

The Nasty Blowback from America's Wars

From the Archive: New [police shooting deaths](#) of two black men – in Louisiana and Minnesota – show the kind of violent blowback that America is facing after decades of imperial warfare abroad, as ex-CIA analyst Ray McGovern wrote in 2015.

By Ray McGovern (Originally published on April 12, 2015)

Brutality thrives in American police treatment of common citizens reflecting an ethos of violence that has flourished over the past dozen years with almost no one in authority held accountable. Much of this behavior can be traced back to U.S. wars of choice and it is not as though we were not warned of the inevitable blowback.

On Feb. 26, 2003, three weeks before the U.S./UK attack on Iraq, Coleen Rowley, then division counsel and special agent at the FBI office in Minneapolis, had the prescience and the guts to send [a letter](#) to then FBI Director Robert Mueller. The New York Times published it a week later.

Rowley warned Mueller that launching unjustified war would prove counterproductive in various ways. One blowback she highlighted was that the rationale being applied to allow preemptive strikes abroad could migrate back home, “fostering a more permissive attitude toward shootings by law enforcement officers in this country.” Tragically, the recent spate of murders by police has proved Rowley right.

And not only killing. Police brutality toward the citizenry, some of it by former soldiers who themselves were brutalized by war, has soared. Yet, the dark side of what was done by U.S. troops abroad as well as the damage that was done to their psyches and sense of morality is rarely shown in the U.S. mainstream media, which prefers to veer between romanticizing the adventure of war and lamenting the physical harm done to America's maimed warriors.

One has to go to foreign media for real-life examples of the brutalization *of*, as well as *by*, the young soldiers we send off to battle. (See, for example, [this segment](#) from Germany's “60 Minutes”-type TV program, Panorama.)

The glib, implicit approval of violence (embedded, for instance, in the customary “Thank you for your service”) simply adds to the widespread acceptance of brutality as somehow okay.

Gratuitous Beatings

Cases of police beating citizens who are detained or taken into custody have

multiplied, with police offenders frequently held to the same unconscionable let's-not-look-back "accountability" that has let George W. Bush and Dick Cheney walk free so far for launching the "war of aggression" on Iraq.

The post-World War II Nuremberg Tribunal carefully defined such a war as "the supreme international crime, differing from other war crimes only in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole." Accumulated evil? Having just emerged from the nightmare of world conflagration, the jurists on the Tribunal understood that it was the unleashing of the dogs of war launching an aggressive war that also loosed all the other atrocities and barbarities associated with warfare.

Looking back on the last decade, think of crimes like kidnapping, black (or secret) prisons and torture as well as the slaughter of so many civilians as the Bush/Cheney war of choice has spread violence and death now in the form of the brutal Islamic State and America's endless "drone wars" across almost the entire Middle East.

But part of that accumulated evil is also playing out at home on the streets of American cities and in even in our deserts. On April 9, 2015, San Bernardino's "sheriff's deputies" were caught on video viciously brutalizing a man who had already prostrated himself on the desert floor with his hands behind his back.

Warning: Watching this video may make you ill or cry. If so, take heart. For this would merely show that, because you still have a conscience, you are sickened by what you see, and that you can still "cry our beloved country."

Conscience is a good thing, for it often brings the courage to speak out and confront the banality of evil that always flows and inevitably blows back from wars of aggression. Indifference to human suffering is another one of those accumulated evils of the whole.

We need to summon the kind of courage Coleen Rowley showed three weeks **before** the United States launched the "supreme international crime." We need to monitor closely what happens **after** the unconscionable abuse by police of the helpless man in San Bernardino, **after** the recent police shootings of unarmed black men, and **after** the excessive brutality that America's over-militarized police now regularly inflict on citizens during routine arrests.

"If you see something, say something" we are constantly told. If we see this video coverage, watch this sort of brutality, and do nothing, I fear for what will become of our country.

Ray McGovern works with Tell the Word, a publishing arm of the ecumenical Church of the Saviour in inner-city Washington. He served as an infantry/intelligence

officer, and then as a CIA analyst for a total of 30 years.

In Case You Missed...

Some of our special stories in May focused on the new Cold War with Russia, the U.S. presidential election race, and the costs – financial, ethical and human – from endless war.

[“Russia Rises From the Mat”](#) by Gilbert Doctorow, May 1, 2016

[“Shying Away from 9/11 Evidence”](#) by Kristen Breitweiser, May 3, 2016

[“If Russia Had ‘Freed’ Canada”](#) by Joe Lauria, May 5, 2016

[“A Need to Clear Up Clinton Questions”](#) by Ray McGovern, May 5, 2016

[“How Obama Legalized the War on Terror”](#) by Michael Brenner, May 7, 2016

[“The Secret Behind the Yemen War”](#) by Daniel Lazare, May 7, 2016

[“Price for Witnessing Against War”](#) by Ray McGovern, May 8, 2016

[“China Closes the Innovation Gap”](#) by John V. Walsh, May 9, 2016

[“A Longwinded and Winding Rhodes”](#) by James W Carden, May 10, 2016

[“Exploiting Global Warming for Geo-Politics”](#) by Jonathan Marshall, May 10, 2016

[“Neocons and Neolibs: How Dead Ideas Kill”](#) by Robert Parry, May 11, 2016

[“Army Chaplain Resigns over Drone War”](#) by Ann Wright, May 12, 2016

[“Donald Trump’s Unsurprising Surprise”](#) by Mike Lofgren, May 12, 2016

[“LBJ’s ‘X’ File on Nixon’s ‘Treason’”](#) by Robert Parry, May 13, 2016

[“Democrats, Too Clever by Half on Clinton”](#) by Robert Parry, May 13, 2016

["Political Pressure Stymies US-Iran Ties"](#) by Gareth Porter, May 14, 2016

["Escalations in a New Cold War"](#) by Jonathan Marshall, May 14, 2016

["Refugees from Endless War"](#) by Ann Wright, May 15, 2016

["The Coming Democratic Crackup"](#) by Robert Parry, May 16, 2016

["Muslim Memories of West's Imperialism"](#) by William R. Polk, May 17, 2016

["The Danger of Demonization"](#) by Robert Parry, May 17, 2016

["Global Warming Accelerates"](#) by Nicholas C. Arguimbau, May 18, 2016

["US Media as Conduits of Propaganda"](#) by Robert Parry, May 18, 2016

["Up Close on Venezuela's Crisis"](#) by Lisa Sullivan, May 19, 2016

["The Clinton-Colombia Connection"](#) by Jonathan Marshall, May 19, 2016

["US Downplays a New Syrian Massacre"](#) by Daniel Lazare, May 20, 2016

["The Widening Cracks of Zionism"](#) by Lawrence Davidson, May 20, 2016

["Pushing Russia Toward War"](#) by Alastair Crooke, May 20, 2016

["Hillary Clinton's 'House of Cards'"](#) by Greg Maybury, May 21, 2016

["Trump's Five Questions on US Foreign Policy"](#) by John V. Walsh, May 22, 2016

["Intel Vets Urge Fast Report on Clinton's Emails"](#) by Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, May 23, 2016

["Does Russia Have Reason to Fear?"](#) by James W. Carden, May 23, 2016

["More Game-Playing on MH-17?"](#) by Robert Parry, May 24, 2016

["NFL's War Against Science and Reason"](#) by Robert Parry, May 25, 2016

["Clinton's Imperious Brush-off of Email Rules"](#) by Ray McGovern, May 26, 2016

[“America’s Worst-Laid Plans”](#) by Michael Brenner, May 27, 2016

[“Eerie Silence about a New World War”](#) by John Pilger, May 27, 2016

[“Ticking Closer to Nuclear Midnight”](#) by Jonathan Marshall, May 27, 2016

[“New Nukes for a New Cold War”](#) by Chuck Spinney, May 28, 2016

[“Tragic Valor of Marines at Con Thien”](#) by Don North, May 29, 2016

[“Democrats at a Clinton/Sanders Crossroad”](#) by Lisa Pease, May 31, 2016

To produce and publish these stories – and many more – costs money. And except for some book sales, we depend on the generous support of our readers.

So, please consider a tax-deductible donation either by [credit card online](#) or by [mailing a check](#). (For readers wanting to use PayPal, you can address contributions to our PayPal Giving Fund account, which is named “The Consortium for Independent Journalism”).

Seeking a Debate on ‘Regime Change’ Wars

A group of Americans, concerned about the U.S. government’s obsession with “regime change” wars and frightened about the potential for a nuclear confrontation with Russia, [urges](#) a national debate on these policies.

By [Center for Citizen Initiatives](#)

On June 16, the New York Times [reported](#): “More than 50 State Department diplomats have signed an internal memo sharply critical of the Obama administration’s policy in Syria, urging the United States to carry out military strikes against the government of President [Bashar al-Assad](#) to stop its persistent violations of a cease-fire in the country’s five-year-old civil war.

“The memo, a draft of which was provided to The New York Times by a State Department official, says American policy has been ‘overwhelmed’ by the unrelenting violence in Syria. It calls for ‘a judicious use of stand-off and air weapons, which would undergird and drive a more focused and hard-nosed U.S.-led diplomatic process.’”

