe Russia attempted to interfere with and influence the 2016 election.

I am not aware of any of the 17 intelligence agencies that have alluded or provided an evidentiary basis for the conclusion that it was done in collusion with the Trump campaign.

So, in fairness to the 17 agencies, in fairness to the Trump campaign, and



in fairness to just the truth, if there are intelligence agencies that have drawn that link, I would like to know.

MR. STONE: Well, I did include in my response to you the leaks, which I think would prove that. Other than that, I'm prepared to go back and reexamine it, certainly.

MR. GOWDY: Well, thank you, because I would say the leaks may be evidence to something else, but it would not be evidence of collusion. Nobody likes -- nobody dislikes the leaks more than I do, but I'm not sure that that shows the 17 intelligence agencies believe that there was collusion. There may be other explanations for the leaks.

MR. STONE: Well, it would show that someone in the intelligence agency was leaking in violation of the law.

MR. GOWDY: Assuming *arguendo* that it was an intelligence agency that provided that information to the reporter, which gets back to my last point, which is the indispensability of interviewing the original source.

MR. STONE: Well, yes.

MR. GOWDY: And if you're willing to go back and ask your intermediary go-between --

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: -- that would be helpful.

MR. STONE: Yes, I will do that.

MR. GOWDY: And, with that, I would go back to my chairman.

MR. ROONEY: As part of that, you know, what Mr. Gowdy was alluding to with our report, could you accept the possibility that the 17 intelligence agencies, as you stated, have seen no evidence of collusion, conspiracy, or coordination

with the Russian Government and the Trump campaign, as you have stated for yourself personally, at the same time also believing that the Russian Government was trying to influence or interrupt our election? Do you think that both of those things could possibly happen at the same time?

MR. STONE: Yes, that's possible.

MR. ROONEY: You stated that you have never been to Russia and you didn't have any Russian contacts during your time on the campaign. Is that correct?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. ROONEY: And you stated -- or I don't know if you stated this, but did you meet with any Russian officials?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. ROONEY: So while you're affiliated with the campaign or otherwise?

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. ROONEY: Okay. I'd like to get into the whole 30,000 violations that the NSA committed, according to something that you stated, as the chairman of the subcommittee on the NSA, but I will leave that for another time.

Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART OF UTAH: How much time do we have, Kash?

MR. PATEL: We have about 15, 16 minutes.

MR. STEWART OF UTAH: Okay. I certainly won't take that. Just a few minutes.

Mr. Stone, you mentioned the Panama Papers release of information, I believe, in January of 2016?

MR. STONE: Uh-huh.

MR. STEWART OF UTAH: Can you help me understand why that was relevant to this investigation, why that information was important to you?

MR. STONE: Because they reported extensively on John Podesta's business dealings in Russia, specifically his involvement in a Uranium One deal or, more precisely, his brother's involvement in the Uranium One deal, his involvement in a bank deal, his involvement with Gazprom.

MR. STEWART OF UTAH: And can you -- beyond that, can you characterize what you learned either from this briefing that you requested or you asked it to be memorialized in writing -- can you characterize the content of that beyond what you've said here so far?

MR. STONE: I thought we had attached the memo as an exhibit. We did. There is an exhibit that goes through -- which is dated August 31, from Dr. Jerome Corsi to me -- going over various business dealings in Russia with entities and individuals who are close to the Putin government.

MR. STEWART OF UTAH: Okay. And just so I understand, the point of that being is you felt that it was relevant because there were accusations made against you and other members of the campaign, either formally or informal members, and that there wasn't the same interests in what you felt were also relationships with Secretary Clinton's campaign officials. Is that true, or am I misreading that?

MR. STONE: Well, it was not that there were allegations made against me. It was that there were allegations made against Paul Manafort. And I thought that it would be honest to examine, since we're examining the chairman of the Trump campaign for his Russian or his Eastern European, in this case, business dealings, because, at that point, I'm unaware of his work for Deripaska,

who I'd never heard of at that juncture, but I thought that, yes, Mr. Podesta's business dealings should come under the same exact scrutiny. And they would. They would be extensively covered by the press before the election.

MR. STEWART OF UTAH: All right. That's all I wanted to follow up.

Thank you.

MR. PATEL: Mr. King has a question.

MR. ROONEY: Pete.

MR. KING: Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. KING: Just one question. It's been asked if there's been any evidence of any collusion, cooperation, or coordination between the Trump campaign and the Russians. In your meetings with President-elect Trump -- with President Trump, candidate Trump at that time, or any of his top people, was there ever any mention of Russia at all as far as possible help from Russia, possible interference, anything else? That ever come in any way?

MR. STONE: None whatsoever.

MR. KING: And there was no inference at all from any of them that they were concerned that something might come out on Russia or we have to look out for this, be careful of --

MR. STONE: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. KING: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Stone, if you would like, we're -- our side is finished a little bit early, but we promised you a break if you want one. So, if you do, we should take 5 minutes.

And, Adam, we can come back after that and get back on your side.

MR. STONE: Sure. Let me find the men's room.

[Recess.]

MR. PATEL: All right. If we could continue, 15 minutes to the minority.

MR. ROONEY: Adam, you're up.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stone, actually, let me hand it over to Mr. Quigley now. I'll have a few questions for you after that.

MR. QUIGLEY: Thanks again, sir.

Sir, do you know Chuck Johnson?

MR. STONE: I do.

MR. QUIGLEY: And how do you know him?

MR. STONE: He's a gadfly on the right. I've met him in various gatherings.

MR. QUIGLEY: How long do you think you've known him?

MR. STONE: A couple years.

MR. QUIGLEY: And did you communicate with him during the 2016 campaign?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: By phone? In person?

MR. STONE: Probably by phone.

MR. QUIGLEY: Never in person?

MR. STONE: I saw him at the Republican National Convention.

MR. QUIGLEY: So you communicated with him also with Twitter or email?

MR. STONE: No, I don't think so. I think telephone or in person, if I ran into him or if he just happened to be in the same place I was.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did he ever provide you with any information about WikiLeaks or Julian Assange's plan to release hacked emails related to the 2016 election?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did he ever speak to you at all about Hillary Clinton's missing 33,000 emails?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Did he ever talk to you about Julian Assange?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Do you know Nigel Farage?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: And how long have you known him?

MR. STONE: If I may, I find Mr. Johnson to be noncredible based on a number of other things that he's written and done. So he's not a friend of mine. He's just somebody I know.

MR. QUIGLEY: Gotcha.

Do you know Nigel Farage? Certain that I'm pronouncing that incorrect.

MR. STONE: Yes. I met him once at the Republican National Convention at an Italian restaurant. We had a brief exchange. He has an amazing ability to eat, smoke, and drink all at the same time.

And he wanted to meet Donald Trump, and he made a case as to why the Brexit election and our election were -- had certain commonalities and that's what he wanted to talk to Trump about. And I agreed to recommend that the candidate meet with him.

MR. QUIGLEY: Do you know if he did that?

MR. STONE: I got the clear impression that he didn't just ask me; he asked many people. So I'm not -- and I did recommend that, but I don't know that I'm responsible for that meeting.

MR. QUIGLEY: So they did meet?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: And do you know what that meeting was about?

MR. STONE: I believe it was about the commonality between our election and the Brexit election.

MR. QUIGLEY: And did you communicate with him other than in person that one time?

MR. STONE: No. No, never.

MR. QUIGLEY: And he never spoke to you about WikiLeaks or Julian Assange's plans to release hacked emails?

MR. STONE: He did not. I'm aware of him telling a reporter that he met me on a second occasion during the inauguration, but in all honesty, I have no memory of that. And I have no memory of ever discussing WikiLeaks or Assange with Mr. Farage.

MR. QUIGLEY: And he never communicated to you about, again, Hillary Clinton's missing 33,000 emails?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. I'll ask the same questions about one more person, Lee Stranahan. Do you know him?

