



**Episode 1,087: The Truth About the FISA Memo, With ex-CIA Analyst Ray McGovern**

**Guest: Ray McGovern**

**WOODS:** I'm really glad to talk to you with everything that's going on. I read a piece you just wrote, and you're one of *the* people I'd want to talk to in this situation. So let's start off at the most basic level for people who just haven't been keeping up with the news. There was a "memo" released at the end of last week pertaining to the FBI and the alleged politicization of the FBI against Trump, and it had to do with the use of a dossier and all that stuff. Just give me let's say the one-minute or two-minute version of what you would tell somebody – let's say an eighth grader in school – about what was important about that memo, just from the point of view of news. And then we'll get into what it means.

**MCGOVERN:** Can I have two and a half minutes?

**WOODS:** Take all the time you want, Ray. It's totally arbitrary.

**MCGOVERN:** It is frightfully complicated, but for those who have not been tuned in, the immediate donnybrook has to do with the House Intelligence Committee, led by Devin Nunes from California, doing its job. Now, this hasn't happened in decades. What I'm saying here is that Nunes has required the FBI to serve up documents which indicate that the most senior officials of the FBI and the Department of Justice interfered with the 2016 election.

How did they do that? Well, they caused a dossier to be composed by an ex-British foreign intelligence officer, and that was used as an essential justification before the court to get permission to intercept, to monitor, to surveil this fellow named Page, who was working for Trump earlier. And when you get permission to surveil one person, as most people know, there are two hops, so to speak. Everyone with whom that person has been in touched is also surveilled, and everyone who has been in touch with that second person is also surveilled. Now, think of the possibilities here, when if just one of those people is on Facebook or Twitter or whatever.

So what they did was they got permission to surveil people in the Trump campaign. And that's illegal. That's a violation of the law. This Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act law was put into place after J. Edgar Hoover was discovered to have been doing this all the time. This law worked for a couple of decades, but until now, it has been – well, let me put it this way. The so-called oversight committees, well, that word oversight has two meanings. They became the "overlook" committees until now.

What do we have now? Now we have documentary proof, documentary proof that the FISA court applications were based on extremely frivolous, extremely, demonstrably wrong

information from this hired hand that the FBI recruited. Now, MI-6, which is the British foreign intelligence service, its opposite member is the CIA, not the FBI. And my friends tell me that is unprecedented that the FBI would go hire a former MI-6 officer. That has to do with the CIA. Implication here is the CIA, NSA, and the FBI were all involved in what one could call a soft coup to make sure, number one, Trump could never win, and number two, if he did win, well, there was kind of an insurance policy to make sure that he was disabled from doing anything he wanted to do once he did get elected.

And those things worked, but now it's being revealed how it worked and how the FBI and the Department – Get this. The Department of "Justice" at the highest level approved these warrants on the basis of spurious information. And the key here is that the media in this country are unwilling to realize that they've been spinning a yarn that is now demonstrably false. First it was Russian hacking. That fell apart. Then it was Facebook and Twitter, if you could believe that. That sort of was shown to be ridiculous. Now they have this memo written by Nunes and his staff – were they Republican staffers? Yes, they were. Well, why is that? Well, it's because the Democratic staffers wouldn't cooperate.

Now, one last thing here. The Democrats have their own memo, and that has not yet been released. The latest news is that will be released tomorrow, on Tuesday. Now, do I favor that? Of course I favor that. Transparency is the name of the game here. We're dealing with documents, okay? Documents should be able to be interpreted. And up until now, we have people in the media, the mainstream media and in the so-called progressive media all saying, "This memo purports to show...", "This memo purports to show..." And this was as recently as one hour ago when Amy Goodman was very careful to use those terms to kind of avoid backing off the Russiagate allegations that she and others have drunk the Kool-Aid on. Now, this is important. This is really important, because as Mark Twain said, "It's far easier to deceive people than it is to persuade them that they've been deceived."

**WOODS:** All right, a lot to unpack here. First of all, the counter argument that we've been hearing is that these FISA warrants would have been sought with or without the dossier, so therefore, the whole thing is a tempest in a teapot.

**MCGOVERN:** Okay, the Nunes memo, so-called, which is the memo that was released late last week on Thursday, says that "the dossier formed an essential part of the justification" for the FISA application to allow surveillance on Trump people, first and foremost, Carter Page. Now, when I say "first and foremost," the media would have you believe that this had to do only with Carter Page. And as I said before, we know from NSA documents and from NSA people that used to work there that this isn't just Carter Page. This is everybody with whom Carter Page has been in contact, including the next hop. In other words, not only his family and his associates in the campaign, but everybody that talked to them as well.

So this is really serious, and for people to say that, *Oh, well, it may have been part of the justification for the FISA memo*, no, we'll see now when the documents are released whether they really say "an essential part." Now, if they had enough on Carter Page to pursue a FISA application for surveillance, then they didn't need the dossier. So why would they use this very scurrilous and unprovable dossier unless they felt they needed it? Again, the language says it was an essential part."