We are a group of concerned U.S. citizens currently visiting Russia with the goal of increasing understanding and reducing international tension and conflict. We are appalled by this call for direct U.S. aggression against Syria, and believe it points to the urgent need for open public debate on U.S. foreign policy.

We note the following:

(1) The memo is inaccurate. There is no 'cease-fire' in Syria. The 'cessation of hostilities' which was agreed to has never included the major terrorist groups fighting to overthrow the government in Syria. This includes Nusra (Al Qaeda), ISIS and their fighting allies.

(2) A U.S. attack on Syria would be an act of aggression in clear violation of the UN Charter. (Ref 1)

(3) The supplying of weapons, funding and other support to armed groups fighting the Syrian government is also a violation of international law. (Ref 2)

(4) A U.S. attack on Syria would lead to more bloodshed and risk potential military confrontation with Russia. With arsenals of nuclear weapons on both sides, the outcome could be catastrophic.

(5) It is not the right of the USA or any other foreign country to determine who should lead the Syrian government. That decision should be made by the Syrian people. A worthy goal could be internationally supervised elections with all Syrians participating to decide their national government.

(6) The memo reportedly says, *"It is time that the United States, guided by our strategic interests and moral convictions, lead a global effort to put an end to this conflict once and for all."* Similar statements and promises have been made regarding Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya. In all three cases, terrorism and sectarianism have multiplied, the conflicts still rage, and huge amounts of money and lives have been wasted.

In light of the above, and the danger of escalating global conflict:

—We urge State Department officials to seek non-military solutions in conformity with the U.N. Charter and international law.

—We urge the U.S. Administration to stop funding and supplying weapons to armed 'rebels' in violation of international law and end the policy of forced "regime change".

—We call for an urgent nation-wide public debate on the U.S. policy of "regime change".

The Center for Citizens Initiative (CCI) delegation currently visiting Russia includes:

Ann Wright, retired United States Army Colonel and U.S. State Department official. Ann received the U.S. State Department Award for Heroism in 1997 after helping evacuate several thousand persons during the Sierra Leone Civil War. She was one of three U.S. State Department officials to publicly resign in direct protest to the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Elizabeth Murray, retired Deputy National Intelligence Officer for the Near East in the National Intelligence Council. She is a member of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS) and the Sam Adams Associates for Integrity in Intelligence.

Raymond McGovern, retired CIA analyst (1963 to 1990) who worked in the Washington, DC White House and prepared daily briefs for seven Presidents. In the 1980s Ray chaired the National Intelligence Estimates and the U.S. Presidents' Daily Briefs. Ray is the founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS).

Kathy Kelly, peace activist, pacifist and author. She is a founding members of Voices in the Wilderness and is currently a co-coordinator of Voices for Creative Nonviolence. Kathy has traveled to Iraq 26 times, notably remaining in combat zones during the early days of the US-Iraq wars. Her recent work took her to Afghanistan and Gaza.

David Hartsough, co-founder of the Nonviolent Peaceforce and the "World Beyond War." David is a life-long peace activist, peace maker, and author "Waging Peace: Global Adventurers of a Lifelong Activist."

William H Warrick III, retired Family Physician and 25-year member of Veterans For Peace. Former US Army Security Agency Intelligence Analyst (1968 – 1971).

Sharon Tennison, President and Founder of the Center for Citizen Initiatives. Sharon has 33 years of experience working in USSR/Russia (1983 to present).

Robert Alberts, MBA, Accountant. Bob volunteers with Voices for Creative Nonviolence.

Peter Bergel, Oregon PeaceWorks Board member and PeaceWorker news magazine editor.

Karen Chester, optometrist by vocation and a peace activist volunteer for two decades. Karen's greatest concern has been and is the plight of Central American peoples, supporting those who come to the U.S. fleeing violence and poverty.

Jan Hartsough is an educator and community organizer. Jan worked for American Friends Service Committee (Quakers) for many years and currently works at the grassroots level to help African women gain access to safer water.

Paul Hartsough, Ph.D., clinical psychologist. Paul focuses on conflict resolution and how we can survive as one global family in the nuclear age.

Martha Hennessy, retired occupational therapist. Martha volunteers at the New York Catholic Worker.

Bob Spies, website developer, technical support for CCI, and activist for a number of non-violent causes. Bob previously was a participant in Beyond War.

Rick Sterling , retired aerospace engineer, Vice-Chair Mt. Diablo Peace & Justice Center, co-founder Syria Solidarity Movement, Board President Task Force on the Americas.

Hakim Young is a Singaporean medical doctor who lives in Afghanistan part of the year. He is active with Afghan Peace volunteers and is deeply concerned about US-Russia relations.

References:

(1) UN Charter Preamble: "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other matter inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations". The first purpose of the United Nations is "To maintain international peace and security, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

(2) On June 27, 1986 the International Court at the Hague issued its legal ruling in the case of Nicaragua vs. United States. The ruling was as follows:

Decision of the International Court at the Hague

Decides that the United States of America, by training, arming, equipping, financing and supplying the "contra" forces or otherwise encouraging, supporting and aiding military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua, has acted, against the Republic of Nicaragua, in breach of its obligation under customary international law not to intervene in the affairs of another State.

By "training, arming, equipping, financing and supplying" the military rebel groups waging war against the Damascus government, the US and "friends" are committing the same crime that the USA was responsible for committing against Nicaragua in the 1980's.

Bridging Divides of a New Cold War

As NATO steps up military maneuvers near Russia's borders and congressmen fume about "Russian aggression," a delegation of Americans including former U.S. officials is looking for face-to-face ways to encourage peace, writes Ann Wright.

By Ann Wright

I just flew across 11 time zones – from Tokyo, Japan to Moscow, Russia. Russia is the largest country in the world, covering more than one-eighth of the Earth's inhabited land area, nearly twice as large as the United States and has extensive mineral and energy resources, the largest reserves in the world. Russia has the world's ninth largest population with over 146.6 million people. The population of the U.S. of 321.4 million is more than twice as large as Russia's.

I haven't been back to Russia since the early 1990s when the Soviet Union dissolved itself and allowed 14 new countries to be created from it. At the time I was a U.S. diplomat and wanted to be a part of the historic opening of U.S. Embassies in one of the newly formed countries. I asked to be sent to a new country in Central Asia and soon found myself in Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

Since the new embassies were being logistically supported out of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, I was fortunate to make frequent trips to Moscow in the short three months I was in Uzbekistan until the permanent Embassy staff was assigned. Several years later in 1994, I returned to Central Asia for a two-year tour in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan and again made trips to Moscow.

Over almost 25 years since the Cold War ended, Russia has undertaken a monumental shift from state-operated institutions to privatized businesses with the Russian Federation joining the G20, the Council of Europe, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the World Trade Organization.

But now the U.S./NATO and Russia are engaged in a 21st Century new Cold War complete with large military "exercises" in which a small misstep could bring actual war.

On June 16, I will join a group of 19 US citizens and one from Singapore in

Moscow, Russia. We are going to Russia to do what we can to continue bridges of peace with the Russian people, bridges that our governments seem to be having difficulty maintaining.

With international tensions high, members of our delegation believe it's time for the citizens of all nations to loudly declare that military confrontation and hot rhetoric are not the way to resolve international problems.

Our group is composed of several retired U.S. government officials and persons representing peace organizations. As a retired U.S. Army Reserve Colonel and former U.S. diplomat, I join retired CIA officer Ray McGovern and retired Deputy National Intelligence Officer for the Middle East and CIA analyst Elizabeth Murray. Ray and I are members of Veterans for Peace and Elizabeth is the member-in-residence of Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action. The three of us are also members of the Veterans Intelligence Professionals for Sanity.

Long-time peacemakers Kathy Kelly of Voices for Creative Non-Violence; Hakim Young of Afghan Peace Volunteers; David and Jan Hartsough of the Quakers, Nonviolent Peaceforce and World Beyond War; Martha Hennessy of the Catholic Workers movement; and Bill Gould, former national president of Physicians for Social Responsibility are just a few of the delegates on this mission.

The delegation is led by Sharon Tennison, the founder of the Center for Citizen Initiatives (CCI). Over the past 30 years, Sharon brought thousands of Americans to Russia and over 6,000 young Russian entrepreneurs to 10,000 companies in over 400 American cities in 45 states. Her book *The Power of Impossible Ideas: Ordinary Citizens' Extraordinary Efforts to Avert International Crises*, is the remarkable story of bringing citizens of the U.S. and Russia together in each other's country for better understanding and peace.

In the tradition of going where our governments do not want us to go to witness the effects of the breakdown of non-violent approaches to conflict resolution, we will be meeting with members of Russian civil society, journalists, businesspersons and perhaps government officials to express our commitment to non-violence, not war.

The Russian people know well the carnage caused by war, with over 20 million Russians killed during World War II. Although not on the same scale as Russian deaths, all too many U.S. military families know the agony of injuries and deaths from World War II, the Vietnam War and the current wars in the Middle East and Afghanistan.