MR. STONE: I do.

MR. QUIGLEY: And how do you know him?

MR. STONE: I write for Breitbart. He also writes -- he wrote for Breitbart.

I no longer write for Breitbart. He no longer writes for Breitbart.

MR. QUIGLEY: All right. And so you've met him many times, I would assume then?

MR. STONE: I wouldn't say many times. I've met him -- I've probably been in his presence three or four times.

MR. QUIGLEY: And have you -- you've communicated with him by phone?

MR. STONE: Yes, I have.

MR. QUIGLEY: And emails, texts, or social media otherwise?

MR. STONE: Not social media. Perhaps email, but I have no specific recollection. I've certainly communicated with him by phone.

MR. QUIGLEY: And then you would have communicated with him during the 2016 campaign?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. QUIGLEY: And did he ever talk to you or did you ever have discussions with him about information about WikiLeaks or Julian Assange's plan or Julian Assange in general?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: Or the plans to release hacked emails related to the 2016 election?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. QUIGLEY: And he never communicated with you about meeting with Julian Assange?

MR. STONE: No. I'm unaware if he has ever met with Julian Assange.

MR. QUIGLEY: Well, okay.

MR. STONE: And he never communicated that to me if he did.



MR. QUIGLEY: Okay.

I yield back to Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Stone, at the time you were in contact with Guccifer 2, you believed that he had broken into the DNC. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I believed that he was -- I had seen that he had taken credit publicly for the hacking and that -- prior to the publication of those documents by WikiLeaks. And the fact that he predicted it and that it happened convinced me at that time that he was the hacker.

MR. SCHIFF: So the time that you initiated contact with him, you believed that he had broken into the DNC?

MR. STONE: I believe he was responsible for the hack.

MR. SCHIFF: So you believe that he had been responsible for a crime?

MR. STONE: Well, you know, the release of the Pentagon Papers was a crime, but it was also a journalistic event. He took the material, and he gave it to a journalist, who published it. But, I guess, in the technical sense, you could say yes.

MR. SCHIFF: So you acknowledge that a break-in to the Democratic headquarters and the stealing of emails was a crime?

MR. STONE: Again, I'm not certain that the Democratic committee servers were hacked at all now.

MR. SCHIFF: But at the time, you believed they had been?

MR. STONE: At the time, I believed they had been.

MR. SCHIFF: And you were willing to reach out and communicate with him even though he had committed a crime in the United States?

MR. STONE: Yes. This was after the fact, and our communication

related specifically to being suspended at Twitter, as we discussed.

MR. SCHIFF: And during the time that you communicated with him, you were willing to exploit the fruits of that illegal hack of the DNC?

MR. STONE: I was not involved in the illegal hack. I had no knowledge of it, other than what he had -- but, yeah, this is politics. And as I said earlier, the material has not been questioned in terms of its authenticity or its accuracy.

MR. SCHIFF: So you had no qualms about making use of material that had been stolen from the DNC?

MR. STONE: Making use. I think WikiLeaks made use of them, not me.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, you have described yourself as a political dirty trickster. That's a name you've given yourself at times --

MR. STONE: No, I don't think that's accurate. I have been described that way. I won't reject it because it has a certain notoriety. But one man's dirty trick is another man's civic participation; one man's dirty trickster is another man's freedom fighter. I guess it depends on your point of view.

But as I said earlier --

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Stone, did you consider the use of stolen documents to be a civic role?

MR. STONE: It is something that has happened in politics for as long as I have followed it. I cited the Pentagon Papers case. You'll remember that the government went to court to seek to block the publication of that material on the basis that it was stolen and the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against the government for The New York Times and the publication regardless of where the material had come from.

MR. SCHIFF: You mentioned that you were also the subject of a hack,

correct?

MR. STONE: Yeah, I believe so.

MR. SCHIFF: Was that a crime?

MR. STONE: Yes, it would be.

MR. SCHIFF: Would you have defended the publication of your private emails?

MR. STONE: I wouldn't have been happy about it, but it happens.

MR. SCHIFF: You've also said that, at the time that you were communicating with Guccifer 2, you didn't know whether he was foreign or domestic. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I don't know that I said that specifically. I may have said that I did not believe he was a Russian. I didn't know what his nationality was. I don't even know if he is a person.

MR. SCHIFF: So at the time you were communicating with someone you knew to have committed a crime --

MR. STONE: Well, claimed to have committed a crime.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, you believed had committed a crime.

MR. STONE: At that time, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: You were also not sure he was even an American citizen; you might be communicating with a foreigner or foreigners?

MR. STONE: I didn't believe that he was a Russian at that time, if that's what you're asking me.

MR. SCHIFF: But you also believed he might be a non-U.S. national.

MR. STONE: I don't think I ever said that. I was uncertain of his nationality. I wasn't even certain that he was a real person.

MR. SCHIFF: So, at the time, you were willing in the service of the Trump campaign to communicate with someone who had committed a crime who you could not be sure was even a U.S. person?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And at the time you communicated with Guccifer 2, you also communicated via a channel that was nonpublic, that wasn't disclosed to the public. That was your choice about how to communicate with him, was it not?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: You didn't tweet at him publicly. You chose to use a direct messaging function that would be nonpublic?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And it wasn't you who disclosed that private communication originally, was it?

MR. STONE: Actually, I'd forgotten that the exchange even happened. I was contacted by what I considered to be a fake news site called The Smoking Gun. How they got what would be proprietary information leads me to wonder about The New York Times story of August 20 that said that I was a subject to a FISA warrant and whether the government was leaking, because how else was this proprietary information obtained? When I looked it up, I released it.

MR. SCHIFF: And, Mr. Stone, you certainly didn't intend to make it public yourself?

MR. STONE: I had even forgotten it was there. When they asked about it, I released it. I have read it. I continue to believe it's benign. It certainly doesn't constitute --

MR. SCHIFF: But for --

MR. STONE: It certainly doesn't constitute evidence of collusion with the Russians.

MR. SCHIFF: But for someone else releasing these private messages, though, the public would be unaware of your communication --

MR. STONE: Since it's not terribly newsworthy, I'm not sure what damage would be done to the public. You've read the exchange, but yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you initiate the contact with Guccifer 2, or did Guccifer 2 initiate the contact with you?

MR. STONE: No, I initiated it when he was reinstated. I congratulated him on reinstatement. Remember, this is many weeks after the WikiLeaks has already published the DNC material. Consequently colluding with him for that publication would have been impossible unless I owned a time machine, which I don't.

MR. SCHIFF: But you sought out the communication with Guccifer 2, not the other way around?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SCHIFF: And you --

MR. STONE: As hundreds of other journalists did. He gave many interviews.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you reach out to him on your own initiative, or did someone suggest that you make contact with Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: No one suggested that I make contact with him.

MR. SCHIFF: So you did that purely on your own initiative?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SCHIFF: No one introduced you to Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SCHIFF: On March 21 of 2017, Lee Stranahan, who Mr. Quigley asked you about, tweeted at me: I'm the guy who introduced @RogerStone to Guccifer 2.

Did Lee Stranahan introduce you to Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: I think what he means is that he told me who Guccifer 2 was. Prior to that, I didn't know who he was.

MR. SCHIFF: So you had conversations with Lee Stranahan about Guccifer 2 before you made contact with Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: I had conversations with Lee Stranahan about Guccifer 2 prior to writing the article about Guccifer 2 on August 5 -- was published August 5.

MR. SCHIFF: And was that prior to your making contact with Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: Yes, many weeks prior.

MR. SCHIFF: And how did you communicate with Mr. Stranahan about Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: I really don't recall.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you communicate in writing with him?

MR. STONE: I really just don't recall.

MR. SCHIFF: So, when Mr. Stranahan says that he introduced you to Guccifer 2, your testimony is that all he meant by that was he told you that there was a Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: Who he was. Yes, I was unaware of who he was prior to that.