Let me just comment. The British are very, very helpful to us. Do you remember before Iraq there was a dossier? The British like to use French words when it's really important. So this

dossier showed that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and that he was about to give them to terrorists. Okay, what did that dossier, which was called eventually the Dodgy Dossier – what did that rely on? It relied on a master's thesis composed by some hack in a Western university in the United States. So dossiers have a history here. You don't have to go back more than 15 years to see what an ugly, subversive role they can play when the British hop to and compose one for our intelligence services.

**WOODS:** I was reading a piece by a woman named Caitlin Johnstone, who made this point: that what we're reading in the memo would have been known at the time the FISA renewal was being discussed and surveillance powers were being discussed and being, in a bipartisan way, urged upon everyone. So there's some kind of a disconnect here. On the one hand, we have to renew the government's surveillance powers at all costs. On the other hand, we have ample evidence that they're being employed in an openly partisan way. What are we to make of this?

**MCGOVERN:** Well, there's two things here. Let me address the second one first. The renewal of this very intrusive and unconstitutional surveillance by the NSA was passed just days before all this information came out. Did the head of the House Intelligence Committee vote for that? Yes, he did. That was Devin Nunes. Did they know at the time that this very law had been used in this scurrilous way that is now coming out in the Nunes memo? Yeah, they knew that.

Okay, now what's the problem here? The problem here is that, just like J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI and the National Security Agency have the book on every one of our congressmen and our senators. Why do I say that? Is that an exaggeration? No, no. When Bill Binney, who used to be technical director of NSA, and Ed Loomis, who was also a technical director of NSA, told me, *Look, Ray, NSA captures everything. All your telephone calls, all your emails, all your texts. They've got it all.* And I said, *Right. Come on. That can't be right. Billions and billions?* And they said, *Yes, Ray, trust us.*

The technology allows it and the leadership of the NSA, FBI, Department of Justice, they encourage it. And so it's all stored. Now, they don't read everything. They don't hear everything. But if they need to read or hear something, it's in that database. Witness the Boston bombers there during the marathon. Well, right after that happened, they dug right into the database and found all kinds of information about Tsarnaev and his accomplices. And how'd they do that? Well, because they had collected all this stuff and they had labeled it properly. They'd touch a couple of buttons on their computer and there it was. Now, this is one example of demonstrable proof that they monitor everything.

So what I'm saying here is that this is J. Edgar Hoover on steroids, and it is not a stretch, not a stretch at all to think that people like – well, like Nunes himself, like all the other Republicans and Democrats realize that they can be destroyed by selective leaks – and selective leaks is the name of the game here in Washington – destroying their reputation. And so they have to be really careful not to vote against something that purports to be – and in this case, I'm using the right expression – purports to be defense against terrorist attacks. There is not one – I repeat, there is not one terrorist attack that has proven to have been prevented by mass surveillance. You have the proverbial haystack under which no needles have been found. And why is that? Well, it's a simple matter of volume.

So let me just finish with this analogy here. J. Edgar Hoover did something really well. Under his tutelage, fingerprints, *fingerprints* were discovered. Was that big? Yeah, that was really big. Did that prevent any bank robberies? Well, no, no, it didn't. Oh, but it helped catch the bank robbers – if we had the prints on file. So the situation is analogous. You collect all this stuff. You can't possibly use it to prevent a terrorist attack. But once one occurs, you look up the guys. Oh, yeah, here it is. Like the Boston Marathon bombers. *There, there, we're getting him. Talked to his wife. This is what he said, you know.*

So all I'm saying here is that that renewal of this very intrusive law – which goes against the Fourth Amendment, you know? I should probably explain. We may be considered quaint or even obsolete, but we – and when I say "we," I mean people like Bill Binney, Ed Loomis, Kirk Wiebe, myself – we swore a solemn oath. Just one. And that solemn oath was "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

Now, does that oath have an expiration date? Actually, it doesn't. And so we feel really strongly about the Fourth Amendment, which says everyone should be protected against unreasonable searches and seizures, no warrants shall issue except upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and specifically defining the places to be searched and the persons or things to be seized. Now, unless you argue that all us Americans, everybody in the world, that there's probably cause to believe that we're involved in all kinds of mischievous activity or terrorism, there is no justification under the Fourth Amendment to allow this kind of mass surveillance. Now, sorry to be so long-winded, but this is really important stuff that people don't get from the major media.

Now, the first part of your thing had to do with Johnstone saying – could you repeat the first –

**WOODS:** Yeah, it was that when it was being reauthorized – this was December – and everything in this memo had already occurred and was known, at least to people in the know at that time, and yet we're being told we've got to ram this thing through on a bipartisan level. And yet at the same time, or now, all of a sudden we're being told about the highly partisan way in which these powers are being used.

**MCGOVERN:** Yeah, it's pretty much what I tried to answer what I thought was part two. It's the same nexus here. These people know that they're being surveilled by the NSA. They know that the – we call it the deep state. Now, people are criticized for talking about a deep state, but I've been there, you know? I've watched it. I've watched it particularly close since I became not only an analyst of Russian affairs and international affairs, but an analyst of what the CIA has been suborned into doing, first and foremost, fraudulently cooking up evidence to "justify" an attack on Iran, which is under the Nuremberg principles, an act of aggression in war.