We go to Russia to talk with the Russian people about the hopes, dreams and fears of the American people and to call for a peaceful resolution to current

tensions between the US/NATO and Russia. And we will return to the United States to share our first-hand impressions of the hopes, dreams and fears of the Russian people.

Ann Wright served 29 years in the US Army/Army Reserves and retired as a Colonel. She was a US diplomat for 16 years and served in US Embassies in Nicaragua, Grenada, Somalia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Sierra Leone, Micronesia, Afghanistan and Mongolia. She resigned in March 2003 in opposition to President Bush's war on Iraq. She is the co-author of "Dissent: Voices of Conscience."

Will Hillary Clinton Get Favored Treatment?

Exclusive: Hillary Clinton's private emails jeopardized the safety of undercover CIA officers, suggesting criminal charges, but the Obama administration might make an exception for the Democratic frontrunner, says ex-CIA analyst Ray McGovern.

By Ray McGovern

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is in a legal pickle over her careless email practices – in that she appears to have endangered national security secrets including the identity of covert CIA officers and done so for selfish reasons (personal convenience or keeping her documents out of reach of transparency laws).

The facts of the case would seem to merit criminal charges against her, since Clinton's situation is analogous to problems faced by other senior officials, including former CIA directors John Deutch and David Petraeus who were accused of mishandling classified information, Deutch by having secret material on his home computer and Petraeus for giving notebooks with highly sensitive information to his lover/biographer.

Deutch agreed to plead guilty to a misdemeanor but was preemptively pardoned by President Bill Clinton; Petraeus pled guilty to a misdemeanor in a plea deal that spared him from jail time and was widely criticized as excessively lenient, especially since the Obama administration had jailed lower-level officials, such as former CIA officer John Kiriakou, for similar violations.

In 2012, faced with a multiple count indictment, Kiriakou agreed to plead guilty

to one count of violating the 1982 Intelligence Identities Protection Act for giving a reporter the phone number of a former CIA officer whose work for the spy agency was still classified. Though the reporter did not publish the ex-officer's name, Kiriakou was sentenced to 30 months in prison.

The Intelligence Identities Protection Act was also a factor in the "Plame-gate affair" in 2003 when officials of George W. Bush's administration disclosed the CIA identity of Valerie Plame as part of a campaign to discredit her husband, former U.S. Ambassador Joseph Wilson, who had challenged Bush's claims about Iraq seeking yellowcake uranium for a nuclear program, one of the falsehoods that was used to justify invading Iraq.

Right-wing columnist Robert Novak blew Plame's undercover identity but a special prosecutor chose not to indict anyone, including Bush's aides, under the 1982 law. He did, however, convict Vice President Dick Cheney's chief of staff, I. Lewis Libby, of obstructing justice. However, Bush commuted Libby's sentence so he avoided jail time.

The recent State Department Inspector General report makes clear that Clinton blithely disregarded safeguards designed to protect the most highly classified national security information and that she included on her unprotected email server the names of U.S. intelligence agents under cover.

In other words, there is legal precedent for Hillary Clinton to be charged in connection with her decision to handle her State Department emails through a personal server in her home in Chappaqua, New York, rather than through official government servers. But there's political precedent as well for the well-connected to be either slapped on the wrist or let off the hook.

A Biblical Warning

Beyond Clinton's legal predicament over secrets, there is also the question of how she manipulates information on small matters as well as big. There's a pertinent Bible quotation: "If you are faithful in little things, you will be faithful in large ones. But if you are dishonest in little things, you won't be honest with greater responsibilities." (Luke 16:10)

And I happen to have personal experience with how Clinton has been dishonest in the little matter of my brutal arrest on Feb. 15, 2011, after I stood with my back turned toward her while she delivered a speech at George Washington University about the importance of respecting dissent (in other countries, that is).

I have looked closely at her relevant email exchanges from late February 2011 after Secretary Clinton didn't miss a syllable as I was roughly dragged away by

security personnel right in front of her. From my review of those emails, I had two take-aways: (1) Secretary Clinton is not truthful about the smallest of things; and (2) she had a much more important issue to worry about at the time; namely, rallying support for a “no-fly zone” as a gateway to a “regime change” war on Libya.

Could that be why she never took up her confidant Sidney Blumenthal’s suggestion that an apology to me might be in order? Since the emails speak so eloquently to both issues, I will cite them below:

On my standing silently at George Washington U. on Feb. 15, 2011:

From: sbwhoep [Sidney Blumenthal]

To: H (Hillary Clinton)

Sent: Fri Feb 18, 09:27:25, 2011

Subject: H: FYI, an unfortunate incident. Sid

“Don’t know if you are aware of this unfortunate incident described below on Larry Johnson’s website. Ray McGovern, a former CIA officer who gave the daily brief for President George H.W. Bush, is pretty well known in the intelligence community. He’s become a Christian antiwar leftist who goes around bearing witness. Whatever his views, he’s harmless. Something bad happened at your speech at GW. And it’s become a minor cause celebre on the Internet among lefties. You might have someone check this out and also have someone apologize to Ray McGovern. Sid”

From Sidney Blumenthal (continued)

“Larry C. Johnson is a former analyst at the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, who moved subsequently in 1989 to the U.S. Department of State, where he served four years as the deputy director for transportation security, antiterrorism assistance training, and special operations in the State Department’s Office of Counterterrorism. He left government ... in October 1993 ... and is an expert in the fields of terrorism, aviation security, and crisis and risk management, and money laundering investigations. Johnson is the founder and main author of No Quarter, a weblog that addresses issues of terrorism and intelligence and politics.)”

Blumenthal then quoted from a blog piece that Johnson wrote after hearing what

happened during Secretary Clinton's speech at GWU on Feb. 15:

"During a speech by Hillary earlier this week at George Washington University retired CIA analyst, Ray McGovern, was physically accosted and arrested for disorderly conduct for the simple act of standing up and turning his back to Hillary. Ray ended his career at the CIA as one of the senior officers who provided George H.W. Bush his daily intelligence brief. Since then Ray has emerged as an anti-war activist. Ray is a fearless but he also is a kind, gentle soul. ...

"Unfortunately Hillary is getting blamed for what happened to Ray, but it is not her fault. Hillary is not in charge of her security detail. ... He had every right to stand and silently protest. He posed no threat to Hillary and made no threatening move. The security folks grossly over-reacted. ... Since the folks inside the auditorium had gone thru a metal detector there was no reason to assume that Ray represented a threat to do harm. It is the ultimate irony that the Obama Administration is calling on foreign leaders to tolerate protest and dissent but when it comes to an old man standing silently there was no tolerance at all."

[end of shortened text of email from Larry Johnson, quoted by Sidney Blumenthal]

Clever Wording

Secretary Clinton then replied:

To: Sidney Blumenthal Subject: "H: FYI, AN UNFORTUNATE INCIDENT. SID"

From: H hrod17@clintonemail.com [one of two email accounts that Clinton used]

To: sbwhoeop

Sent: Friday, February 18, 2011 10:14 AM [replying to Blumenthal less than an hour later]

Subject: Re: "H: FYI, an unfortunate incident."

"Sid I appreciate your sending thgis (sic) to me. Neither State nor my staff had anything to do w this. The man stood up just as I was starting and GW—which claims their quick actions were part of their standard operating procedures to remove anyone who stands up and starts speaking while an invited guest is talking—moved to remove him. GW claims he was not in any way injured. We have no other info but I will see what else can be done."

In this brief email, Secretary Clinton takes two misleading tacks. Though she had first-hand knowledge that I had not been "speaking" – since she was there –

she suggests otherwise while not actually saying so. She just strongly implies that I was “speaking.”

Not only was she an eyewitness, numerous videos on the Internet in the days prior showed that I did not say a word until the security people had me in a headlock and almost out the door and into the street. Lawyers like Hillary Clinton apparently parse words – even on minor matters, and even in emails that they hope will never see the light of day. (And what, by the way, is the meaning of “is?”)

Similarly, Secretary Clinton attributes to GWU the claim that I “was not in any way injured.” Case closed. ... except for the photos sent around on the Web a few days earlier.

So, as you might guess, there was no apology from the Secretary of State or a statement that perhaps the “unfortunate incident” with McGovern had unfortunately stepped on her passionate and surely heartfelt denunciation of Iran for not respecting the right of dissidents to protest their government’s policies.

Targeting Gaddafi

But the incident with me was minor compared to what Secretary Clinton was then cooking up for Libya, where she was outraged that Col. Muammar Gaddafi was citing the need to root out Islamic terrorists operating around Benghazi. Dismissing Gaddafi’s claims, Clinton and her State Department preferred to denounce Gaddafi’s domestic “war on terror” as a “genocidal” attack on innocent dissenters in eastern Libya.

Again, Clinton was communicating with her outside adviser Blumenthal about how to rile the world up enough against Gaddafi to push a “no-fly zone” through the United Nations Security Council.

