



## **Former CIA Officer McGovern on Nord Stream, Fighter Jets & the Arrest Warrant for Putin (PART 2)**

*This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.*

**Zain Raza (ZR):** Thank you guys for tuning in today and welcome back to another episode of The Source. I'm your host Zain Raza and today I'll be talking to Ray McGovern about the latest developments in Ukraine. In case you've missed part one, please click on the link in the description below, because in this segment we will be talking about the latest developments. Ray McGovern is a former CIA officer who served in the agency from 1963 to 1990. In the 1980s, he prepared the president's daily brief and also prepared the national intelligence estimates. In 1990, he retired from the CIA and received the CIA's Intelligence Commendation Medal. Ray McGovern, welcome back to the show.

**Ray McGovern (RM):** You're most welcome.

**ZR:** Let us focus in this segment on the latest developments. Last month, in February, Seymour Hersh released an article which detailed how the United States bombed the pipeline. It went into great detail, which surrounded the technical aspects as well as the logistical aspects. Thereafter a few weeks, The New York Times released an article which provided a completely different account of events, and they stated that no British or American citizens were involved and perhaps an rogue group that could be anti-Putin or Ukrainian were responsible behind the attack. They also found traces of explosives as well as falsified documents. How do you view these two contradicting articles? Which one can be trusted and which one do you hold to be false?

**RM:** Sure. You asked which version, I believe for Sy Hirsch's version of the sabotage of the pipeline or the cockamamie story given to The New York Times by CIA intelligence officers and the Germans, for example, who was it? Die Zeit, for god's sake?! So, I mean the other

story simply does not hold water. You can't do this on a yacht. You can't do this without a depressurisation facility. You can't carry the tons of explosives, the pounds of explosives that were necessary. You need the expertise. It just was so strange that no one sensible could be expected to believe it for more than two or three days. But that's the catch. You don't have to play it for one, two or three days. It's a lead story in The New York Times. It countervails or sort of scoops what Sy Hersh has said. Not only in the United States but people read Die Zeit and blah, blah, blah. And so it doesn't matter if it's true or not. When it turns out not to be true it'll be buried in the Times on page A17, below the fold. Okay. I mean here's a very short example. During the US electoral campaign in 2016, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama were out to show that Trump was in Putin's pocket, right. And so the Democrats working for Clinton did up this little scheme where they would get technical people to contrive some technical connections between Alpha Bank - sounds bad doesn't it - Alpha Bank in Moscow and the Trump people in New York. Well, they did the best they could to come up with some artificial, some sort of network and everything. And then they said, Look, you know, if we go with this, I mean, if we go with this, people are going to find out in about three days, you know, like, this is crazy. The reaction: Hillary Clinton approved this herself. No problem. Three days is good. We only have a week before the election. In other words, you know, so it doesn't matter if it's true if it deflects attention from other things. In this case, Sy Hersh's. If it's cast as a countervailing story, as an alternative story, well, you know, that will serve its purpose. Doesn't have to make any sense. Doesn't have to be proven correct in a matter of fact, that it's false on its face. And that's just the way the media works these days when the CIA, which whispers to The New York Times ear, The New York Times does what it's told. The Deep State has incredible influence on what we call our mainstream established media.

**ZR:** As a journalist, I also ask how journalists, other journalists from the mainstream media can just recycle without being critical when leaks are coming from the inside, from government sources? Because usually they're filled with political narratives or they're trying to get a narrative to the public, and that should be treated with utmost scrutiny. In the case of Seymour Hersh, he was treated with the utmost scrutiny, as journalists should do and his work on anonymous sources was criticised, amongst other issues. But in this case, we did not see the scrutiny. Even things like falsified passports being left behind and explosive traces, none of them received any critical comments. Has the state of the media changed since the Iraq war 2003? Where we know that they played a huge role in drumming up the war drums for Iraq.