MR. SCHIFF: And how soon after Mr. Stranahan told you about Guccifer 2 did you make contact with Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: Well, first, I wrote the article on the 5th of August, and then I think I contacted him on August 15th.

MR. SCHIFF: Now, you mentioned the context of your tweet about John Podesta?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: The context also included your comment about his time in the barrel coming after the disclosure of the hacked DNC emails pertaining to the Clinton campaign, did it not?

MR. STONE: I didn't say that in the email, no, in the text --

MR. SCHIFF: Well, you also didn't say anything about any business dealings of John Podesta, did you, in your tweet?

MR. STONE: No, I did not.

MR. SCHIFF: And the context at the time you wrote that was that there was a frequent dumping of DNC documents that had been stolen by Guccifer 2.

MR. STONE: No. The context was that Manafort's business dealings in Eastern Europe were being pedaled very aggressively to the news media by Clinton operatives.

MR. SCHIFF: But that's not something that you ever articulated in your Twitter feed at the time. That's only something you've said --

MR. STONE: No, I didn't, but --

MR. SCHIFF: -- after the fact.

MR. STONE: But I didn't know I had any obligation to do so.

MR. SCHIFF: Later, when you tweeted that the WikiLeaks dump was coming, that the October dump was coming, days before the release of the Podesta emails --

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: -- were you still referring to John Podesta's business?

MR. STONE: No, I was never referring to John Podesta's business -- well, I was referring to his business dealings in my prediction that his time in the barrel, time under public scrutiny would come. I'm sorry. Finish the rest of your question.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, when you said that the WikiLeaks dump was imminent in late October --

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: -- only days before the Podesta emails were released, were you talking about Podesta's business dealings?

MR. STONE: No. No. I viewed those as separate events.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you discuss Mr. Podesta with the intermediary you've described that you had to Mr. Assange?

MR. STONE: Did not.

MR. SCHIFF: You have said at times that you were in communication with Assange, and other times you have said that you were in communication only through an intermediary.

MR. STONE: I think there's only one occasion in which I didn't clarify it, and even then, I clarified it later in the speech. I've always made it pretty clear that I was referring to, you know, a source, an intermediary. I've never said that -- I have never had any direct communication with him prior to the election, and I had said that.

MR. SCHIFF: There are published accounts, Mr. Stone, that you have described yourself as being in communication with Assange without qualifying it as



through an intermediary.

MR. STONE: There's one that I'm aware of. If there are others --

MR. SCHIFF: We will need to determine which is accurate, whether you were in communication with Assange or you were in communication through an intermediary. So we'll need to determine whether we can corroborate that through your intermediary.

MR. PATEL: One minute.

MR. SCHIFF: You said before --

MR. STONE: -- we addressed that, and I promised to make a request.

MR. SCHIFF: You said before that you would not provide that as you're here voluntarily and only under subpoena. If it's necessary, we will subpoena you to bring you back. You can save us all the time and trouble having to do that or you cannot, but either way, we will be prepared to subpoena you to provide that information to the committee.

MR. STONE: As I have said, I will consider that. Should you be required to levy a subpoena, I'll consider that also and how I would respond. I would like to resolve this, as I said to Mr. Gowdy, by simply getting my source to agree to release his name to you, and then you can speak to him yourself.

MR. PATEL: Mr. Rooney.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Gowdy.

MR. GOWDY: Mr. Stone, I want to go back to the issue of hacks or nonpermissive intrusions, unauthorized downloads. It really doesn't matter from my perspective what we call it. I listened to a series of questions that you were just asked about profiting from criminal acts. And just so the record is clear: I do think it was a criminal act.

I guess where I differ from some of my colleagues is I try to be equally outraged at people benefiting from crimes. I don't hear -- and I'm open to being corrected if I'm wrong. I think the dissemination of classified information is also a crime.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. GOWDY: I know that the unauthorized intrusion into people's servers is a crime. I'm almost positive that the unauthorized dissemination of classified material is a crime. In fact, I am positive it is. I don't hear the same outrage from all quarters when people benefit from the leaking of classified information. I don't hear the same outrage that how dare we seek to benefit from this crime. We're going to condemn you for seeking to benefit from someone else's, but we're not going -- I hear a very muted response from some quarters about benefiting from, profiting from, authenticating classified information that winds up on the front page of The Washington Post and New York Times.

In fact, I think I have heard some of my colleagues quote from articles that cited classified information. And it's not that far of a walk from what you're just accused of doing, which is profiting or benefiting from someone else's crime -- and profiting and benefiting from someone else's crime.

So I may be wrong, but at least I have the luxury of being consistently wrong. I think leaks are bad. I think they're wrong. I don't think there's an exception for good leaks. I don't think there is such thing as a good leak.

So, to the extent our committee has been asked to look into unmaskings and leaks, have you been the source of the dissemination of any classified information to anyone in the media?

MR. STONE: Not only have I not, but I would ask the committee's

assistance in learning whether I was among those whose names were unmasked since I most certainly was in communications with individuals in Trump Tower during that period.

MR. GOWDY: Well, I'm going to draw a distinction between unmaskings and the dissemination of classified information because the unmasking is not a crime. The dissemination of classified material is a crime. They're both important. One is a crime; one is not.

Do you have any information, no matter the source, that could benefit this committee in trying to better understand the proliferation of leaks of classified information over the first 8 to 9 months of this year?

MR. STONE: Not firsthand, no, sir.

MR. GOWDY: Those will be all the questions that I have, Chairman Rooney.

MR. ROONEY: We yield.

Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stone, you've said that you'll consult with your attorney in terms of providing documents from your Twitter account or other social media accounts to the committee.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: The committee wrote to you on May 9th requesting no later than May 22 any documents, records, electronically stored information, including email communication, recordings, data, and other tangible things relevant to our investigation.

You wrote back through counsel that you had no documents, records, or

electronically stored information regardless of form responsive to our requests.

Was that a false statement?

MR. STONE: That is not a false statement. That's what -- I believe that to be true.

MR. SCHIFF: So you have no emails, no written documents, no text messages, no Twitter messages pertinent to the campaign or the Russia investigation?

MR. STONE: Pertinent to the campaign, I think we met the narrow criteria of your request precisely. If you want to make a more specific request, I'm happy to go back and look, but I think we completely complied with your request.

MR. SCHIFF: So you have no emails to anyone concerning the allegations of hacked documents or your conversations with the Guccifer 2 or any discussions you have had with third parties about Julian Assange? You have no emails, no texts, no documents whatsoever, any kind of that nature?

MR. STONE: That is correct. Not to my knowledge. I think we met, again, the precise criteria of your request, and we complied. Again, if you have a more specific request, I'm happy to go back and look. But we did an --

MR. SCHIFF: I just want to ask you under oath --

MR. STONE: We did an extensive search consistent with the direction of my attorneys, and we found nothing that met the criteria that you asked for.

MR. SCHIFF: I just want to be certain because you are under oath, where your letter was not under oath, that you have no documents, no emails, no texts, no tweets that refer to Julian Assange or Guccifer 2 or Paul Manafort or the allegations concerning Russian connections with the campaign. You have had no discussions in any written form. You've written no documents yourself.

MR. STONE: In connection with Russian collusion, consistent with your exact and precise request, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Our exact and precise --

MR. STONE: Now, to say no emails pertaining to Paul Manafort, we worked in a campaign together for a period of time.

MR. SCHIFF: Our request was as to facts within the investigation's publicly announced parameters.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And so you have no documentation of any kind?

MR. STONE: I am unaware of anything that met that criteria that would have been required to be turned over.

MR. SCHIFF: So what is it you're going to consult with your attorney about providing to the committee then?