So I've been watching really closely, and when I look at what the deep state – that is, the CIA, the FBI, and to a degree, to the degree that the NSA Director is complicit, the NSA, as well – the new wrinkle here is that the heads of the Justice Department have to sign off on these FISA warrants – again, FISA, Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act – warrants. And so they willingly cooperated here. Comey did it three times as head of the FBI. And the others, there's five of them, I think, that were all either in the Justice Department at the very highest level or Comey's successors – McCabe, for example, who took over, who was deputy.

And this is interesting. Last Monday – so exactly a week ago – we found out that McCabe, Andy McCabe had abruptly resigned. Now, everyone's surprised at that because McCabe had said, *I'm going to hang on until March because then I'll get my full retirement*. Now, what does that mean? Well, for those who aren't here in Washington or don't work in the federal apparatus, it means this: senior people like McCabe can squirrel away all their annual leave or most of it, and when they retire, they get a lump sum. And in cases like McCabe at that very senior level, this means \$70-, \$80-, \$100,000 extra, like a little bonus. Now, I did the same thing when I was in the Army. I was in the Army for two years, and I got \$2,000. I was able to buy a car with that. Now it's \$100,000. So what McCabe wanted to do is linger on in the apparatus and wait until March when he could retire at full benefits.

Now, what happened? Well, on Sunday, Sunday before yesterday, his boss, Christopher Wray, head of the FBI, and was given a look at this Nunes memorandum, at the memorandum prepared by Republican staff on the House Intelligence Committee. And Wray was described as being stunned. What did he do? He got on the phone and said that, *Hey, Andy? – Andy McCabe – Don't come to work tomorrow, okay? I'll tell you about it later, but we don't want you around here anymore and we're not going to let you retire in March with the extra \$100,000 lump sum. You're going to have to get out now. Again, I'll explain it when we're on a more secure phone*. Well, what does that tell you?

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**MCGOVERN:** That tells you Andy McCabe was fully involved in all this scurrilous, extraconstitutional activity. And we have further proof of that. There were these two lovers in the FBI. One was a guy named Peter Strzok. I call him "Dumb Strzok," but that's irreverent. Peter Strzok and his lover, Lisa Page. Now, his lover wasn't some secretary. She was one of the lead attorneys for a fellow named Andy McCabe.

**WOODS:** She's no relation to Carter Page, by the way.

**MCGOVERN:** Oh, no, she's not.

**WOODS:** Right.

**MCGOVERN:** Thanks for making that clear. So what do we have? We have all these telephone calls which are not pillow talk. How did we get them? Well, we got them from the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, who's running an inquiry on all this stuff, ironically to uncover evidence of collusion between the Russians and the Trump campaign. So he gets these text messages, and the first thing he discovers is Peter Strzok saying to Lisa, *No, we can talk on this*, and she says, *Are you sure? We can talk about Hillary Clinton on this line?* And he says, *Yeah, it's a company phone. It's safe*. You know, this would be excusable if he were some lower level analyst, but he's the Deputy Head of Counterintelligence, and he doesn't know that the NSA and the FBI collect everything, including text messages? And jocularly I suggested the explanation for this may be that he was texting with Lisa during the security briefing that made clear that this was going on.

Now, in a more serious vein, he says to Lisa: *Lisa, what you just said in Andy's office – nobody denies that this is Andy McCabe's office, for whom she was working. What you just said in Andy's office I really want to believe. Trump has no chance to win, so I want to*

*believe that, but Lisa, we need an insurance policy, sort of like in the unlikely event that – you know, if you're 40 years old, you're not going to die, but you take out an insurance policy anyway. So we need to do that, Lisa. And later she says, Yes, we were dependent on you, Peter. You're doing a great job and you're in the right place to make this all happen.*

Now, what's the insurance policy? Well, who's Peter Strzok? He's the guy that supervised the – what shall we call it? – the exoneration of Hillary Clinton for the felonious storage and use of an open computer, open to Russians, Chinese, anybody else to get the most sensitive information when she was Secretary of State. He let her off. How do we know that? Because he changed the wording, changed the wording from terms that would have almost required prosecution to something like "gross negligence," which, I mean, that's what you expect these days in the intelligence apparatus. So gross negligence lets you off.

Now, how did he get at this? Did he put Hillary or any of her people under oath? No, no. Did he make a record of his interviews with them? No, no. Did they say things during the interviews that they knew were not true? Yeah, they did, but they let them get off anyway. Who was the guy? Peter Strzok. Now, later he becomes the guy that's sort of the point man for the insurance policy.

Now, I say "insurance policy." We double back here and say "dossier," dossier prepared by a guy who had worked for the FBI. His name is Steele. He had been an FBI agent, and they told him to do this. They knew quite well that it was not supported by any evidence. Even James Comey said it would be scurrilous and not supported by evidence, but they used it anyway before the court.

Now, big bottom line here, okay? Everybody who's listening may be scratching their heads and saying, how in the world did they think they were going to get away with that? I mean, these are felonies. They could be put in jail forever because there's five years for each count. Well, the answer is very simple. Hillary was going to win. Everyone knew that Hillary was going to win. The thing was wired. Who would vote for this idiot, Trump, this scurrilous guy who does these things to women? Hell if he's going to win. And so this is just a little bit of extra insurance.