**RM:** It has changed, but not for the better. It's gotten worse. You know, I don't like to use terms like presstitutes for the connotation that that conveys. But there's good money in serving your master and getting your guidance and following that guidance. I remember back about seven or eight years ago when my mentor as a journalist, Robert Parry, and Sy Hersh used to commiserate on the phone. What has happened to our profession? My God, what has happened? Here's an example. There were lots of publications in the Washington Post op ed section. You'll recall perhaps that the arch neoconservative Kenneth Adelman talked about,

Oh the war is going to be a cakewalk, a cakewalk. And then a year later, he said, See, I was right. A couple of weeks after the war started, See, I was right. All these people that have said, No, no, no, we won't gonna have that, no! It's going to be a cakewalk. Now who was it that let all those op eds into the op ed page of The Washington Post? A guy named Fred Hyatt. Now, to their credit, Columbia School of Journalism invited Fred Hyatt up there and asked him: Now, Fred, you had about 90% of your articles before the war saying, there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. And as you know now, there weren't. So why did you say that? Here is his answer, I quote: "Well, if there weren't weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, we probably shouldn't have said that there were." Period. End quote. And Rob Parry comments to me, Yeah, that's right, Ray. That's sort of like a principle of journalism. If something is not so, you're not supposed to say that it is. Hello? Now, what happened to Hyatt? He was allowed to stay as chief editor of that ed op page of The Washington Post for almost 20 more years until he died a year or so ago. So no consequences for these people. And that is the rub. If you could do this stuff, as Putin says, with a feeling of impunity, then you go ahead and do this because, well, there's filthy lucre in it. You could get famous and you could get your face in the cameras all the time, and you could be a big deal. I mean, it's very, very sad. But that's what's happened to journalism- mainstream journalists. Now, people like John Mearsheimer, professor, a realistic school of political science at University of Chicago, who has been right about Ukraine for the last ten years, he can't get any university or any think tank to invite him to speak. He's got to go most recently to Norway or to Turkey or to China or to some other place where they'll be interested in what he says. I don't think, well, he's given some interviews in Germany, but there's been no "establishment place" that I know of who invited him to speak. What happened to German universities? They used to cultivate this kind of stuff. So that's how bad it is. And, you know, I have been complaining about this for so many years and so outspokenly that it hit me that, you know, I was not heeding what I consider to be the Noah principle, which is a, you know, a ground for me. And the Noah principle is this: No more awards for predicting rain, awards only for building arks. Okay, so you and I were sort of in the same business. You're doing everything you can. So I. Maybe we need some even younger people than you. Maybe we need to get some new imagination. There has to be... I can't, I can't get rid of the thought that the thought might not be in our stars, but in ourselves. I mean, Julian Assange is in prison, but there are lots of real technical people. That is, people have imagination almost as good as Julian. So this is my little plea to anyone who is listening. You know, if we get together, if we said, people old as I am, should not be expected to come up with new imaginative ways, but oh sure, here sure as hell willing to chip in if somebody else does. Because, you know well, I just add this, that General Eisenhower, who was president on his way out of the presidency, he warned about the military industrial complex. And suffice it to say that now the media is very much part of that complex, serving the same masters. But the more operative thing about what he said was that there is a cure. There is some way to oppose the accretion of power wanted or unwanted by the military industrial complex. And that is a well informed citizenry. We don't have that in the United States. I don't think you have that in Germany. It's not widely available for English speaking folks unless they take extra pains to watch shows such as yours. So, you

know, that's where it's at. If people who are pulling the strings and making and profiteering on making arms to give to Ukrainians and the fight against China, oh my God, if they control the media, which they do - you know, I'm told that my acronym that I created a couple of years ago for the new MIC is the MICI MATT, that I'm told that it's in dictionaries now. Got a pencil? The military industrial congressional intelligence MEDIA academia think tank complex. Why do I say media as if in all caps? Because the media is the sine qua none. Without the media you can't do this stuff. So let's pledge to redouble our efforts to figure out how to get through this, because a lot depends on it, including the prospect of a wider war in Europe.

**ZR:** Let us move to some recent developments. Poland, just a few weeks ago, became the first native country to pledge fighter jets to Ukraine, and it would send four MiG 29 fighter jets there. Slovakia, Finland and Netherlands have also stated willingness to supply Ukraine with warplanes. Whereas Germany and the US have ruled it out thus far. How do you assess this development? Will these fighter jets make a difference in favour of Ukraine and drive the Russians out?