Secretary Clinton’s private emails also contradict her testimony before the House Benghazi Committee that Blumenthal “was not at all my adviser on Libya,” although I guess it depends on what your definition of “adviser” is. The emails show that she actually took immediate proactive steps to follow up on his advice, as can be seen in the following:

From: sbwhoeop [Sidney Blumenthal]

Sent: Monday, February 21, 2011 10:32 PM

To: H Subject: H: Option: no-fly zone over Libya. David Owen proposes. S

"UK former Foreign Secretary David Owen has called for a no-fly zone over Libya, imposed by the United Nations and/or Nato ... US might consider advancing tomorrow. Libyan helicopters and planes are raining terror on cities."

[Article from Aljazeera as quoted by Blumenthal]: "In the wake of reported aiattacks (sic) on civilian crowds by the Libyan airforce, former Foreign Secretary Lord David Owen has called on the UN Security Council to immediately meet in emergency session and authorise a `No Fly Zone' over Libya. Speaking on al Jazeera, Lord Owen called for a UN Charter Chapter 7 intervention (meaning the authorisation of both military and non-military means to 'restore international peace and security') to be enforced by NATO air forces with Egyptian military support to demonstrate regional backing."

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com> [the other Clinton email, using her maiden name initials, Hillary Diane Rodham]

To: Sullivan, Jacob 3 [deputy chief of staff]

Sent: Mon Feb 21 22:42:21 2011

Subject: Fw: "H: Option: no-fly zone over Libya. David Owen proposes. Sid"

"What do you think of this idea?"

From: Sullivan, Jacob J [mailto:Sullivan33@state.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 04:59 AM [early the next morning]

To: H

Subject: Re: "H: Option: no-fly zone over Libya. David Owen proposes. Sid"

"Several have proposed it but honestly, we actually don't know what is happening from the air right now. As we gain more facts, we can consider."

From: H hrod17@clintonemail.com [back to the other email address]

Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 6:09 AM

To: sbwhoeop

Subject: Re: "H: Option: no-fly zone over Libya. David Owen proposes."

"Sid, We are looking at that for Security Council, which remains reluctant to 'interfere' in the internal affairs of a country. Stay tuned!"

From: H <HDR22@clintonemall.com>

To: Sullivan, Jacob J

Sent: Tue Feb 22 06:34:15 2011

Subject: Re: "H: Option: no-fly zone over Libya. David Owen proposes. Sid"

"I've heard contradictory reports as to whether or not there are planes flying and firing on crowds. What is the evidence that they are?"

From: Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 7:21 AM

To: H

Subject: Re: "H: Option: no-fly zone over Libya. David Owen proposes. Sid"

"Not much – unconfirmed reports. Though helos firing seems more plausible."

On to War

It took three more weeks, but on March 17, 2011, Secretary Clinton got her wish for a "no-fly zone" approved by the UN Security Council, acting under the military authority of Chapter Seven of the UN Charter. The vote was ten in favor, zero against, and five abstentions.

The five abstentions were: Brazil, Russia, India, China and Germany; Russian and China, which as permanent members could have vetoed the motion, complained later that they were deceived as to the real purpose of the "no-fly zone," not realizing that it was a pretext for another "regime change," which involved slaughtering much of the Libyan army before driving Gaddafi from power.

When Gaddafi was captured in his home town of Sirte on Oct. 20, 2011, he was tortured with a knife, which was used to sodomize him. Then he was murdered. When Clinton was notified of Gaddafi's demise, she declared, "we came, we saw, he died" – and clapped her hands in undisguised glee.

It turned out, however, that Gaddafi was right that many of his adversaries in the east were radical jihadists and terrorists, a truth that Clinton learned when U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens and three other U.S. personnel were slain by attackers in Benghazi on Sept. 11, 2012.

Clinton's deception around the Libyan "no-fly zone" – as a gateway to yet another brutal U.S.-backed "regime change" – also helped poison U.S. relations with Russia and China, which balked at similar U.S. demands for a "safe zone" inside Syria, an idea that Clinton has advocated both as Secretary of State and as a presidential candidate.

In other words, Clinton is no more honest about big things than small, just as the Bible passage foretold, except now the fate of the world may hang in the balance.

Ray McGovern works with Tell the Word, a publishing arm of the ecumenical Church of the Saviour in inner-city Washington. He served as a CIA analyst for 27 years, and used to brief every other morning one of Secretary Clinton's predecessors, George P. Shultz, with the *President's Daily Brief*.

Clinton's Imperious Brush-off of Email Rules

Exclusive: The State Department's Inspector General issued a blunt report criticizing Hillary Clinton's imperious refusal to follow email rules as Secretary of State, adding to Clinton's credibility problem, notes ex-CIA analyst Ray McGovern.

By Ray McGovern

State Department functionaries faced a hopeless task as they tried to spin their own Inspector General's matter-of-fact critique of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's imperial attitude toward basic security measures everyone else is required by law to follow.

It turns out that she deliberately chose to use a hacker-friendly, unprotected email server, and not so much for convenience – unless you define "convenience" as the ability to operate in total secrecy with no possibility of being held accountable for your policies or behavior. In one email to an aide, Clinton explained, "I don't want any risk of the personal being accessible."

When some staffers had the temerity to voice concerns over the vulnerability of

a non-governmental email system, they were warned by their seniors “never to speak of the Secretary’s personal email system again.” The IG report establishes that Clinton’s claim that her use of an insecure email system for official business had been “allowed” is, well, disingenuous.

Pity the State Department spokespeople tasked with putting the best face on the IG’s stark criticism. Media representatives actually posed some direct questions to those applying the cosmetics, who showed themselves far more guilty than Socrates in “trying to make the worst case the better.” At several points, I sensed them wishing some hemlock came in their job jar.

Just doing their job, I know. But it was bizarrely clear that their instructions included taking a bullet for Secretary Clinton. It wasn’t really her fault, you see. It was actually the State Department’s fault, collectively. There were only a few variations on the meme: “We could have done a better job ensuring that people understand security policies;” “We could have done a better job at preserving emails;” “We have not lived up to all our obligations.” In other words, “we” failed the Secretary, not that Clinton failed in her duty to ensure that government information was properly secure.

I counted no fewer than 15 examples of this kind of self-criticism, and it was more than a little nauseating. But then, again, if Clinton becomes President, who wants to be assigned to be deputy chief of mission in Upper Slobovia? It was encouraging as it was heartening to notice that this time the press corps was not sitting still for the notion that it wasn’t really Clinton’s fault, after all.

The fly in the ointment preventing the usual careful orchestration of such announcements was an early leak of the IG report. Worse still, for the State Department spokespeople, several of the journalists had actually read the report and noticed that its declarative prose did not square with the collective self-flagellation serving as a diversion. Even the mainstream press corps could see through the transparent attempt to direct the public lashes onto a group of whipping boys and girls to spare the ex-Secretary and likely Democratic presidential nominee.

Again, some pity is in order for the briefers. It was not supposed to go down this way. Clearly, the State Department had intended to disclose the IG report this (Friday) afternoon to those few unlucky enough to be still around before the Memorial Day weekend. No doubt the spokespersons fully expected to have an extra day to do the homework required to be more plausible in the squaring-a-circle task they were given. The task would have been quite difficult with even a week to prepare.

Small Miracle

Opening my Washington Post, I encountered another surprise. For the first time since our Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity began writing corporate Memoranda for the President, the Post and VIPS were of one mind on something important.

The editors of the Post do not let us onto their pages, of course. But apparently they did read our open appeal to President Obama three days ago urging his administration to wind up the email investigation as quickly as possible and let the country know *now* what the FBI has learned – before the Democratic nomination is locked in. Where else would they have gotten such a good idea?

In the print edition, the Post lead editorial's headline reads: "Ms. Clinton's willful misjudgments: She repeatedly ignored warnings not to use private email during her tenure as secretary of state." The online headline reads: "'Clinton's inexcusable, willful disregard for the rules.'" The editorial ends with the recommendation: "We urge the FBI to finish its own investigation soon, so all information about this troubling episode will be before the voters."

In the Post's news columns, a report on the IG findings runs as the page-one lede under the headline "State Department watchdog rebukes Clinton over email: No approval sought for private server," undercutting Clinton's argument that her decision to operate an email tied to her home-based server "was permitted" by the State Department. Too early to tell, of course, but Ms. Clinton may begin to worry that the editorial page editors, who until now have enthroned her as their favorite neocon, may be getting wobbly.

Same goes for The New York Times, which led its Thursday editions with a factual report and included two articles on page A14, one of which includes a rebuttal of the lame demurrals put out by the Clinton campaign. The take-no-prisoners headline of the other article by Amy Chozick is: "Emails Add to Hillary Clinton's Central Problem: Voters Just Don't Trust Her."

Chozick points out that Secretary Clinton refused to be interviewed by the Inspector General as part of the security review and, in effect, questions Clinton's insistence that the voters don't care about the email controversy. Noting Clinton's very high unfavorable opinion rating, Chozick notes that when voters are asked why they do not trust Ms. Clinton, "Again and again they will answer with a single word: Emails."

As Sir Walter Scott observed in a memorable poem:

Oh what a tangled web we weave,

When first we practice to deceive!