Now, what happened? Well, for those who have been asleep for two years, Hillary didn't win. And now these guys who violated basic laws and the Constitution are going to have to pay the piper. The big question is whether the House Intelligence Committee, under the leadership of this relatively young and relatively new Devin Nunes, Republican from California – whether they will have the guts to pursue this against – what? Against the deep state, and equally important, against the mainstream media and the so-called progressive media. I mentioned Amy Goodman. The list is very, very long. We have – what's his name? The columnist for *The Washington Post* saying yesterday they're crossing the FBI. You don't cross the FBI. They can do you in. And of course that's true.

So if you have the mainstream media obfuscating or saying "purports to be," well, the good news is that this is based on documents, and as long as no one fools around with the documents, we should be able to get to the bottom of it. I'm all for the Democratic memo getting out. That way we could see whether their reasoning is specious or whether there were some valid points. That should happen tomorrow, I hope. There's supposed to be a vote tomorrow.

**WOODS:** In light of that comment you just made, I'm just curious to get your response to that famous, notorious Chuck Schumer comment from early last year, when he said, "Let me tell you: you take on the intelligence committee, they have six ways from Sunday at getting back at you." That should have sent a chill up the spine of every American, but half of America apparently listened to that and said, *Yeah, yeah, they can really get you, yeah*, and they thought that was normal. That's not normal.

**MCGOVERN:** Well, I hope it's not normal. It didn't used to be normal, okay? But the fellow whose name I was searching for, Eugene Robinson, who's on TV a lot and he's supposed to be a progressive fellow for *The Washington Post*. He wrote that, you know, this is a big mistake, taking on the FBI. You don't do this. The FBI doesn't take this kind of criticism lightly. Now, it was really very clear that this is the same Chuck Schumer attitude. And I thought, wow, Schumer just lost it. He's been around — Schumer has been around over 30 years. 15 years, as I recall, in the House, 15 years in the Senate. He's Democratic Leader in the Senate, and he's saying this scurrilous thing about how the CIA has a hold on the president of the United States? He must have just lost it.

Well, I don't know about that anymore, you know? It happens to reflect reality. And maybe this was Schumer's way of saying, *Look, we don't want to get into this, we Democrats. We like the way the FBI and the deep state is subverting or suborning all the people who work for Trump. So beware if you take these guys on. They have six ways from Sunday to get back at you.* It was pretty, pretty blatant.

I'd like to make one more point, and that is you don't hear anything about Russian hacking anymore, right? Hmm, that's interesting. That was a big deal. Well, suffice it to say that with the help of our two former technical directors of NSA, Bill Binney and Ed Loomis, we've been able to prove that the celebrated "hack" of 5 July, 2016, which was blamed on the Russians and the Russians alleged to have given it to WikiLeaks, and that of course was the DNC emails, that this was not a hack. Not a hack? By the Russians? No, not by Russians. It's not a hack by anybody.

Now, how does that work? Well, in this case, we had physics on our side. It's not very complicated. It's called the principle of fluid dynamics. Now, let me illustrate it. We live at the bottom of a hill. It used to flood when the rain was very heavy, and so the county was going to put in a new pipe, and they said a 36-inch pipe should do it. And our friend who builds roads for the Bureau of Public Roads said no, you ought to require a 48-inch pipe. Why? Well, because the diameter of a pipe delimits the capacity of the flow of water.

Okay, so now think of the Internet as a pipe. Now, we know what the capacity of the Internet was in early July of 2016. Now, the information said to have been hacked could not have been hacked because it was downloaded onto a thumb drive at a speed three times what the Internet pipe would have been able to tolerate given its capacity. This is physics, okay? Now, what rate was it that was downloaded? Well, it happened to be exactly the same rate as a thumb drive can tolerate.

So last thing here is that we know and have proven from forensics, forensics that the FBI did not do, that the celebrated hack on the 5th of July was not by Russia or by anybody else; it was a download. You can say it was a copy onto a thumb drive, because the speed at which it was copied exceeded the capacity of the Internet by three times. We have since gotten information — Bill Binney is still working on this — that shows that Guccifer 2.0, who is said to

be working for the Russians or very much involved in this, that it's a fraud. That everything he's been saying is demonstrably suspect because of various physical principles.

Now, why is that of importance? Well, let me just tell you that we have a new nuclear posture statement revealed on Friday, and the really new aspect of this says that we can go to war with nuclear weapons or these small nuclear weapons on the occasion of any kind of enemy act, including cyber attack. Whoa. So 80% of the American people, according to my informal poll including my family, believe that everybody knows the Russians hacked into our election. Everybody knows that, just like everybody knew that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. It's not true that they did. It's demonstrably untrue. But you know, the next time this comes around, the next time there's cyber attack by the Russians or anybody else, so-called, this is still on the record. *Well, they hacked into our election. They tried to undermine our democracy in 2016 and they're doing it again.*

So what we're trying to do and which I'll try to do with Bill Binney this week is to point out that, look, this is really serious stuff. Either there was a cyber attack or there wasn't. We can prove that there wasn't. And so when you're thinking about nuclear strike and retaliation for a cyber attack, you ought to be darn sure that, number one, it came through the Internet, which is the network they have to use, and not from a thumb drive; and number two, you've got to make sure it's the Russians; and number three, you want to think about whether you really want to use nuclear reactions in reaction to a "cyber attack." This is why the truth matters, and I've never seen it so bad.