MR. STONE: The name of the intermediary.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, in answer to Mr. Swalwell's question about whether you would provide your Twitter communications to the committee --

MR. STONE: I want to go back and examine them. I'm not aware of anything there that would fit within the criteria of the committee's request. If there's something there, we'll turn it over, but I'm not aware of anything.

MR. SCHIFF: And you said that you were writing a book. Is that right?

MR. STONE: I've written five books.

MR. SCHIFF: But you're in the process of writing a book now?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And does your book discuss the communications you had with Guccifer 2 or the allegations surrounding it?

MR. STONE: No. My book is about how a proper gentleman should dress.

MR. SCHIFF: Oh, well, okay. Well, that certainly is not pertinent to our investigation.

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. SCHIFF: Okay. The May 9th letter to you also imposed a preservation obligation on you to preserve all records that are pertinent to the publicly announced parameters of our investigation. Since you received that letter, have you deleted any emails or texts or destroyed any records that pertain to Guccifer 2, Julian Assange, WikiLeaks, or any of the other announced parameters of our investigation?

MR. STONE: I have not.

MR. SCHIFF: So you have deleted nothing from any of those accounts that are pertinent to --

MR. STONE: I have not --

MR. SCHIFF: -- the publicly announced parameters of the investigation?

MR. STONE: Nothing pertaining to that list of items you just read.

MR. SCHIFF: At that point, I'll yield it to Mr. Swalwell.

MR. SWALWELL: Thank you.

Mr. Stone, earlier you had told me under oath that you had never posted a tweet and then subsequently deleted it.

MR. STONE: No, I don't think I ever said that; if I did, then I misspoke. I've certainly tweeted things and then reconsidered them and deleted them but not pertaining to these matters, I don't believe.

MR. SWALWELL: I'm going to show you a March 4th, 2017, tweet where

you say to @RVAWonk, where she is stating that you deny contact with Assange, you say: You stupid, stupid bitch. Never denied. Perfectly legal back channel to Assange, who indeed had the goods on #CrookedHillary.

MR. STONE: Back channel, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you recognize that tweet?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Was it deleted?

MR. STONE: I don't really remember. If it was, it was because stupid, stupid bitch was intemperate, and I may have reconsidered it. But I don't recall this specifically. On the other hand, using a back channel to confirm Assange's tweet would not be illegal. That's the point I was making.

MR. SWALWELL: But you would agree that tweet would relate to this matter that we are talking about?

MR. STONE: Yes. I just had no memory of it, however.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you discussed with Donald Trump any pardon of yourself or anyone else in the administration or U.S. person with respect to the Russia investigation?

MR. STONE: No, absolutely not.

MR. SWALWELL: Has he discussed it with you?

MR. STONE: He has not.

MR. SWALWELL: Would you agree that, if the Intelligence Community assessment is that Guccifer 2.0 was a Russian, that you were, in the summer of 2016, communicating with a Russian?

MR. STONE: It's a hypothetical question. I've seen no evidence that convinces me that he's Russian. You're asking me to answer a hypothetical

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

88

question. I'm not going --

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

DOJ01-HPSCI-000090



[11:50 a.m.]

MR. SWALWELL: But we agree that that's their conclusion?

MR. STONE: Seems to be, yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Now, we talked about your communications with Donald Trump from March 2015 to August 2015. I want to talk about post-August 2015, once you left the campaign. How often were you talking with him?

MR. STONE: Less often, but from time to time.

MR. SWALWELL: In person?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: By phone?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: By email or any electronic device?

MR. STONE: No. No.

MR. SWALWELL: What were you talking about?

MR. STONE: The campaign, politics.

MR. SWALWELL: How long would these phone conversations usually last?

MR. STONE: It would vary. Some could be very brief. Some could be as long as an hour. It's important to recognize that, when you talk to President Trump for an hour, that means that he talks for 50 minutes and you talk for 10.

MR. SWALWELL: What are some of the conversations you remember, topics?

MR. STONE: Do you think we can really win Wisconsin? Do you think Michigan's really within our grasp? How do you feel about Florida? What's your view on our prospects in Ohio?

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever talk about his statement in the summer of 2016 at a public rally that Russia, if you're listening, please hack Hillary Clinton's emails?

MR. STONE: No, we never discussed that.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever discuss WikiLeaks at all with him?

MR. STONE: Did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever discuss the DNC hacks?

MR. STONE: Did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever discuss the leaking of John Podesta's emails?

MR. STONE: Did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever discuss any of the stories that were being published by Sputnik or RT?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: As you know, in the summer of 2016, it was widely reported that Russia was seeking to interfere in our elections. At any point that you talked with Donald Trump, did you ever discuss at least those public reports?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: After Donald Trump was elected on November 8 and before he was inaugurated on January 20th, did you talk to him?

MR. STONE: I'm sorry, again?

MR. SWALWELL: So let's go from -- let's now carve this up between November 8, 2016, and January 20, 2017. So he's President-elect.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you talk to him during that period?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: In person?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: How many times?

MR. STONE: Once.

MR. SWALWELL: Where was that?

MR. STONE: Trump Tower.

MR. SWALWELL: When?

MR. STONE: I could not pin down the date, but prior to the inauguration, obviously. Most likely, I would say, early December.

MR. SWALWELL: And did you talk to him at all at that time about any of the accusations around Russia's involvement in the election?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Now, let's talk about phone conversations during that period. Did you talk to him at all on the phone?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: How many times?

MR. STONE: I couldn't -- I couldn't quantify it.

MR. SWALWELL: And on the phone, any conversations about Russia's involvement?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: January 20th forward to as you sit here today, have you seen Donald Trump in person since?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you talked to him on the phone?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: When was the last time you talked to him?

MR. STONE: Recently, but I have declined to be specific about the exact dates. A couple Sundays ago, I believe.

MR. SWALWELL: By phone?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you discuss your upcoming testimony to the House Intelligence Committee?

MR. STONE: Did not. I don't even know if he is aware that I'm here today.

MR. SWALWELL: So, from January 20th to today, how many times would you estimate you've talked to him on the phone?

MR. STONE: Four or five.

MR. SWALWELL: And how long for each conversation?

MR. STONE: Varied, just like before.

MR. SWALWELL: Ever discuss any of the news surrounding Russia's involvement in our election?

MR. STONE: In one conversation, he told me that he believed the Russian investigation to be a witch hunt.

MR. SWALWELL: Was that before or after May 6?

MR. STONE: I couldn't tell you. I don't remember.

MR. SWALWELL: Was it within the last couple months?

MR. STONE: No. It would have been earlier.

MR. SWALWELL: What else did he say about the witch hunt?

MR. STONE: That's kind of it, actually. It was the only reference to

Russia that I can recall. And he moved off of it and onto something else pretty quickly.

MR. SWALWELL: On May 6th of this year, you told The Daily Caller -- you referenced to The Daily Caller ongoing conversations with Donald Trump. Do you remember that?

MR. STONE: Not specifically, but it would be accurate. We had at that period ongoing conversations.

MR. SWALWELL: And you watched, on March 20th, when then-Director Comey told our committee that the FBI was investigating counterintelligence, had counterintelligence and criminal investigations into whether Trump campaign persons had worked with Russia. You were aware of that?

MR. STONE: I didn't see the testimony. I read the transcript.

MR. SWALWELL: Did Donald Trump, as President, ever talk to you about James Comey?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever talk to him about James Comey?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever express any feelings to anyone on Donald Trump's administration about James Comey?

MR. STONE: No. Now, I did write, speak, and proselytize for the firing of Mr. Comey. So my opinion could have been known to the President or people around him, but I never had any direct conversation about this.

MR. SWALWELL: Well, intermediaries, did you ever send a writing to an intermediary, knowing that that message would be passed to Donald Trump --

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: -- about James Comey?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: There was a Politico story on May 10th that said --

MR. PATEL: Five minutes.

MR. SWALWELL: -- that many of your friends and allies told Politico that you had encouraged the President to fire James Comey.