**RM:** The answer is no. And, you know, as an Army intelligence officer, I don't pretend - actually, that was a while ago - so I don't pretend to know all the answers to these questions. But I do relish in the fact that people like Colonel MacGregor and other people who are much more recent to the task and have been reporting on this, tell me very confidently: not going to make much difference at all. These are all figments of what the Polish and others want to do to show how forward they are in cooperating with this endless war. There are dangers there, of course. Where are these Polish MiG 29 going to take off from? I mean that you think about that because if they're going to try to take off from Ukrainian airfields, they're not going to be on airfields very long. Okay. If they're going to try to take off from Polish airfields, well, your guess is as good as mine. Putin is pretty circumspect, but he's under great pressure. He admits that he was really wrong eight years ago. That he was naive. He says that. He thought that the Western powers would implement the Minsk accords. And, of course, they didn't. We're still bragging about diddling Russia on this, bragging about not implementing them so that they could build up the Ukrainian armed forces to NATO standards. Merkel along with Poroshenko, Zelensky himself, there hahaha... And the Russian people are saying, Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, why didn't you strike while the iron was hot? Why didn't you go in there and clean them out in 2014 and not depend on some written agreement approved by the UN Security Council, in not depending on the West to carry those out because they don't do that kind of thing. Why were you taken in? Well, he admits that he was taken in. He has said so. Okay. So what's the implication of that? Well, next time, he's not going to be taken in, next time any agreement that comes out of Ukraine and ideally hope there's a cease fire soon - after all the Chinese the Vatican, for God's sake, is now calling for a cease fire. And the Pope says he's willing to go to Kiev, willing to go to Moscow. So let's hope that saner minds come into the equation because they're not around now and that we can spare ourselves from the worst. But Putin is not going to be diddled. He's not going to be led down the garden path

again for fear of his own safety. I mean, there are a lot of people in Moscow that really ticked off at him for "being taken in" and for not moving more quickly with what they did over the past year.

**ZR:** The argument against ceasefire and diplomacy is usually and let me quote the German chancellor here, "Wanting peace does not mean submitting to a bigger neighbour. If Ukraine stops defending itself, it will not mean peace but the end of Ukraine." How would you respond to this sort of argument?

**RM:** Well, again, I would draw an analogy with the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. Now, what would Scholz tell Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev: Look, you've got a big neighbour there, but you got to stick up to them. You got to put those medium range ballistic missiles in there because your big neighbour shouldn't be allowed to influence your activities. Is that what Scholz would tell Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev? Well, maybe it is, but if so, in my view, that's a very foolish way to approach things, because reality is reality. The balance of power 101 indicates that Cuba and Russia did the right thing, actually Russia. Cuba really wanted to keep those missiles, right? Russia did the right thing by Khrushchev. You know, to his credit, let's give him credit. He got together with his advisors, they were still talking to the Americans, right? And he said, Look, Kennedy tells me this is an existential threat and he's not going to tolerate it. Now, for us, it was a ploy. Nothing ventured, nothing gained, for God's sake. Maybe we get these things in there before they know it. They almost did. Right? Actually, they did. They did. We didn't know it at the time, those missiles had been armed with nuclear warheads. They were ready to go. Minutes away from Washington, minutes away from Omaha, where our strategic air command was. Minutes. Remember what I said about 5 to 7 minutes, 7 to 10 minutes for the ones arrayed in Poland and Romania. So anyhow, what Khrushchev said was, Look, nothing ventured, nothing gained. Let's pull in our horns. Let's see if we can get a deal of some kind to make it go down a little easier. And sure enough, Robert Kennedy negotiated the side deal, which was not made public at the time, that the US would take missiles out of Turkey at the same time, missiles that were sort of obsolete already in those days. But all I'm saying here is that I don't know what planet Scholz comes from, but if he doesn't know Realpolitik, if he hasn't studied the balance of power 101, then I guess I can explain his attitude. But rhetoric of that kind is not helpful because reality speaks a different story.

**ZR:** Leading figures such as Ursula von der Leyen, the European Union's commissioner, regularly cite that Russia is violating international law and that any diplomacy or territorial concessions will only incentivise as well as send false signals to authoritative states that they can invade any country whenever they want without any repercussions. Therefore, they state, no decision can be made without Ukraine's consent. How do you respond to this argument?