Or as one might add in the context of modern politics:

But when we've practiced for a while,

We markedly improve our style

Secretary Clinton faces an immense task in trying to improve her style. A judgment on how well she's doing may be recorded by the voters in the California primary on June 7.

Ray McGovern works with Tell the Word, a publishing arm of the ecumenical Church of the Saviour in inner-city Washington. He served as an Army Infantry/Intelligence officer and then as a CIA analyst for a total of 30 years, and is familiar with the damage that inevitably occurs when people with access to classified information are dismissive of the need to protect it from unauthorized disclosure.

In Case You Missed...

Some of our special stories in April focused on the global troubles made worse by U.S. "endless war," the unorthodox 2016 presidential race, and the crisis in the American mainstream news media.

["Cleaning Up Hillary's Libyan Mess"](#) by Robert Parry, Apr. 1, 2016

["The 'Hybrid War' of Economic Sanctions"](#) by Alastair Crooke, Apr. 1, 2016

["Behind Brazil's 'Regime Change'"](#) by Dan Steinbock, Apr. 3, 2016

["Fear and Loathing in Ukraine"](#) by James W Carden, Apr. 4, 2016

["'Corruption' as a Propaganda Weapon"](#) by Robert Parry, Apr. 4, 2016

["Killing the US Republic – and Empire"](#) by Chas W Freeman Jr., Apr. 5, 2016

["When Donald Trump Makes Sense"](#) by Mike Lofgren, Apr. 5, 2016

["The Mystery of Shakespeare's Tomb"](#) by Peter W Dickson, Apr. 5, 2016

["Bush-41's October Surprise Denials"](#) by Robert Parry, Apr. 6, 2016

["A Media Unmoored from Facts"](#) by Robert Parry, Apr. 7, 2016

"Covering Up Hillary's Libyan Fiasco" by Jonathan Marshall, Apr. 8, 2016

"Is Hillary Clinton 'Qualified'?" by Robert Parry, Apr. 8, 2016

"Why We're Never Told Why We're Attacked" by Joe Lauria, Apr. 9, 2016

"Would a Clinton Win Mean More Wars?" by Robert Parry, Apr. 10, 2016

"Behind Ukraine's Leadership Shake-up" by Gilbert Doctorow, Apr. 11, 2016

"'Yats' Is No Longer the Guy" by Robert Parry, Apr. 11, 2016

"Sanders Annoys Democratic Establishment" by Rick Sterling, Apr. 11, 2016

"How an Iran War Was Averted" by Ray McGovern, Apr. 12, 2016

"The Victory of 'Perception Management'" by Robert Parry, Apr. 13, 2016

"The New Propaganda War" by Jonathan Marshall, Apr. 13, 2016

"Pope Francis Reinforces Sexual Taboos" by Daniel C. Maguire, April 14, 2016

"The 'Credibility' Illusion" by Robert Parry, Apr. 14, 2016

"Learning to Love the Bomb – Again" by Michael Brenner, April 15, 2016

"Hillary Clinton's Gender Argument" by Ray McGovern, Apr. 15, 2016

"Yes, Hillary Clinton Is a Neocon" by Robert Parry, Apr. 16, 2016

"The Shame of the Jesuits" by Ray McGovern, Apr. 17, 2016

"Is Hillary Clinton Above the Law?" by Ray McGovern, Apr. 17, 2016

"Saudi Arabia Coerces US Over 9/11" by Kristen Breitweiser, April 18, 2016

"Democrats March Toward Cliff" by Robert Parry, Apr. 18, 2016

"The Sanders/Clinton Split on Israel" by Marjorie Cohn, Apr. 19, 2016

"Playing Off Europe's Muslim Fears" by Andrés Cala, Apr. 20, 2016

"How The New Yorker Mis-Reports Syria" by Jonathan Marshall, Apr. 20, 2016

"No Reward for Sanders's Israel Stance" by Robert Parry, Apr. 20, 2016

"A New Anti-Assad Propaganda Offensive" by Daniel Lazare, Apr. 21, 2016

"How CBS News Aided the JFK Cover-up" by James DiEugenio, Apr. 22, 2016

[“What’s Left of Palmyra – and Syria”](#) by Jeff Klein, Apr. 23, 2016

[“Is Hillary Clinton ‘Honest’”](#) by Robert Parry, Apr. 24, 2016

[“Hidden Costs of US Air War”](#) by Nicolas J S Davies, Apr. 25, 2016

[“From Brady to MH-17, Power Defines Reality”](#) by Robert Parry, Apr. 26, 2016

[“9/11 Commission Didn’t Clear Saudis”](#) by Kristen Breitweiser, Apr. 27, 2016

[“Erosion of the ‘War on Drugs’”](#) by Jonathan Marshall, Apr. 27, 2016

[“Hiding the Indonesia Massacre Files”](#) by Jonathan Marshall, Apr. 29, 2016

[“Ukraine’s Rightists Return to Odessa”](#) by Nicolai N Petro, Apr. 28, 2016

[“Hillary Clinton’s Damning Emails”](#) by Ray McGovern, Apr. 30, 2016

–

To produce and publish these stories – and many more – costs money. And except for some book sales, we depend on the generous support of our readers.

So, please consider a tax-deductible donation either by [credit card online](#) or by [mailing a check](#). (For readers wanting to use PayPal, you can address contributions to our PayPal Giving Fund account, which is named “The Consortium for Independent Journalism”).

Price for Witnessing Against War

Exclusive: The funeral for anti-war priest Daniel Berrigan was a reminder of humanity’s need to challenge immoral government actions and the price that one pays for doing so, writes ex-CIA analyst Ray McGovern.

By Ray McGovern

Fr. Daniel Berrigan’s funeral was being live-streamed Friday, as I started to write this, which seems only fitting. Dan’s witness and writing have been a constantly re-chargeable battery for my moral compass.

Live-streaming (arranged by *America* magazine) was the next-best thing to being at the funeral in person. And it brought back memories of getting shoe-horned into West Baltimore’s St. Peter Claver church in early December 2002 for an equally moving celebration of the life of Dan’s younger brother, Fr. Phil

Berrigan.

Homilist Fr. Steve Kelly, S.J., who has spent more than a decade in this or that prison for non-violent resistance to war began with some Berrigan-style Irish humor: "Let members of the FBI assigned here today validate that it is Daniel Berrigan's funeral Mass of the Resurrection, so they can complete and perhaps close their files. 'Death has no dominion!' to quote Daniel's friend William Stringfellow."

Kelly then minced no words in calling out "appointed pastors who collude with structures of domination, blessing the bombs."

Tears welled as I watched Catholic Worker friends drop a large banner with the words from Isaiah, "They shall beat their swords into plowshares. Nations shall make war no more," a charge lived into by all three brothers Berrigan – Jerry, Dan, and Phil.

And I thought back on what I learned decades ago at retreats led by Dan on the prophets Isaiah and Amos.

During the eulogy, Liz McAlister, Phil's widow, quoted from the "apology" Dan wrote for burning draft cards with home-made napalm in Catonsville, Maryland, in May 1968 at the height of the Vietnam War:

"Our apologies, good friends, for the fracture of good order, the burning of paper instead of children, the angering of the orderlies in the front parlor of the charnel house."

Liz continued to read from the *Statement of the Catonsville 9*: "**The suppression of truth stops here; this war stops here!**" (emphasis added by Liz's own prophetic voice.) Not stopping was the loud, un-church-like cheering that rattled the rafters.

So Liz added a vintage Berrigan admonition for those who "seek ways to exempt themselves from responsibility." I had the feeling that the affirming crowd would still be making a din, had not Phil's daughter Frida gently gestured: Please, let my mom finish.

Thanks to the live-streaming, I could discern many of my friends at the still functioning Dorothy Day Catholic Worker houses for men and women in the Bowery. The only folks missing were those doing the daily Martha-work of preparing food for the lunch line. Ringing in my ears was another charge, heard hundreds of times from my Irish grandmother: "Show me your company, and I'll tell you who you are!"

As the daughter of the late Jerry Berrigan, eldest of the three brothers, added her words to the eulogy, I felt proud to be out on bail, awaiting trial with 11 others of the “Jerry Berrigan Memorial Anti-Drone Brigade” for shutting down the main entrance and exit to Hancock Air Force Base Brigade near Syracuse, New York, on the morning of Jan. 28, 2016. Jerry, who lived in Syracuse, was frequently arrested there for similar protests against drone killings.

‘Whatever His Views, He’s Harmless’

Following people like Dan, Phil, and Jerry can get you beaten up and thrown in jail, but the benefits are out of this world, so to speak. Watching Dan’s funeral, I found myself musing over the words chosen by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s confidant Sidney Blumenthal, reassuring Clinton that she had nothing to fear from the likes of me.

On Feb. 15, 2011, at George Washington University, Clinton had, with callous aplomb, completely ignored my getting assaulted by two security personnel as I silently stood directly in front of her with my back turned.