MR. STONE: Yeah, I denied that at the time, and I deny it today. I don't believe that to be true.

MR. SWALWELL: So, as you sit here today, there's not a person in the world who you told that knew Donald Trump that he should fire James Comey?

MR. STONE: That is correct. And I believe he denied it in a tweet after that story ran.

MR. SWALWELL: Paul Manafort.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SWALWELL: When was the last time you talked to him?

MR. STONE: Let's see. Four or 5 days ago.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you talk about the Russia investigation?

MR. STONE: Not specifically.

MR. SWALWELL: Indirectly?

MR. STONE: Only in the sense that I called to say, how are you doing? He has enormous legal bills, as you know.

He said: I'm holding up okay.

We both talked about the raid on his apartment in Virginia, which is the first time I've talked to him since that became public. But beyond that, there were no specifics. It was a very brief conversation. I was essentially just trying to find out

how he was.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you know where he was?

MR. STONE: I don't. I called his cell phone.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you know whether he has been in recent contact with Donald Trump?

MR. STONE: I don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you know if he has been in recent contact with anyone in the administration?

MR. STONE: I don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: Anyone in the Trump family?

MR. STONE: I don't know.

MR. SWALWELL: How often would you talk to Paul Manafort after you left the campaign in August 2015? I am mostly interested in when he was presiding as chairman.

MR. STONE: Fairly often. Once, twice a week.

MR. SWALWELL: By phone?

MR. STONE: Yes, always.

MR. SWALWELL: Never in person?

MR. STONE: When he was in the convention director role prior to the Republican National Convention, we met in person a couple times, specifically relating to the convention.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever have any conversations, by phone, by email, by text, with Paul Manafort ever about the Russia investigation prior to Donald Trump being elected -- I'm sorry -- Russia's involvement? So --

MR. STONE: I don't -- I don't recall one.

MR. SWALWELL: So the accusations are out there in the public sphere.

MR. STONE: Other than to say -- other than to be dismissive and believe, as we both do, that there was no collusion between the Russian state and the Trump campaign, but not more specific than that.

MR. SWALWELL: Restore American Greatness PAC, is that your PAC?

MR. STONE: I don't think so.

MR. SWALWELL: The Committee to Restore American Greatness, are you familiar with that?

MR. STONE: I'm uncertain. I had a PAC called the Committee for American Sovereignty.

MR. SWALWELL: When did you start that?

MR. STONE: Before the convention.

MR. SWALWELL: Why?

MR. STONE: Because it was specifically designed to go collect information regarding irregularities in the voting in certain State primaries in the event that we needed, the Trump supporters needed, to raise a challenge in the credentials committee at our convention. This was modeled after what Dwight Eisenhower did in --

MR. SWALWELL: How much did you raise?

MR. STONE: I don't recall.

MR. SWALWELL: Was it over \$100,000?

MR. STONE: Probably.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever receive contributions from foreign nationals?

MR. STONE: Contributions from foreign nationals are illegal.



MR. PATEL: One minute.

MR. STONE: I don't believe we did. We would have returned them had we -- had they come in.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever do any digital communications, by Facebook or Google Ads or social media postings, through the PAC?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever do any voter communications by radio or television or phone calls or mail?

MR. STONE: There's two different entities here, so I'm a little confused.

MR. SWALWELL: What are the entities?

MR. STONE: The Committee to Restore -- was it America's Greatness?

MR. SWALWELL: Well, I asked you about Restore American Greatness.

MR. STONE: Yeah. I'm not sure that that's ours, to be honest with you, but it's possible. The other one, American Sovereignty, I don't think did any electronic or digital advertising.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you hold any voter data at all?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: What's the time?

MR. PATEL: Your time is up in about 5 seconds.

MR. SWALWELL: Do you guys have more questions?

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Gowdy.

MR. GOWDY: Mr. Stone, I don't ordinarily like to ask leading questions unless it is just to summarize what I think the record already contains and makes it easier for those who have to go back and search the record to find kind of a central repository for purposes of citation. So I'm going to ask questions that

some may consider to be leading, but if I misstate any fact, I want you to correct me, no matter how small.

MR. STONE: All right.

MR. GOWDY: I believe it is your testimony that you did not collude, conspire, or coordinate with the Russian Government or any Russian not connected with the government to impact or interfere with the 2016 election cycle. Is that true?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. GOWDY: I believe it is your testimony that you are in possession of no evidence, regardless of the source and no matter the manner or form of that evidence, that Donald J. Trump colluded, conspired, coordinated with the Russian Government or any Russians not in the Russian Government to impact the 2016 primary or general election.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. GOWDY: I believe it is your testimony that you are in possession of no evidence, regardless of source, regardless of the manner or form in which that evidence may manifest itself, of anyone in the official Donald J. Trump for President campaign colluding, coordinating, conspiring with the Russian Government or any Russian not connected with the government to impact the primary or general election in 2016.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. GOWDY: I believe it is your testimony that you are in possession of no evidence, regardless of the source and no matter the form or manner in which that evidence may manifest itself, of anyone even loosely affiliated with the campaign, as a hanger-on or a wannabe or a self-described adviser, colluding,

coordinating, or conspiring with the Russian Government or any Russian not connected with the government to impact the 2016 primary or general election.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. GOWDY: I think it is your testimony that you had no foreknowledge whatsoever of the hack of the DNC, with the caveat that you are not convinced it was a hack.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. GOWDY: Is it equally true that you have no foreknowledge of the DNC -- fill in the blank -- voluntary release, internal intrusion, by whatever means that information was accessed, you had no foreknowledge of it?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. GOWDY: Would the same be true with respect to the hacking of the John Podesta email?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. GOWDY: I believe you testified, but I'm going to ask you again if it's true, that you in no way, manner, shape or form coordinated, colluded, conspired with the releasing of the proceeds of either the Podesta hack or the DNC hack?

MR. STONE: That is absolutely correct.

MR. GOWDY: Let me consult with Mr. Rooney whether or not I have missed any relevant questions of our four pillars of our jurisdiction.

MR. ROONEY: It depends on how you define hangers-on.

Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And as my colleague was allowed some commentary, I'd just add my own commentary. I think if you ask Vladimir Putin whether he colluded, cooperated,

coordinated, he'd probably say no as well. I'm not sure that question is designed to get the most accurate answer, but that's my commentary.

Mr. Stone --

MR. GOWDY: I don't mean to interrupt you, but what was that in reference to?

MR. SCHIFF: Well, the question that you just asked Mr. Stone and have asked others.

MR. GOWDY: Whether or not he did it, you think that's an irrelevant question?

MR. SCHIFF: No, I don't think it's irrelevant at all. My point is I'm not sure that question is dispositive of what we need to ascertain. But, anyway, I don't want to engage. I just wanted to add my own commentary as you added your commentary.

MR. GOWDY: I'm not trying to interrupt you, but what of my commentary do you -- I've expressed no opinion on whether or not a witness told the truth any more than you have expressed an opinion on whether a witness -- the testimony is what the testimony is.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Gowdy, I shouldn't have opened a can of worms. I'm just responding to your questions about leaks and asking Mr. Stone whether he's leaked classified information, which I did not see the value in. But, nonetheless, I'm ready to move on.

MR. GOWDY: Fair enough.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Stone, I wanted to ask you, on October 12th, you gave an interview to NBC News where you said that: We have a mutual friend who's traveled to London several times, and everything I know is through that channel of

communication.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: Referring to a mutual friend of Assange.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And you said something similar in another interview on October -- to CBS Miami.

Did the intermediary tell you how often he traveled to London to meet with Mr. Assange?

MR. STONE: No. I just knew that he had been there a couple times.

MR. SCHIFF: And did the intermediary tell you whether he had been in communication with anyone in the Trump campaign?

MR. STONE: He did not. I don't believe that he had, but he never specifically said.