**RM:** Well, this is in rhetoric, what we call *reductio ad absurdum*. You widen it out, in a word, von der Leyen is lying again. I mean, there's no indication that this would be the end of the

world, it is sort of like the domino theory in Vietnam, right? If we let South Vietnam fall to the communists, all of Southeast Asia, Indonesia and the rest of it, all falls- come on. So again, von der Leyen needs to be told that the Soviet Union fell apart. After it fell apart the West took great advantage exploiting and plundering the natural resources together with Russian and other oligarchs and that when Putin came in, he said, Enough of that. He rebuilt their armed forces. He helped to rebuild their economy and their strategic forces - von der Leyen should know this- Ursula, Listen! Hör zu, okay. "And hör auf". Hör zu, Soviet strategic capabilities are now unparalleled. Russian industry, its arms industry spent all the time when Lockheed was making these unworkable F-35s and other companies were making these unworkable ABM systems, fashioning what they call hypersonic missiles and missiles of all kinds, which cannot be defended against. Some of them are on station. Now, this is one thing that really scares me. It doesn't seem that the Polish makers in Washington realise that the strategic equation used to be, neither side attack the other. Now there seems to be a slight advantage on the Russian side. What does that mean? Well, it means volumes. Because, you know, if well, maybe what the Americans are trying to do, the policymakers are: Let Ukraine fight to the last man, okay? It seems to be coming our way. And then the Ukrainians will appeal to Washington, Oh, my God, now, we desperately need you to come in. Polish forces, maybe US forces, okay. Or missiles. So what do you do? Well, we'll do vessels. But the Poles can send forces. Now, the Russians have the strategic superiority now. Mark my words. Putin laid it out, chapter and verse with graphics in a major speech, I think it was, what, 2018? Big, big speech, right? Okay. So that's reality. The Pentagon knows about that. Is the Pentagon going to put the brakes on this kind of thing and say, Look, we're vulnerable. There are missiles right off the Atlantic here, like the old submarines used to be. But these ones go like that [makes fast movement]. They're hypersonic and we have no defence against them. So that's why it's getting very "labil", as Germans would say, very, very precarious. And a von der Leyen needs to know that. Her heritage or where she comes from, the family she comes from it's bespeaks the "von". The "von", what does the "von" mean? Well, it means a sort of privileged kind of, you know, I'm not "von McGovern". No, I wouldn't be a "von McGovern". I'm a proletariat type. So if you're a "von" or if you're neoconservative with well-heeled shoes and the best of education, then you can get away with dreamy and unthinkable thinking, that risks the rest of us. The rest of us poor slobs, who have to abide by the consequences of these decisions. So yeah, tell von der Leyen to stop it.

**ZR:** On March 17th, the International Criminal Court issued an arrest warrant for Russian President Vladimir Putin in the context of the Ukraine war. He's allegedly responsible for the crime of unlawful deportation of children. Today also marks the 20th anniversary of the US war of aggression against Iraq that killed hundreds of thousands of civilians. This war included rendition and a global torture program, as well as holding teenagers as young as 14 years old at Guantanamo Bay. Furthermore, the war on terror that the US expanded greatly after the Iraq war also employed a drone assassination program that killed thousands of people, a majority of them being civilians. Why do you think that the ICC is so quick to issue an arrest warrant for Russian President Vladimir Putin in the context of the Ukraine war but

is unable to issue an arrest warrant for President Bush 20 years later?