In a Feb. 18, 2011 email, Blumenthal explained: “Ray McGovern, a former CIA officer who gave the daily brief for President George H.W. Bush, is pretty well known in the intelligence community. He’s become a Christian antiwar leftist who goes around bearing witness. Whatever his views, he’s harmless.”

Harmless or not, I can see my grandmother smiling down at the company I now keep, and whispering in her thick Irish brogue, “If you were really harmless, Raymond, they would not be writing them email things about you.”

It was not so long ago that I moved in circles where the label “activist” was dismissed as misguided but, well, harmless. How fortunate, then, to learn of the definition given to activism by my co-passenger on the U.S. Boat to Gaza, poet Alice Walker: “Activism is the rent I pay for living on this planet.”

I could not be more grateful at having fallen in, better late than never, with such companions. Dan’s funeral served as a reminder of how much my journey has changed – having witnessed power from the inside, and the consequences of challenging it from the outside.

On the Inside

During the first Ronald Reagan administration, it was my job to conduct early morning one-on-one briefings of the Secretary of Defense (Caspar Weinberger), Secretary of State (George Shultz), and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Gen. Jack Vessey) and also, depending on their schedules, Vice President George H. W. Bush, as well as a movable feast of Assistants to the President for

National Security Affairs.

Another senior CIA officer and I took turns, each of us briefing every other day six days a week. As professional intelligence analysts, we conducted ourselves in a completely non-partisan way, and our services were appreciated. We relied largely on *The President's Daily Brief* that we had helped prepare the day before, and we updated and supplemented the material in it, as needed.

Ronald Reagan was given these one-on-one briefings as soon as he became president-elect and put considerable value on them. Once in the White House, however, he ordered that, as a general rule, the early morning briefings be given to his most senior national security advisers whom he would normally ask to brief him directly several hours later.

When I took early retirement at age 50, I was fully aware that few others on "the outside" had the privilege of acquiring a first-hand feel for how intelligence could be used, and power abused.

At the time, however, I had no inkling that the creeping politicization and careerism fostered by senior CIA official Robert Gates on behalf of Reagan's CIA Director William Casey would corrupt managers and analysts alike to the point they would let themselves be suborned into conjuring up the kind of faux intelligence that President George W. Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney ordered up to "justify" war on Iraq.

'Quid Est Veritas?'

What brought this to mind earlier this week was the tenth anniversary of an impromptu, four-minute debate that I had with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in Atlanta on May 4, 2006.

It was not hard to prove him an inveterate liar about important matters like the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) he said were in Iraq – but weren't; and the ties that existed between Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein – but didn't. But my Rumsfeld anniversary brought a painful reminder that things have hardly improved – and that no one has challenged former Secretary Clinton openly about her lies – about Syria and Libya, for example. [See Consortiumnews.com's "A Need to Clear Up Clinton Questions."]

The opportunities for such challenge have become fewer; the penalties harsher; the Fawning Corporate Media dumber and dumber.

The mini-debate with Rumsfeld in Atlanta depended largely on luck. Not only had I truth as my breastplate, so to speak, but the stars were nicely aligned. People like Rumsfeld, an accomplished Princeton debater (and, for that

matter, Wellesley valedictorian Hillary Clinton), are required to keep careful track of their lies. Those not normally burdened with that extra chore – professional intelligence analysts, for example – enjoy a distinct advantage, even in times like these, when all too many Caesars keep asking “Quid est Veritas?” – “what is truth?” – a phrase attributed to Pontius Pilate during the trial of Jesus.

As it turned out, I had some success – momentarily, at least – exposing Rumsfeld, who had played fast and loose with the truth, while enjoying the “matinee-idol” label pinned on him by President George W. Bush during the initial weeks of “shock and awe.”

The abundance of evidence notwithstanding, my attempts to expose the lies of Hillary Clinton proved much more difficult (as I was wrestled away by security guards for turning my back on the Secretary of State), and I had zero success exposing Teflon-coated General (and former CIA Director) David Petraeus for the fraud he is (as I was arrested by New York City police at the entrance of a Petraeus speech). Worse still, the violence I encountered escalated with each nonviolent attempt.

With Rumsfeld, none of the media stenographers at Pentagon briefings ever looked up from their pads long enough to ask the Defense Secretary a direct question about his prevarications, so the Pentagon prima donna seemed a bit shocked by a factual question he could not spin.

So, Rumsfeld was not used to fielding “impertinent,” un-self-censored questions. Indeed, it may have seemed to some as though I were unfairly blindsiding the poor Secretary of Defense.

An Exchange with Power

The setting for Rumsfeld’s talk was a little-known, defense-secretary-friendly-Southern-white-male-upper-crust “think tank.” There was no advance notice of Rumsfeld’s talk on its website, but some women friends from the World Can’t Wait figured out a way to get me a ticket (for \$70!).

The impromptu debate went as follows:

RAY McGOVERN: And so, I would like to ask you to be up front with the American people. Why did you lie to get us into a war that was not necessary and that has caused these kinds of casualties? Why?

DONALD RUMSFELD: Well, first of all, I haven’t lied. I did not lie then. Colin Powell didn’t lie. He spent weeks and weeks with the Central Intelligence Agency people and prepared a presentation that I know he believed was accurate, and he

presented that to the United Nations. The President spent weeks and weeks with the Central Intelligence people, and he went to the American people and made a presentation. I'm not in the intelligence business. They gave the world their honest opinion. It appears that there were not weapons of mass destruction there.

RAY McGOVERN: You said you knew where they were?

DONALD RUMSFELD: I did not. I said I knew where suspect sites were, and we were –

RAY McGOVERN: You said you knew where they were, "near Tikrit, near Baghdad, and northeast, south and west of there." Those were your words.

DONALD RUMSFELD: My words – my words were – no, no, no, wait a minute! Let him stay one second. Just a second.

RAY McGOVERN: This is America, huh? Go ahead.

DONALD RUMSFELD: You're getting plenty of play, sir.

RAY McGOVERN: I'd just like an honest answer.

DONALD RUMSFELD: I'm giving it to you.

RAY McGOVERN: We're talking about lies and your allegation that there was bulletproof evidence of ties between al-Qaeda and Iraq. Was that a lie or were you misled?

DONALD RUMSFELD: Zarqawi was in Baghdad during the prewar period. That is a fact.

RAY McGOVERN: Zarqawi, he was in the north of Iraq, in a place where Saddam Hussein had no rule. That's where he was.

DONALD RUMSFELD: He was also in Baghdad.

RAY McGOVERN: Yeah, when he needed to go to the hospital. Come on, these people aren't idiots. They know the story.

DONALD RUMSFELD: You are – let me give you an example. It's easy for you to make a charge, but why do you think that the men and women in uniform every day, when they came out of Kuwait and went into Iraq, put on chemical weapon protective suits? Because they liked the style? They honestly believed that there were chemical weapons. Saddam Hussein had used chemical weapons on his own people previously. He had used them on his neighbor, the Iranians. And they believed he had those weapons. We believed he had those weapons.

RAY McGOVERN: That's what we call a non-sequitur. It doesn't matter what the troops believe. It matters what you believe.

MODERATOR: I think, Mr. Secretary, the debate is over. We have other questions, courtesy to the audience.

'Let Him Stay'

Early in the exchange, the black-hatted point man from Rumsfeld's SWAT Team (clearly seen in the video) put his elbow in my solar plexus as I was speaking and started to pry me from the microphone to which I was adhering like permanent glue.

However, after a glance in the direction of the TV cameras, Rumsfeld waved him off, with a "no, no, no, wait a minute! Let him stay one second. Just a second." It was a snap decision to continue the debate, with Rumsfeld convinced he could put me in my place. After all, I had identified myself as a former CIA analyst, and Rumsfeld had had an easy time intimidating CIA directors George Tenet and Porter Goss, as well as those of my former colleagues badgered into dancing the Cheney/Rumsfeld fraudulent tango on Iraq.

The event also took place early enough that afternoon to make the evening news. Better still, the event was aired live on C-Span and CNN. All this together made it very difficult for TV producers, anchors and pundits to brush off my challenges to Rumsfeld as inconsequential. Besides, there was very little happening that was newsworthy on May 4, 2006, which put icing on the cake.

In any case, the tense scene of a citizen challenging the great and powerful Rumsfeld with real questions was so unusual that even the corporate media recognized it as "news" and gave it at least fleeting attention on the evening news shows.

But my unmasking of Rumsfeld's Iraq War lies also created a highly unwelcome precedent that I would be made to pay for by soon being pigeonholed as a disgruntled stalker.

CNN anchor Paula Zahn's first questions that evening were (1) "How long have you harbored this animus against Donald Rumsfeld?" and (2) why was I "following the Secretary of Defense all the way down to Atlanta?"

I explained that, in fact, I had gotten to Atlanta first – to receive, that same evening, the ACLU's National Civil Liberties Award (won the previous year by Coretta Scott King).

I could not remember how long I had had "this animus" toward Rumsfeld. Were I

quicker on my feet, I would have said something like – since his lies got thousands of human beings killed in an unnecessary war. But you don't get a do-over.