MR. SCHIFF: If he never specifically said one way or another, then what's the basis of your belief?

MR. STONE: Wasn't covering the campaign. I think I would have known if he had reported on anybody he'd interviewed in the campaign.

MR. SCHIFF: What was his purpose in sharing information with you that he'd obtained from Mr. Assange?

MR. STONE: I asked him to just confirm that the tweet of Assange of July 31st was accurate. He came back and said yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And was that the only communication you had with the intermediary about what Mr. Assange may or may not possess in terms of stolen emails?

MR. STONE: It was. Now, he would continue to tell me the exact same

thing through September, through the balance of August, and all of September, that he believed that WikiLeaks had this material and that it would be released in October. That was the extent of it, though.

MR. SCHIFF: So, throughout the many months in which you represented you were either in communication with Assange or communication through an intermediary with Assange, you were only referring to a single fact that you had confirmed with the intermediary --

MR. STONE: That --

MR. SCHIFF: -- was the length and the breadth of what you were referring to?

MR. STONE: That is correct, even though it was repeated to me on numerous separate occasions.

MR. SCHIFF: And did you discuss your conversations with the intermediary with anyone involved in the Trump campaign?

MR. STONE: I did not.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you have any communication with DCLeaks?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Swalwell.

MR. SWALWELL: Thank you.

Mr. Stone, it's your testimony today that you are not affiliated at all with the Committee to Restore America's Greatness?

MR. STONE: No, I said I was uncertain. It may be -- we set up a number of PACs that we use. We set up others that we did not use.

MR. SWALWELL: How many did you set up that you were involved in?

MR. STONE: Two. I'm just not certain whether this is one of ours. I

would have to go back and look. It may be. I would like to come back and answer the question after I have a chance to look at it.

MR. SWALWELL: Are either of these PACs still active?

MR. STONE: I'm not certain. I believe that the Committee for American Sovereignty -- I'm not even certain that it's a PAC. It may, in fact, be a 527. I would have to go back and look, but I believe it's still filed. In other words, it hasn't been closed. Inactive, but I think it still exists.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever talk to anyone on the campaign about your work with the PACs?

MR. STONE: No, because coordination is illegal.

MR. SWALWELL: And you don't know today how much money was raised between both?

MR. STONE: I don't.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever pay yourself out of the PACs?

MR. STONE: I may have taken expense reimbursements out of the PAC. Again, we had to obtain an enormous amount of -- enormous number of affidavits as to voter irregularity, which entailed travel, local attorneys, and so on.

MR. SWALWELL: In advance of today's interview, your attorney wrote to the committee in a letter dated September 22, 2017, that: Mr. Stone has watched as, after the appearances of several witnesses, they have been subjected to relentless misrepresentations of what was said to the committee under oath.

Have you talked to any person about their testimony to our committee?

MR. STONE: Only Michael Caputo.

MR. SWALWELL: When did you talk to him?

MR. STONE: After he testified here.

MR. SWALWELL: And what did he tell you about his testimony?

MR. STONE: That he felt that he answered all the questions honestly and fairly, and that he was subsequently accused of perjury by a member of the committee.

MR. SWALWELL: Did he tell you the questions we had asked?

MR. STONE: He did not.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you talked to anyone else other than your attorneys about your testimony today?

MR. STONE: I have not.

MR. SWALWELL: Anyone at the White House?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: Anyone who worked on the Trump campaign, other than Mr. Caputo?

MR. STONE: I told Paul Manafort in our last conversation I was coming to testify, but that was the extent of it. He was unaware of that.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you ever provided interviews or material to RT? And I'm not talking about retweet now; I'm talking about Russia Today.

MR. STONE: I think I've done a couple interviews there.

MR. SWALWELL: Okay. And --

MR. STONE: You could -- I imagine they're on YouTube.

MR. SWALWELL: And you agree that RT is a Kremlin-funded outlet?

MR. STONE: No doubt about it.

MR. SWALWELL: And you still had no problem providing interviews to a Kremlin-funded outlet?

MR. STONE: They often cover matters that the mainstream media in this



country doesn't. On some occasions, they are less censored than our own matter. I just view them as an outlet. We acknowledge that they're Russian-funded, but it's an opportunity to say what we want to say.

MR. SWALWELL: And you're familiar with the Intelligence Community assessment that RT was used by the Russian intelligence services to run its interference campaign in the 2016 election?

MR. STONE: No, I'm actually not aware of that.

MR. SWALWELL: Did you ever encourage anyone on the Trump team to communicate with RT?

MR. STONE: Not that I recall, no.

MR. SWALWELL: Are you familiar with Sputnik?

MR. STONE: I've become familiar with Sputnik only recently.

MR. SWALWELL: Just for your education, Mr. Stone, I'm giving you page 9 of the unclassified Intelligence Community assessment. You can look at that on your own time.

Finally, are you familiar with Peter Smith?

MR. STONE: Only having read about who he is.

MR. SWALWELL: Have you ever met him?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SWALWELL: I yield back to Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: Ms. Speier.

MS. SPEIER: Thank you.

I just have some cleanup questions for you. A lot of these have been covered.

Could you name for us your present clients?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair, I believe that is outside the scope of the stated boundaries of this interview. I mean, if --

MS. SPEIER: I'm just trying to determine if any of them relate to --

MR. STONE: I have no foreign clients, if that's what you're asking, none whatsoever.

MS. SPEIER: Do you have any clients that are at all somewhat related to this investigation?

MR. STONE: None whatsoever.

MS. SPEIER: When you were working for Black, Manafort, did you ever file as a representative of a foreign government?

MR. STONE: No, I don't believe so, because I didn't work on any foreign clients. All of the clients I represented were domestic. Paul Manafort ran the international practice. I -- other than my one election I did in Bermuda through the United Bermuda Party, I had no foreign business.

MS. SPEIER: Didn't you testify earlier that you worked for Ukraine?

MR. STONE: Yes, but that was long after Black, Manafort, and Stone no longer existed.

MS. SPEIER: All right. As an independent company, entity, have you ever filed as a representative of a foreign government?

MR. STONE: I have not. I've never lobbied for a foreign government in the United States.

MS. SPEIER: What was your role at the Republican Convention?

MR. STONE: I had no formal role. I was there on my own behest. I had a book signing. I gave a number of interviews --

MR. PATEL: Five minutes.

MR. STONE: -- to Charlie Rose and so on.

MS. SPEIER: Did you have any contact during the campaign with a U.S. person of Russian descent?

MR. STONE: So an American citizen who was an ethnic Russian?

MS. SPEIER: Or who emigrated from Russia.

MR. STONE: Not that I can recall.

MS. SPEIER: So you had no contact with a person like Felix Sater?

MR. STONE: No, definitely not. I've never met Felix Sater.

MS. SPEIER: Are you familiar with the Internet Research Agency?

MR. STONE: I am not.

MS. SPEIER: It is responsible for much of the fake news, fake Facebook pages. It's the industrialization of trolls in Russia, in St. Petersburg.

MR. STONE: I'm unfamiliar with it.

MR. SMITH: Ma'am, what was the name of that organization?

MS. SPEIER: Internet Research Agency.

You have a number of times said that the DNC refused to give their server to the FBI. Where did you get that information?

MR. STONE: I've read it numerous times in various publications.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. And you know full well that oftentimes publications don't get it right. You've said so relative to coverage of yourself. Correct?

MR. STONE: Sure, but I've never seen any correction requested of that

fact. I believe it to be true.

MS. SPEIER: Well, it is not true, for the record.

MR. STONE: Well, that would be news to me.

MS. SPEIER: Are you aware that the Nation article that you referred to as suggesting that it was an inside job has been refuted?

MR. STONE: I'm not surprised by that, but that doesn't make it incorrect.

MS. SPEIER: Are you aware that The Nation magazine is reviewing the authenticity of that article now?