I always say in any interview that I've been here in Washington for 55 years, since I got out of the Army, right? And I watch things very, very carefully. And you see a lot of change in 55 years, but there's one change that dwarfs all the other changes, and that is that we no longer have in any real sense a free media. And that is big. I mean, you've got the progressive people all falling in, "purport, purport, purport."

I've been banned – I've been banned from *Democracy Now!* for two years because I don't say the right things. That's Amy Goodman's program. I've been banned from CommonDreams.com, from Truthout.com, from *Reader Supported News*. All these people used to publish my stuff automatically. No more. The only ones that will do that are ConsortiumNews.com, Bob Perry's network – and we're going to keep that going – and usually Antiwar.com and usually OpEdNews.com and sometimes Counterpunch. So there are limits to even what the so-called progressive media will tolerate. And of course I don't get on CNN anymore or CBS. I haven't gone on CNN for five years. I used to be on at least a couple times a year. So the system is pretty well rigged. And not only that, but people like me are accused of being in Putin's pocket.

**WOODS:** Yeah. Yeah, this makes McCarthy seem like just a regular guy. I mean, these accusations are just so ridiculous.

**MCGOVERN:** Well, you know, they are, and even MSNBC was allowing people last week to say, *I wonder where Nunes – I wonder where his loyalties are. I wonder if he's part of this Russian cabal.* It's getting really, really bad. Somebody on *Consortium News* in reply to my article of a couple days ago said, *You know, we ought to look at where Consortium News is getting its funding, see how much it's getting from the Kremlin, you know?*

So I would feel outraged were it not for the fact that I'm in pretty good company. You remember Rand Paul, when he dared to suggest that, *You know, Montenegro, I think I know where that is. Why do we have to pledge to defend Montenegro from any aggression and let it join NATO? Let's explain that.* Well, immediately, John McCain said, *Ha ha, Rand Paul, I knew he was in Putin's pocket.*

**WOODS:** Yeah. And so to hear progressives, so-called, adopting a line that really is straight out of John McCain, it really takes kind of the glimmer away. And also for them, of all people, for them to be the champions of the FBI given the history of the FBI just goes to show – meet the new boss, same as the old boss.

**MCGOVERN:** Well, you have to realize that here in this town, in November of 2016, there was a shock beyond all shocks I have witnessed. When Hillary Clinton did not win, just a couple of weeks after *The New York Times* gave her an 83% chance of winning, there was PTSD, big time. Now, the cognoscenti here, the smart people couldn't abide the notion that Hillary was quite capable of losing this election all by herself, that she didn't need the Russians, that very few people trusted her, that she didn't go out into those few states in the middle, that she was guilty of this capricious use of very classified information. Nobody thought about that. No, no, it couldn't have been that. It had to be the Russians.

Now, let me tell you. This is a very, very carefully-planned, coordinated offensive. It went back to June 2016 when Julian Assange announced that he had emails relating to Hillary Clinton – that was the way he put it – and he was about to publish them. Whoa, June 12th, 2016. That was just six weeks before the Democratic National Convention. My God, what do we do? Well, I have this vision of Hillary sitting around with her main advisors saying, "Oh my God, if he's got DNC emails, they show how we stacked the deck against Bernie Sanders and prevented him from having an equal chance to win the nomination. They'll show how we stole the nomination from Bernie. Oh my God, what are we going to do?" And somebody says, "I've got an idea. We'll blame the Russians." And everybody's kind of like, "Come on now. It wasn't the Russians; it was Julian Assange." "That's okay. Look, this is a twofer. We hate the Russians. We hate Julian Assange. We'll say that the Russians hacked and gave the material to Julian Assange. Then when Julian reveals this – my God, he might even do that before the convention – we'll turn the whole mainstream press into a microphone that says, 'Why did the Russians do this? Why did the Russians do this?' And no one will look at the texts or the emails which show that Bernie was gipped out of the election."

So Julian Assange released these things on the 22nd – I'm sorry, three days before the 22nd when the Democratic National Convention began. Now, Bernie, he caved. If he read those emails and had any guts, he would have said, "Look, this turns this convention into an open convention. I'm not going to abide by this sleight of hand. Let's have a normal convention, normal vote." But he didn't. Nobody did.

And Hillary's PR person – her name is Jennifer Palmieri – she later bragged about taking a golf cart and going around to the various tents of the cable and network news outlets and saying her job, as she described it, was "to show that the Russians hacked into our emails." Now, she said, "It was a tall order because people had trouble believing this, and actually, I had a little trouble understanding. But then when we got back to Brooklyn" – Brooklyn was of course Hillary's headquarters – "when we got back to Brooklyn, some intelligence folks and some journalists connected with intelligence folks came and gave us the information to show that the Russians hacked in. And then the Obama administration confirmed some of this

information. Then we were off and running and we could show how the Russians had hacked into the election."