After the Zahn interview, CNN's Anderson Cooper's first question, asked of me haltingly as I was exiting the auditorium, was much less hostile but, in its own way, far more revealing: "Weren't you afraid?" he asked. Think about that for a while.

No Such Luck With Hillary

Five years later, with some slight hope for an encore during a possible Q & A – this time with then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton – I wangled a ticket to hear her speak at George Washington University on Feb. 15, 2011. After several minutes of fulsome praise from the university president and prolonged, standing, adulatory applause from the carefully chosen audience, before Clinton even uttered a word, I decided to remain standing in silence with my back to her.

Unlike Rumsfeld in 2006, Secretary of State Clinton was taking no chances. True, her speech focused on the need to respect dissent, but she was talking about the authorities in Iran, not in Washington. She missed not a syllable as she watched me brutalized directly in front of her and then dragged down the main aisle (with Clinton seeing-no-evil and nary a peep from the Hillary-friendly audience of by-standers/by-sitters).

Once outside the auditorium, a Clinton security-woman interrogated me at some length, after two sets of steel handcuffs were put on my wrists. I was then arrested and dumped into jail.

Perhaps Clinton thought her tacit condoning of this pre-emptive strike by her security folks would provide a useful deterrent to others who might choose nonviolent but highly visible ways to express dissent – or, God forbid, ask an impertinent question of the kind asked of Rumsfeld in Atlanta.

Unlike my encounter with Rumsfeld and even though multiple TV cameras caught the brutal way I was seized and thrown out directly in front of Hillary Clinton ("escorted out" is the gentle way Fox News put it), there was almost no further mention in mainstream media.

The Clinton incident happened at the same time of day as my mini-debate with Rumsfeld, so its absence from the evening news had nothing to do with the news cycle. Still, one would have thought the Kafkaesque nature of my brutalization at the very moment Clinton waxed eloquent about respecting dissent – in Iran – might have provided irresistible grist for a news story or commentary.

But in the five years that had passed since the Rumsfeld event in Atlanta, the media had grown five years-worth tamer. And, in contrast to Rumsfeld's quick calculation as he looked at the cameras in the back, Clinton apparently believed she could count on the TV outlets and pundits NOT to give much coverage to the assault. In any case, she calculated correctly.

A number of Washington media stenographers were there, of course, as well as the cameras, but the evening TV producers and anchors chose the safer path. After all, no "sensible" commentator or outlet will gratuitously put out of joint the nose of a probable heiress to the presidency.

Less Tolerance of Dissent

If my understandable chagrin at the way Hillary Clinton ignored the assault right in front of her leaves me open to charges of having an "animus" toward Hillary Clinton, so be it. That is very small potatoes in the grand scheme of things.

My "animus" was substantive – her share of responsibility for all manner of death and destruction because of her vote for the Iraq War and the benighted escalation/surge in Afghanistan, for example. It would be only another couple of months after her GWU speech before she helped create equal tragedies in Libya and Syria.

I suppose I should thank my blessings in having avoided the far more brutal, fatal treatment accorded Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi.

Although I had a ticket to hear David Petraeus speak at the 92nd Y in New York City on Oct. 30, 2014, I was barred from even entering, roughly treated, whisked away by NYPD cops already on the scene and jailed overnight in the infamous "The Tombs" beneath the Criminal Court in lower Manhattan.

Although my arrest occurred in the so-called "media capital of the world," the incident was almost completely ignored at least in the mainstream media. [See Consortiumnews.com's, "When Silencing Dissent Isn't News."]

The trend seems to be more violence from the "organs of state security," as they were known in Soviet parlance, and more silence in the mainstream media.

All the more need to follow the example of the Berrigans.

Ray McGovern works with Tell the Word, a publishing arm of the ecumenical Church of the Saviour in inner-city Washington. He served as an Army infantry/intelligence officer and CIA analyst for a total of 30 years and, after retiring, co-founded Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS).

A Need to Clear Up Clinton Questions

Exclusive: As the Democrats glumly line up for Hillary Clinton's belated coronation, the risk remains of potential criminal charges over her Libyan testimony or her careless emails, as ex-CIA analyst Ray McGovern describes.

By Ray McGovern

"Some people think they can lie and get away with it," said former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld with feigned outrage. And, of course, he has never been held accountable for his lies, proving his dictum true.

The question today is: Will former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's Teflon coat be as impermeable to deep scratches as Rumsfeld's has proven to be?

With the "mainstream media" by and large giving Hillary Clinton a pass on her past, few Americans realize how many Pinocchio faces need to be tacked onto many of her statements. Clinton is said to be "unquestionably" the frontrunner for the Democratic nomination, essentially the presumptive nominee. That is unquestionably true – but only because she has not been questioned with much rigor at all. And on those few occasions when she has been asked hard questions, she has often ducked them.

For example, at the March 9 debate in Miami, Jorge Ramos, the longtime anchor for *Noticiero Univision*, asked Secretary Clinton whether she would quit the presidential race if she were indicted for putting classified information on her private email server.

She replied: "Oh, for goodness sake, it's not going to happen. I'm not even answering that question." [See Consortiumnews.com's "[Is Hillary Clinton Above the Law?](#)"]

Not so fast, Madame Secretary. It is looking more and more as if you will, after all, have to answer that question.

Those "Damn Emails" Again

On Wednesday in Washington, DC, a federal judge [issued an order](#) that may eventually require Clinton to testify under oath in a lawsuit related to the private email server she used while Secretary of State.

The judge gave Judicial Watch, a conservative watchdog group, permission to take

sworn testimony from close Clinton aide Huma Abedin and others over the next eight weeks. It is possible that Clinton herself will have to testify under oath on the serious email issue before arriving at the Democratic convention in July.

One key issue in question is whether all relevant documents have been provided to Judicial Watch. My guess is that – given lawyers' propensity, and often their incentive, to secure delay after delay in such proceedings – there may not be much likelihood of all this happening that quickly.

More precarious for Secretary Clinton, in my view, is the possibility that FBI Director James Comey will be allowed to perform a serious investigation and pursue Clinton on sworn testimony she has already given; for example, on whether she was aware of an operation run out of Benghazi to deliver Libyan weapons to rebels in Syria.

During her marathon testimony on Oct. 22, 2015, to the House Select Committee on Benghazi chaired by Rep. Trey Gowdy, R-South Carolina, Rep. Mike Pompeo, R-Kansas, was very specific in his questioning, leaving Clinton little wiggle-room:

Pompeo: Were you aware or are you aware of any U.S. efforts by the U.S. government in Libya to provide any weapons, directly or indirectly, or through a cutout, to any Syrian rebels or militias or opposition to Syrian forces?

Clinton: No.

Pompeo: Were you aware or are you aware of any efforts by the U.S. government in Libya to facilitate or support the provision of weapons to any opposition of Gadhafi's forces, Libyan rebels or militias through a third party or country?

Clinton: No.

Did Secretary Clinton think we were "born yesterday," as Harry Truman used to say? From what is already known about the activities of the U.S. "mission" and "annex" in Benghazi and the role played by the late Ambassador Christopher Stevens there, it seems quite likely that Clinton perjured herself in answering No.

And I believe this will become quite clear, *if* the FBI is allowed to pursue an unfettered investigation – and even clearer *if* the National Security Agency shares the take from its dragnet surveillance.

But those are big IFs. If I read President Barack Obama correctly, he will be more inclined to tell Attorney General Loretta Lynch to call off the FBI, just as he told former Attorney General Eric Holder to let retired General (and CIA

Director) David Petraeus off with a slap on the wrist for giving his mistress intelligence of the highest classification and then lying about it to the FBI.

As for Clinton, perjury is not the kind of rap that she would welcome as she pursues the presidency. Trouble is, not only FBI investigators but also NSA collect-it-all snoopers almost certainly have the goods on whatever the truth is, with their easy access to the content of emails both classified and unclassified. [See Consortiumnews.com's "[Hillary Clinton's Damning Emails](#)."]]

Sadly, Comey and his counterparts at NSA are likely to cave in if the President tells them to cease and desist. Indeed, like legendary FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, they may relish the prospect of being able to hold their knowledge of Hillary Clinton's possible perjury and other misdeeds like a sword of Damocles over her head if she becomes president.

Whistleblower Needed

Thus, unless another patriot with the courage of an Edward Snowden or a Daniel Ellsberg recognizes that his primary duty is to honor his/her oath "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic," and acts accordingly, the country could end up with a compromised President beholden to Hoover's successors and the NSA sleuths who "collect everything," including the emails of the Secretary of State – and those of the President.

Those at the FBI and NSA with the courage to consider whistleblowing need to be aware of the proud tradition they would be joining. The [first recipient](#) of the Sam Adams Award for Integrity in Intelligence (2002) was Coleen Rowley of the FBI, and in 2004 the award was given to FBI analyst and translator Sibel Edmonds.

As for signals intelligence, no fewer than four Sam Adams whistleblower awardees have come from NSA and its British counterpart GCHQ: the UK's Katharine Gun (2003), and three from NSA itself – Thomas Drake (2011), Edward Snowden (2013), and William Binney (2015).