MR. STONE: I was not aware of that.

MS. SPEIER: A followup question to how you communicate. So you communicate by phone? By text?

Yes to phone?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: By text?

MR. STONE: Yes, sometimes.

MS. SPEIER: Email?

MR. STONE: Yes.

MS. SPEIER: Twitter?

MR. STONE: Yes. Facebook.

MS. SPEIER: And Facebook.

MR. STONE: Instagram.

MS. SPEIER: Instagram.

MR. STONE: Snapchat.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. And in all of those venues -- you have checked all of those venues to determine whether or not anything within the scope of this

investigation would be appropriate to deliver to us and you have found nothing?

MR. STONE: That is correct. As I said earlier, if you want to make a more specific request, I'm happy to go back and look again, but I believe we have fully complied with your request.

MS. SPEIER: All right.

Relative to your engagements on RT, you've made a point of saying, "The idea that I, an anticommunist conservative, would throw in with a totalitarian regime is bullshit." And yet RT has been described as a "Kremlin-financed channel operated from within the United States as part of a Kremlin-directed campaign to undermine faith in the U.S. Government and fuel political protest."

Does that give you reason to pause?

MR. STONE: I had family members mowed down by Russian tanks in Budapest in 1956. I have no great love for the Russian state. On the other hand, I guess I adhere to the saying of Gore Vidal, "Never pass up the opportunity to have sex or be on television." It's a forum. I view it simply as a forum.

MS. SPEIER: Have you provided any material to the Russian media -- RT, Sputnik, or any other --

MR. STONE: I have not.

MS. SPEIER: -- news organization?

MR. STONE: I have not.

MS. SPEIER: Okay. I yield back.

MR. SCHIFF: If I could just follow up, and then I'll turn it over to Mr. Castro.

So you never communicated with your intermediary in writing in any way?

MR. STONE: No.

MR. SCHIFF: Never emailed him or texted him?

MR. STONE: He's not an email guy.

MR. SCHIFF: So all your conversations with him were in person or over the phone.

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. SCHIFF: You never responded on Twitter to anyone commenting to you on Guccifer 2?

MR. STONE: I'm not -- give me an example. I'm not sure I understand the question.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, you said that you've engaged in direct messaging, private direct messaging, with people who have written to you on Twitter, that Guccifer 2 was not the only one that you were communicating through direct message. That's what you testified earlier. Am I correct?

MR. STONE: Yes. There are others, certainly.

MR. SCHIFF: So others who have tweeted you on the subject of the Russia investigation you have never responded to in any way?

MR. STONE: Not that I recall.

MR. SCHIFF: So, never sent out any direct communications regarding the hacking of the DNC, the publication of documents, any of the Russia allegations.

MR. PATEL: One minute.

MR. STONE: Not that I recall.

MR. SCHIFF: And you've never emailed anyone on the subject either?

MR. STONE: Not that I recall.

MR. SCHIFF: Not to set up meetings, not to have discussions, not to in any way -- that in any way refer to WikiLeaks, Julian Assange, Guccifer 2,

allegations of hacking, allegations of collusion, any of the above? You've never had any --

MR. STONE: I may have responded to media requests on those topics.

MR. SCHIFF: Did you respond in writing?

MR. STONE: Usually not. Usually by cell phone.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, I'm not asking about usually. You've said that you have no records whatsoever responsive to the committee request. I just want to be absolutely clear, since you're under oath, that that is a true and accurate statement.

MR. STONE: I believe the request said outside of materials that can be found in the public domain. Anything that would've ended up in the public domain I wouldn't have turned over. But I don't have any specific recollection of anything that meets that criteria.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Castro.

MR. CASTRO: You said anything that would've ended up in the public domain. Are you including any newspaper articles or any television --

MR. STONE: That's what I'm referring to.

MR. PATEL: Mr. Rooney.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Gowdy, please, only questions of value, according to what the minority ranking member would say.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Rooney.

MR. ROONEY: You're welcome.

MR. GOWDY: Two lines of inquiry.

Number one, speaking of being under oath and under the general heading, "You learn something new every day if you're not careful," I could've sworn that

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Director Comey and Secretary Johnson both had testified that the DNC did not turn over the server to law enforcement, and I'm hearing today that that is not true.

So I'm going to ask Chairman Conaway, and, Ranking Member Schiff, I'll ask you: If Director Comey and Secretary Johnson testified that the server was never turned over to the FBI or the DHS and there is evidence that they are incorrect in that testimony, I would like that to be reconciled.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Gowdy, I'm happy to talk with you about that. That violates the chairman's injunction, though. That's not a question for Mr. Stone. But I'm happy to discuss that with you after the hearing.

MR. GOWDY: Well, I think you heard the same question I heard from our colleague from California, that it was.

MR. SCHIFF: Well, our colleague from California asked Mr. Stone what was the basis of his conclusion that the DNC had been hacked, and he said public accounts.

But if you would like to discuss with me after the hearing what the state of the evidence is, what the DNC witnesses testified to during our absence during the August recess, we can certainly discuss those things.

MR. GOWDY: I would like that, because the testimony of record is contrary to that, from Director Comey and Secretary Johnson.

Mr. Stone, your answers are under oath. Sometimes Members of Congress' questions are not under oath, but this is an unusual setting where I can give you a chance to answer those questions.

One of my colleagues said this: "Is it a coincidence that Roger Stone predicted that John Podesta would be a victim of a Russian hack and have his private emails published and did so even before Mr. Podesta himself was fully

UNCLASSIFIED, COMMITTEE SENSITIVE



aware that his private emails would be exposed?"

That was a question I guess asked rhetorically, but I'll ask you non-rhetorically, if you want to answer that question.

MR. STONE: Yes, it is indeed exactly that, a coincidence. Anything to the contrary would be conjecture, supposition, projection. But there's no evidence to that effect, because it's not true.

MR. GOWDY: We've heard about quite a few individuals in the Trump orbit who fell somewhere on that spectrum, from mere naivete -- disturbing enough if this naivete is a feature of those, parenthetically, who were supposed to be running our country and foreign policy -- to unwitting Russian dupes, to willing blindness, to active coordination. This rogues' gallery includes those already fired -- Roger Stone, adviser to Donald Trump.

Is there something you would like to say in response to that?

MR. STONE: Yes. It implies that I have worked for the Russians. I have never worked for the Russians, nor am I a dupe of the Russians.

MR. GOWDY: And, finally, a colleague mused: "I believe that Michael Caputo is part of this cabal, including Roger Stone and Paul Manafort and others, who had business relationships with Russia."

MR. STONE: As I have said, I have never had any business relationship with Russia or any Russian company or any Russian entity or the Russian state, and, therefore, I should not be on that list of names.

MR. GOWDY: That's all I have.

MR. ROONEY: Mr. Schiff.

MR. SCHIFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stone, you've acknowledged that it's the conclusion of the Intelligence

Community that Guccifer 2 is a cutout of the Russian intelligence agencies.

MR. STONE: They have said that, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And you've disputed that, but do you have any basis to dispute that other than the fact that you wish it not to be true?

MR. STONE: I just see no proof of it other than the flat statement that it is the case. So I've given you my opinion, yes.

MR. SCHIFF: And because the Intelligence Community hasn't shown you the classified information that would be the basis of their conclusion, you're rejecting it on the basis of the fact that they've gotten other things wrong in the past. Is that your testimony?

MR. STONE: Many, many, many other things. And as I say in my statement, I believe they have been politicized. Yes.

MR. SCHIFF: But if the Intelligence Community is accurate in its assessment, then you were in touch, directly in touch, with agents of the GRU, assisting them in maintaining their Twitter account, and encouraging the publication of materials in an American election that would be damaging to one of the candidates.

MR. STONE: All after the fact. So the idea that I had some role in that or assisted it or colluded with them is not possible based on the timeline, the context, and the content of the exchange.