Wow. Now, I heard her say that personally in Washington after the election, how proud she was to have sold this story and how sad she was that it didn't work. So what I'm saying here is that this was a carefully calculated plan to obfuscate what was in those DNC emails, blame the Russians. It was a magnificent distraction. And what she needed was the full cooperation of *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*, all the other media. And she got it. The question now? Who's going to get cooperation for the mainstream media? As I said before, as Mark Twain said, "It's much easier to deceive people" – as most Americans have been deceived on all of this – "than to get them to understand that they have been deceived."

So in my last piece, I had a little subtitle which said, "It Depends on the Media What Comes next." I should have spelled that out a little more adroitly. What I meant, of course, was that if the media stays in not only *The New York Times*, but the Amy Goodman sort of frame of mind, the American people will continue to be deceived and they'll throw up their hands and say all this business about the House Intelligence Committee, the Republicans say this, the Democrats say, "Well, what are we to believe?" and nothing will happen.

So a lot is at stake here. What's really at stake is whether the FBI and CIA are going to be able to obfuscate their role in violating the Constitution and violating other laws and whether the courts will finally get up and say, yeah, we were deceived. They've said that in secret memoranda. We'll see if this process will surface those memoranda, because when you've got the courts saying we were deceived into doing this and you've got a gutsy head of the House Intelligence Committee, partisan though he may be, if he's relying on documentary evidence, then we should be able to see a reining in of the people at the top levels of the FBI, DOJ, and CIA and a referral to the Department of Justice to convene a grand jury to seek indictments against these people who in documents now available have been proven to have willfully deceived the courts to justify snooping on Trump campaign members so that they could make sure that he didn't win.

Well, again, the bottom line here is that he did win, and none of these people expected it. Now they're liable for prosecution. And if they are not prosecuted, just as if the torturers under Bush are not brought to account, then we have a situation where Ben Franklin comes to mind. On the last day of the constitutional convention in 1787, a woman asked him – and we know this from documents. A representative from Maryland named McHenry was there, and he heard it. And she said, "Mr. Franklin, what have you given us? A monarchy or a republic?" And he looked at her and he said, "A republic, if you can keep it." That's what's at stake here. We need to keep this republic. For that, we need people like you and people like my associates at Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity to be able to be heard and not to be trees falling in a forest with no media around and nobody but an odd lumberjack.

**WOODS:** You know, what you said about Russia giving them a twofer, because on the one hand they get to attack Trump and on the other hand they get to attack or put Russia under even more suspicion than it already is, in a way, it's an extremely clever and fiendish plan. But what I don't get is – maybe I'm answering my own question, but one of the problems with Trump, as I've said, is he's just not a thinker on any level. He's unsystematic. It's almost like half the time he doesn't even understand the implications of his own message, and certainly on foreign policy, there's no better example.

So if it were me, let's say – let's say I were in Trump's situation and they were deliberately trying to make it look as if I was in the hip pocket of a foreign power, and therefore, that if I were – this is the implication – if I were to make moves toward a détente with that foreign power, well, this would just go to confirm everything that they've said about how unreliable I am and how I'm in their hip pocket. I would give an address to the nation from the Oval Office. I would lay out all the evidence, and I would say:

Look, folks, as you can see, this is a story that could be believed only by somebody with an IQ less than 70. And therefore, since it's false, we have to think of why they would start up this story. And the answer is a lot of people get rich with this foreign policy, with constant war that never stops, that makes no sense, that's based on stories that would insult a third grader. And you know what? I'm going to stand up to them, because it's stupid for us to be hostile toward Russia. It doesn't mean we endorse all their policies or we would deny that they have their own interests that they're pursuing and that we may not care for the way they pursue them. But for us not to be as cordial as we can be is not in our interests. It's ridiculous for us to be gratuitously confrontational with everybody in the world. Where has this gotten us?

I would give that speech. He won't give that speech. Why not?

**MCGOVERN:** He's afraid. It's pure and simple. He's afraid. Now, recall what you quoted from Chuck Schumer talking to Amy Goodman on the 3rd of January when he was just president-elect, a warning. He says, "I used to think Donald Trump was a pretty bright guy, a bright businessman and all, but he's done something very foolish." Rachel: "Oh? What's that?" "Well, he's crossed the intelligence community. He's taken them on, and that's very foolish. They have six ways from Sunday to get back at you." Now, what does Rachel do? [laughing] Does she say, "Senator Schumer, you've been in Congress for 30 years. Are you telling me that the president of the United States should be afraid of the intelligence community?" She didn't do that, did she? What'd she do? "Oh, we need to go to break now." [laughing] Like, give me a break, you know? So he laid it all out there. What I'm saying here is that there is substance to his fear.

Now, here's an interesting thing. The CIA, FBI, and NSA did a memorandum on Russian interference with our election. They did it because Obama ordered it up, and they presented it to President-elect Trump on the 6th of January this year. Okay, now, what did that say? Well, it said that the Russians had interfered with our election, that we have – it didn't say that we have evidence. It said we don't have any evidence of this, but "we assess, we assess, we assess," okay? Now, it was presented by Hillary Clinton as saying all 17 U.S. intelligence agencies came to that conclusion. And then it became clear that no, it wasn't 17; it was 3. Wait a second. It wasn't even 3. It was "handpicked analysts" from those 3. Who said "handpicked"? Well, that was the head of National Intelligence, James Clapper, with not a very good reputation for honesty. Perjured himself under oath before the Senate five years ago.