More distinguished company among people of integrity would be difficult – if not impossible – to find. In a few months, we will be considering nominations for the award to be given in 2017.

Ray McGovern works for Tell the Word, a publishing arm of the ecumenical Church of the Saviour in inner-city Washington. He served as a CIA analyst for 27 years and is co-founder of Sam Adams Associates for Integrity in Intelligence (SAAII) and Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS).

Hillary Clinton's Damning Emails

Exclusive: Before the Democrats lock in their choice for President, they might want to know if Hillary Clinton broke the law with her unsecure emails and may be indicted, a question that ex-CIA analyst Ray McGovern addresses.

By Ray McGovern

A few weeks after leaving office, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton may have breathed a sigh of relief and reassurance when Director of National Intelligence James Clapper denied reports of the National Security Agency eavesdropping on Americans. After all, Clinton had been handling official business at the State Department like many Americans do with their personal business, on an unsecured server.

In sworn testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee on March 12, 2013, Clapper said the NSA was **not** collecting, wittingly, “any type of data at all on millions or hundreds of millions of Americans,” which presumably would have covered Clinton’s unsecured emails.

But NSA contractor Edward Snowden’s revelations – starting on June 5, 2013 – gave the lie to Clapper’s testimony, which Clapper then retracted on June 21 – coincidentally, Snowden’s 30th birthday – when Clapper sent a letter to the Senators to whom he had, well, lied. Clapper admitted his “response was clearly erroneous – for which I apologize.” (On the chance you are wondering what became of Clapper, he is still DNI.)

I would guess that Clapper’s confession may have come as a shock to then ex-Secretary Clinton, as she became aware that her own emails might be among the trillions of communications that NSA was vacuuming up. Nevertheless, she found Snowden’s truth-telling a safer target for her fury than Clapper’s dishonesty and NSA’s dragnet.

In April 2014, Clinton suggested that Snowden had helped terrorists by giving “all kinds of information, not only to big countries, but to networks and terrorist groups and the like.” Clinton was particularly hard on Snowden for going to China (Hong Kong) and Russia to escape a vengeful prosecution by the U.S. government.

Clinton even explained what extraordinary lengths she and her people went to in safeguarding government secrets: “When I would go to China or would go to Russia, we would leave all my electronic equipment on the plane with the batteries out, because ... **they’re trying to find out not just about what we do in**

our government, they're ... going after the personal emails of people who worked in the State Department." Yes, she said that. (emphasis added)

Hoisted on Her Own Petard

Alas, nearly a year later, in March 2015, it became known that during her tenure as Secretary of State she had not been as diligent as she led the American people to believe. She had used a private server for official communications, rather than the usual official State Department email accounts maintained on federal servers. Thousands of those emails would retroactively be marked classified – some at the TOP SECRET/Codeword level – by the department.

During an interview last September, Snowden was asked to respond to the revelations about highly classified material showing up on Clinton's personal server: "When the unclassified systems of the United States government, which has a full-time information security staff, regularly gets hacked, the idea that someone keeping a private server in the renovated bathroom of a server farm in Colorado is more secure is completely ridiculous."

Asked if Clinton "intentionally endangered US international security by being so careless with her email," Snowden said it was not his place to say. Nor, it would seem, is it President Barack Obama's place to say, especially considering that the FBI is actively investigating Clinton's security breach. But Obama has said it anyway.

"She would never intentionally put America in any kind of jeopardy," the President said on April 10. In the same interview, Obama told Chris Wallace, "I guarantee that there is no political influence in any investigation conducted by the Justice Department, or the FBI – not just in this case, but in any case. Full stop. Period."

But, although a former professor of Constitutional law, the President sports a checkered history when it comes to prejudicing investigations and even trials, conducted by those ultimately reporting to him. For example, more than two years before Bradley (Chelsea) Manning was brought to trial, the President stated publicly: "We are a nation of laws. We don't let individuals make decisions about how the law operates. He [Bradley Manning] broke the law!"

Not surprisingly, the ensuing court martial found Manning guilty, just as the Commander in Chief had predicted. Though Manning's purpose in disclosing mostly low-level classified information was to alert the American public about war crimes and other abuses by the U.S. government, Manning was sentenced to 35 years in prison.

On March 9, when presidential candidate Clinton was asked, impertinently during

a debate, whether she would withdraw from the race if she were indicted for her cavalier handling of government secrets, she offered her own certain prediction: "Oh, for goodness sake! It's not going to happen. I'm not even answering that question."

Prosecutorial Double Standards

Merited or not, there is, sadly, some precedent for Clinton's supreme confidence. Retired General and ex-CIA Director David Petraeus, after all, lied to the FBI (a felony for "lesser" folks) about giving his mistress/biographer highly classified information and got off with a slap on the wrist, a misdemeanor fine and probation, no jail time – a deal that Obama's first Attorney General Eric Holder did on his way out the door.

We are likely to learn shortly whether Attorney General Loretta Lynch is as malleable as Holder or whether she will allow FBI Director James Comey, who held his nose in letting Petraeus cop a plea, to conduct an unfettered investigation this time – or simply whether Comey will be compelled to enforce Clinton's assurance that "it's not going to happen."

Last week, Fox News TV legal commentator Andrew Napolitano said the FBI is in the final stages of its investigation into Clinton and her private email server. His sources tell him that "the evidence of her guilt is overwhelming," and that the FBI has enough evidence to indict and convict.

Whether Napolitano has it right or not, it seems likely that Clinton is reading President Obama correctly – no profile in courage is he. Nor is Obama likely to kill the political fortunes of the now presumptive Democratic presidential nominee. Yet, if he orders Lynch and Comey not to hold Hillary Clinton accountable for what – in my opinion and that of most other veteran intelligence officials whom I've consulted – amounts to at least criminal negligence, another noxious precedent will be set.

Knowing Too Much

This time, however, the equities and interests of the powerful, secretive NSA, as well as the FBI and Justice, are deeply involved. And by now all of them know "where the bodies are buried," as the smart folks inside the Beltway like to say. So the question becomes would a future President Hillary Clinton have total freedom of maneuver if she were beholden to those all well aware of her past infractions and the harm they have done to this country.

One very important, though as yet unmentioned, question is whether security lapses involving Clinton and her emails contributed to what Clinton has deemed her worst moment as Secretary of State, the killing of Ambassador Christopher

Stevens and three other U.S. personnel at the lightly guarded U.S. "mission" (a very small, idiosyncratic, consulate-type complex not performing any consular affairs) in Benghazi, Libya, on Sept. 11, 2012.

Somehow the terrorists who mounted the assault were aware of the absence of meaningful security at the facility, though obviously there were other means for them to have made that determination, including the State Department's reliance on unreliable local militias who might well have shared that inside information with the attackers.

However, if there is any indication that Clinton's belatedly classified emails contained information about internal State Department discussions regarding the consulate's security shortcomings, questions may be raised about whether that information was somehow compromised by a foreign intelligence agency and shared with the attackers.

We know that State Department bureaucrats under Secretary Clinton overruled repeated requests for additional security in Benghazi. We also know that Clinton disregarded NSA's repeated warnings against the use of unencrypted communications. One of NSA's core missions, after all, is to create and maintain secure communications for military, diplomatic, and other government users.

Clinton's flouting of the rules, in NSA's face, would have created additional incentive for NSA to keep an especially close watch on her emails and telephone calls. The NSA also might know whether some intelligence service successfully hacked into Clinton's server, but there's no reason to think that the NSA would share that sort of information with the FBI, given the NSA's history of not sharing its data with other federal agencies even when doing so makes sense.

The NSA arrogates to itself the prerogative of deciding what information to keep within NSA walls and what to share with the other intelligence and law enforcement agencies like the FBI. (One bitter consequence of this jealously guarded parochialism was the NSA's failure to share very precise information that could have thwarted the attacks of 9/11, as former NSA insiders have revealed.)

It is altogether likely that Gen. Keith Alexander, head of NSA from 2005 to 2014, neglected to tell the Secretary of State of NSA's "collect it all" dragnet collection that included the emails and telephone calls of Americans – including Clinton's. This need not have been simply the result of Alexander's pique at her disdain for communications security requirements, but rather mostly a consequence of NSA's modus operandi.

With the mindset at NSA, one could readily argue that the Secretary of State –

and perhaps the President himself – had no “need-to-know.” And, needless to say, the fewer briefed on the NSA’s flagrant disregard for Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable searches and seizures the better.

So, if there is something incriminating – or at least politically damaging – in Clinton’s emails, it’s a safe bet that at least the NSA and maybe the FBI, as well, knows. And that could make life difficult for a Clinton-45 presidency. Inside the Beltway, we don’t say the word “blackmail,” but the potential will be there. The whole thing needs to be cleaned up now before the choices for the next President are locked in.

Ray McGovern works with Tell the Word, a publishing arm of the ecumenical Church of the Saviour in inner-city Washington. He served as a CIA analyst for 27 years, during which he prepared and briefed the morning *President’s Daily Brief* for Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Reagan.