MR. SCHIFF: But your testimony, Mr. Stone, that you were never in contact with a Russian or Russians, let alone the Russian intelligence services, is only truthful if the Intelligence Community is wrong about its assessment. And you have no basis to conclude they are wrong about their assessment.

MR. STONE: I am entitled to my opinion. I do not believe that they

are -- that he is a -- or that entity is a Russian cutout. And, therefore, I would disagree with you. On the other hand, we have the content of the exchange. It's pretty benign.

MR. SCHIFF: And had you known, Mr. Stone, that Guccifer 2 was, in fact, a Russian Government entity, would you have still maintained your communication with him?

MR. STONE: Had I been certain of it, I may not have.

MR. SCHIFF: But you may have?

MR. STONE: It's a hypothetical question, therefore impossible to answer.

MR. SCHIFF: So you can't answer whether you would have cut off contact had you known they were a Russian GRU cutout.

MR. STONE: I would've had to have seen some proof that I deemed believable. I still don't think that is the case.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Castro.

MR. CASTRO: Mr. Stone, I just want to be clear. Before we switched over, I asked a question about information that came out of the public domain.

Do you have any information relevant to our inquiry that you've not turned over simply because that information may have come out in the newspaper, for example? Are you holding on to any information that would affirm some allegation or claim that showed up in a newspaper or television broadcast about anything having to do with you and this inquiry?

MR. STONE: No. So, for example, the exchange between Guccifer and myself has been made public. You can find this online. It's been widely reported. I still attached it as an exhibit in connection with my testimony today.

MR. CASTRO: Okay.

MR. STONE: But there is nothing else that I think meets that criteria.

MR. CASTRO: The next two questions, if you could, cover the period between January 1st of 2015 to the present day.

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. CASTRO: Can you give me all your addresses during that time, all of your residences or homes that you owned?

MR. SMITH: I think that's a little outside the scope, and it's a little personal. I mean --

MR. CASTRO: Hold on a second. In every request for production, every interrogatory set has that basic information. That's completely within the bounds of this investigation.

MR. SMITH: I do not believe that was in the letter that we received.

MR. CASTRO: That's basic information. Come on. Any request for production, any interrogatory, any documents in any lawsuit, any court proceeding, you know --

MR. ROONEY: This is not a court of law. Mr. Stone, you are here voluntarily. If you want to answer the question, you're more than welcome to. If not, if this information were to be subpoenaed and Mr. Stone come back, that can be revisited at a different time. You can answer whatever you want. You can stay as long as you want.

MR. STONE: Let me ask if this would solve the problem. Could I submit that information voluntarily after I leave? Because I'd have to get ZIP codes and so on.

MR. CASTRO: Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. STONE: I have moved several times since then. I have residences

in New York and Florida.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. That would be fine.

MR. STONE: I'd be happy to submit it. I see no downside to it.

MR. CASTRO: The same information for any cell phone numbers or telephone numbers of yours during that same time period of January 1st --

MR. STONE: I only have one. I've had the same one since they invented the cell phone, I think.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. Will you submit that to us?

MR. STONE: Sure.

MR. CASTRO: Okay.

Same information for financial institutions, banks or credit unions or any other financial institutions that you used.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that Mr. Stone's banking information was at all relevant to this.

MR. CASTRO: Again, this is basic information. Anybody that's practiced litigation knows this is basic --

MR. ROONEY: And, again, this is not a court of law.

Mr. Stone, you are welcome to answer whatever questions you would like or not. You're welcome to stay as long as you'd like, as well.

MR. BUSCHEL: Could you put your requests in writing and we'll answer them? I mean, to put him on the spot now and say, "Will you give up your banking records?", is not something we're prepared to answer.

MR. CASTRO: Sure.

And, by the way, I would just remark that the rules of evidence have been referenced many times in these hearings before, which are also court

proceedings. So --

MR. SMITH: Mr. Castro, what I will say --

MR. ROONEY: Hold on a second.

Mr. Castro, the attorney asked me a specific question, and I'm just answering it. Whether --

MR. CASTRO: No, I'm not blaming you.

MR. ROONEY: -- or not he answers that is up to him.

MR. CASTRO: I'm not blaming you.

MR. ROONEY: I'm not saying that your question is right or wrong. I'm just answering his question.

MR. CASTRO: And I'm simply pointing out that we've referenced the rules of evidence before.

MR. ROONEY: Right. And whether or not that's answered is, again, up to the witness.

MR. CASTRO: Absolutely. Okay.

Are you married?

MR. STONE: I am.

MR. CASTRO: Can you state your wife's name?

MR. STONE: Nydia Stone.

MR. CASTRO: How long have you been married? An approximation is fine.

MR. STONE: Yeah, put me on the spot there.

MR. CASTRO: Just an approximation.

MR. STONE: Twenty-two years, I believe. It's my second marriage.

MR. CASTRO: And what is your wife's employment?

MR. STONE: She's unemployed. She's a homemaker.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. How many children do you have?

MR. STONE: That -- I didn't mean it that way. She's a homemaker.

That's her job.

MR. CASTRO: Sure.

MR. STONE: And she's very good at it.

MR. CASTRO: How many children do you have?

MR. STONE: I have two grown children, both by adoption.

MR. CASTRO: And what are their occupations?

MR. STONE: One of them is a Broward County deputy sheriff, and the other one is a registered nurse.

MR. CASTRO: Okay. And the child that's a nurse, where does she live?

MR. STONE: She lives in Florida, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

MR. CASTRO: You referenced an intermediary that dealt with Julian Assange. Is that correct?

MR. STONE: That is correct.

MR. CASTRO: How many times did the intermediary go back and forth between you and Julian Assange?

MR. STONE: I think only once, to ascertain the confirmation that I asked for.

MR. CASTRO: Because you referenced -- in some of the public statements that are attributed to you, at least, you say that you've got this back channel that's going back and forth. So was it just once?

MR. STONE: Well, that's because he comes back week after week, continuing to insist that what he's told me is right.

MR. CASTRO: So it's more than one conversation --

MR. STONE: Yes.

MR. CASTRO: -- but you're saying it's one subject.

MR. STONE: Right, and one piece of information.

MR. CASTRO: But multiple conversations.

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. CASTRO: Okay.

You also said earlier when Mr. Schiff was questioning you, you said about the intermediary, you said he said the emails would be released in October.

MR. STONE: Correct.

MR. CASTRO: When did he tell you that?

MR. STONE: In August. Middle of August.

MR. CASTRO: So then the question that Mr. Schiff or Mr. Swalwell originally asked about whether you had prior knowledge that there was going to be a release of information, you said no. You've now just told us that the --

MR. STONE: Well --

MR. CASTRO: Hold on, let me ask my question. You have now just told us that the intermediary told you in August that the emails would be released in October. Is that prior knowledge?

MR. STONE: I guess you could consider it prior knowledge. I would have to go back and look. I think that Assange himself had said October on Twitter. I was seeking a confirmation of what he'd already said.

MR. CASTRO: Mr. Stone, you've said multiple times here today that you had no prior knowledge. You've just now admitted that you had prior knowledge that these emails would be released.



MR. STONE: I believe that was a -- I think that was publicly known, in all honesty.

MR. CASTRO: You've given two different answers on a very crucial point of information.

MR. STONE: No, I don't think I have. I think I've been very forthright about the fact that the intermediary said October 1st, but I think that was also already in the public realm.

MR. CASTRO: No further questions for now. I yield back to Adam.

MR. SCHIFF: Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

MR. ROONEY: We also have no further questions.

Mr. Stone, I want to thank you on behalf of the committee and the majority. And if you're requested back, we'll certainly let your attorneys know, but we want to thank you for your time this morning.

MR. STONE: Thank you. And thank you to this committee.

MR. ROONEY: This investigation is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:32 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