Okay, so what we have here, well, we have handpicked analysts from the FBI, CIA, and NSA. Now, who is the FBI analyst? I'll be you even money the guy's name was Strzok. Dumb Strzok – not Dumb Strzok, Peter Strzok. Who was in charge? He was. So even if it wasn't he personally, he was involved. Now, how about Clapper? Well, if you look at that memo, I see Clapper's hand in that memo. It's so disjointed. It's the most embarrassing intelligence assessment I've ever read or ever seen in my 50 years or so of watching this stuff very closely. And about the

NSA, well, the NSA didn't even go along with the high confidence judgments that the Russians hacked.

Now, this was presented to the president-elect. Now, the President-elect Trump on the 6th of January said, *Wow, well, yeah, I'll have to look into this* — bearing in mind what Chuck Schumer had said three days previous. So then James Comey, the head of the FBI, says to his colleagues, John Brennan of the CIA, this guy named Rogers from NSA: John and Director Rogers, would you please leave the room now? Because I have something rather sensitive to give to the president." "Oh, yeah, okay."

So James Comey gives President Trump the dossier, the scurrilous and unproven, according to James Comey himself, dossier on his participating with frolicking prostitutes, urinating on the bed that Obama and his wife slept on, all this crazy stuff. So outlandish you wonder how these covert operations continue to exist. Anyhow, he gives this to the president-elect. And the president-elect looks at him and he says, "So, why are you showing me this?" "Oh, well, Mr. President, this is not proven or anything, but we just want you to be aware that we have this, because it's probably going to hit the press. There's some initial — so just so you know what's going on here."

What's going on here, Tom? Well, what's going on here is the archetypical example of what the deep state — that is, FBI, CIA, and so forth — do to a president-elect. And we have this from other sources. Now, what they do is they take him into a secure place and they say, "No, Mr. President-elect, just so you know, just so you know, we know this about what you did back five years ago, and just two years ago. So just so you know, okay?" And then they go away. Do they give their names? No. Not their last names. They're Fred and they're Tom and they're Bill. And we know this from others. So let's be up front. This is blackmail stuff.

So Trump is given this stuff by James Comey, right? And he knows it's not true. And so not very long after that, Trump fires James Comey as FBI director. Now, what was the reason given? Well, first it was a spurious reason dug up by this Rod Rosenstein that didn't make any sense. But then Trump goes on TV and says there was this Russia thing. Whoa. Cover up, cover up, cover up. He's trying to cover up his ties with — No, it wasn't that at all. It was this scurrilous memo that the FBI, that James Comey had lingered behind to play J. Edgar Hoover on steroids. That was the reason that Trump was talking about this Russia thing. And if I were Trump, I would have fired him as soon as he showed me that thing, knowing full well that it wasn't true.

So this is the kind of thing that prevents Trump from speaking out. He's afraid. Now, I'll give you one more example. He knows that this memorandum, the one that was made public on the 6th of January and which *The New York Times* advertised as showing that Vladimir Putin himself had interfered with our election — that was the heading, okay? Okay, now, he knows that this was done by "handpicked analysts" from CIA, FBI, and NSA. Well, what's to prevent him from going to the heads of these organizations and saying, "I want to talk to those handpicked analysts. I want them in my office Tuesday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon." What's to prevent him from doing that? Well, I think I've given you enough reason why he's afraid.

Now, he did one clever thing. This Russian hacking thing. It's an embarrassment to them because they know that these former NSA technical directors, who are now with Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, that they know more about this than almost anybody else, Bill Binney, for example, having devised many of the systems that are still in place. So

what happened was this. We Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity put out a couple of memos which we addressed to the president just as we used to at very senior levels in our respective organizations. And guess what. This one was read. It's dated 24 July, and it talks about the spurious legend about Russian hacking and how we can prove from the forensic study that James Comey refused to do, we can prove that it wasn't a hack, that it was a download onto a thumb drive for the reasons I mentioned.

Okay, so what did they do? Well, somebody was thinking. Somebody showed that either to Trump or to General Kelly and said:

*You know, this Binney, he's a little mischievous, but maybe we can use him. Yeah, I know what we can do. I think that these handpicked analysts and these cyber warriors that work for John Brennan at CIA, you know, I think that they might compose the kind of "evidence" that brings to mind the aluminum tubes on Iraq or the yellow cake uranium. In other words, cyber warriors are quite capable of constructing scenarios or making up evidence that would show that, yeah, the Russians did hack in, okay? They haven't been able to do that, but now they have incentive to do that. How do we prevent that from happening? Well, easiest way is for me, the president, to direct the head of the CIA to invite Bill Binney into his office and talk to him for an hour – which happened on the 24th of October of last year. Hardly anybody knows that, but it happened.*

What did Bill tell him? He says, "Your people are deceiving you. You ought to look into this." And Pompeo says, "They're very upstanding Americans. I can't believe that." He says, "Look, you can find this out." Pompeo says, "Well, Bill, do you know the FBI people?" And Bill Binney says, "Well, the last contact I had with the FBI people were a dozen of them, guns drawn. They were invading my house very early in the morning several years ago. I'm in the shower, and the guy pulls the shower curtain and points a gun at me. So that's my last contact with the FBI."

**WOODS:** Oh!

**MCGOVERN:** And the FBI knew damn well – well, maybe not the FBI, but the prosecutors at the Department of Justice knew damn well that none of those NSA people who invaded that morning very early – there were four of them – that none of them had anything to do with leaks about surveillance. They already knew who did it, so this was just a warning to the rest of the folks.

So that's what Bill says, you know, "That's my last contact with the FBI. But if you want, you're asking me to contact the FBI? Okay, well, I'd be happy to talk to them." And they said, "Well, how about NSA? Do you know people at the NSA?" And Bill said, "Well, yeah, I know practically everybody at NSA, and I have to tell you that it's run by a bunch of crooks who lie and are not upfront with you. But you want me to talk to them? Fine, I'll wait to hear from them."

Guess what. That was October 24th of last year, and what is it now? February 5th or whatever it is? No one has gotten in touch with Bill Binney. So what was that all about? Well, in my view, that was somebody clever finally at the White House saying, look, these crooks, these cyber warriors who make up these things in the CIA – and there's a major cyber warrior director up there right now – they're quite capable of making up evidence showing that the Russians hacked. So how do we prevent that? Well, let's very openly invite Bill Binney in to talk to the director, and once these cyber warriors realize that anything they cook up, Binney

can show what really happened, Binney and his associates. And we have three others in our group, Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, who have incredible experience in NSA at very technical levels. They'll be able to disprove it, and we'll take cyber warriors will take a lot of bad publicity for that.

So I see it as a very adroit move and probably the only adroit move and a kind of move where you don't expect retaliation. You just say, "Look, we're in touch with Bill Binney. If you're thinking about any dirty tricks about making up technical intelligence to 'prove' that the Russians did this, well, Pompeo is quite able to call Bill Binney again and say, 'What do you think of this?' and Bill will shoot it full of holes. So don't do that, okay? Don't do that. You tried that on Iraq. We had millions of people killed in the Middle East. Don't do it again."

So the White House is not without one clever person in it, at least, but the prevailing mood there is fear. They are afraid of these guys, and I am quite candid in saying that I am amazed, I am really surprised that the head of the House Intelligence Committee has taken this on, because the percentages are not very good. And again, I will say this, that if the mainstream media cannot repent of its sins, if it cannot say, *Oh, gosh, there wasn't a Russian hack, and besides, there's this, that, and the other thing* – if they can't tell the right story, then most Americans will never learn what's going on, and the implications of that for our republic, as Ben Franklin said, I don't know if we can keep it.

**WOODS:** Well, I don't know either, Ray, but I do know one thing, especially as I went back and reviewed your personal history. All I can say is we are very much in your debt that somebody with your background and your credentials and the respect you've earned over the years has turned himself to what is a thankless and not probably especially remunerative task of telling unpopular truths, even when – I know you're no Trump partisan, but this goes way, way beyond any of that stuff, and a lot of people are blinded by that. They can't stand Trump, so they think in the short run it's okay if the FBI sticks it to him. But in the long run, that's not going to be a good scenario for anybody, and you've stood up, even if it means that you've lost some former friends. That's a tough, tough thing. But you've done it I think out of entirely honorable and selfless motives, and we appreciate that very much, and I hope people will check out [RayMcGovern.com](http://RayMcGovern.com), where people can read your most recent writing. And of course we need Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity – we need intelligence professionals who are currently employed in the intelligence community to have some sanity, but thank you very much for all that work and for your time this morning.

**MCGOVERN:** You're most welcome, Tom. And I would just add as a little codicil here that if any currently employed intelligence community people listen to this, look into it, and see if I'm telling the truth, then they might remember the oath that we all take to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and realize that that's a supervening value, as ethicists say, and that yeah, jobs and other things are important, but the Constitution is the most important. And maybe they will feel ready and able to do what Dan Ellsberg did and realize that Dan Ellsberg's main point is his regret that he waited until too late. 1971 was too late to have any effect, any measurable effect on 3 million Vietnamese killed, 58,000 Americans killed. So as Dr. King said, there is such a thing as too late. If there are people who consider their oath to the Constitution sacred, then they need to plumb their consciences and wonder if now is not the time. It's easier now to get the truth out with the capabilities we have with the Internet, the availability of people like Julian Assange. It's easier now to do this and have a reasonable expectation of escaping detection.

Am I encouraging this? Yes, I am encouraging this. And if I disappear from view, Tom, could you look into it?

**WOODS:** You have no suicidal intentions, right?

**MCGOVERN:** [laughing] That's right.

**WOODS:** Okay.

**MCGOVERN:** I have a real old car so that the computers that can make your car go 110 miles an hour without you knowing it, that won't work on my car. But other things would work, so yeah, if I disappear from view, please look into it.

**WOODS:** [laughing] All right, I can't believe we're even having this conversation. Thanks again, Ray McGovern. Much appreciated.

**MCGOVERN:** Okay, Tom.