**RM:** Well, suffice it to say that this move by the ICC on March 17th was a double outrage. You don't do this kind of thing on St Patrick's Day. Well, more seriously: Just as the UN has been doing the bidding of the United States, so too the ICC. I mean, the US is not even part of the ICC. I mean, Russia also not. And so for this completely unnecessary and clearly political move, well, a pox on the ICC. Similarly, with respect to the UN, the US has inordinate influence over the UN at every level. And Russia and China know that. It was very, very interesting when I appeared with Jeffrey Sachs as briefers of the UN Security Council on, say it was January 21st of this year, because the president of the Security Council at that time, from Malta, allowed the deputy secretary general to speak first. And what were her words? She happened to be an American. By coincidence, I suppose. What were her words? "We are going to talk about this report that Sy Hersh has come up with, but we're not going to make any decisions about it. We're not going to do any deep paralysis of it. We're not going to be making any decisions today." Now if you're going to have these briefers, okay, but remember, no decisions. So what happens? Well, I'm looking around here, everybody reads from their notes. Okay. Now, what were the notes? The notes were a diplomatic proclamation. That same morning, mind you, from Denmark, Sweden and Germany, that they don't need an independent investigation by the UN Security Council. No, no, Leave it to us. We got it all. We got it covered. Don't worry about it. We're going to do it, right. Now, the Swedes, I mean, the Swedes have already done an investigation. Did nobody know that? Yeah, they waited till the stuff cleared, I guess went down there, they're experts, they know every inch of the bottom of the Baltic right there. Okay. And they came up up up up up to the surface and everybody said, Wow, what did you find? What did you find? And the Swedes said: We can't tell you, it's a secret. We're not even telling our Swedish citizens. It would endanger national security. And then the Danes. The Danes just this past week say, Well, we're going to do a really good job, but the Russians, no we don't need your help. That reminds me of a phrase, if you'll indulge me from "Die Wunderkinder", it was a film in Germany right after the war. And there's this thing about Denmark, and it goes like this, if I could remember it: Das Leben meint es gut mit Dänen und mit denen, denen Dänen nahe stehen. So it goes with the Danes and all those who are close to the Danes. Okay. So that is sweet. I mean, it is poetic, for God's sake. The Swedes, the Danish and the Germans. So what's with this? The Germans are going to acquiesce in this. I mean, when their whole economy, when each of them are paying 6 to 7 times what energy costs. I've said this so many times in the past that - no, I think this time the Germans are going to act in their own stead. They're going to say, Look, Joe, we're not going to do your bidding anymore. Things are too important here. We want to get our economy back in shape and we want to be secure in our energy supply for next winter as well. So one of those pipelines still works, we're going to get that open. And, you know, maybe I just have one extra thought here. The question is, it also comes up, often comes up: Why is it that having learned that it was possible to blow up those pipelines with special C-4 and Navy divers and Norwegian help, as Sy Hersh says, why didn't they do it then? Why didn't they do it after the Russian invasion? Why did they wait until

September? Well, as you may know, Zain, there were Germans going up to Moscow and saying, Hey, we need to do a deal here. Maybe we can get some of the sanctions lifted. But we don't want to freeze this winter and we certainly don't want our industry to go "kaputt". So now the Germans don't do anything without the Americans learning about it, right? So there was the crucible. You know, how do we prevent this from happening? I mean, if the Germans turn the spigot, the gas will flow. How do we prevent that? And as Sy Hersh says, Well, we can do it in a kinetic way, with violence or non-kinetic, with more sanctions, which are not going to work. So it's got to be kinetic. Okay, guys, you say you can do this, do it. Turns to the head of the CIA, William Burns mentioned before in the other segment, and he said, You want us to do it, do it, he tells Burns. Burns turns to those people and says, Do it. Burns is a smart guy. It shows what can happen when you're part of the team. A director of the CIA doesn't shouldn't be part of the team if he's going to tell the president the truth. So it happens to everybody. It happens to everybody except Admiral Stansfield Turner, who I very much admired for sticking up for his own and doing what the president wanted rather than what his FBI colleagues or others wanted. So, anyhow, it's a real murky business. And I think the timing is really interesting. And if you remember that and the Germans remember that and, you know, the German negotiators that are up in Moscow talking to them, if they remember, are they going to keep their mouths shut? Well, we'll have to see. We only have a few months before the die is cast. And the US has to make some really basic decisions as to how to proceed in Ukraine. By that time I just hope enough Germans will have woken up, maybe thanks to programs such as you're saying, that they'll not have the kind of sheepish submissiveness that they reacted to the Reichstagsbrand, 90, count them, 90 years ago last month.

**ZR:** Ray McGovern, former CIA officer, thank you so much for your time today.

**RM:** You're most welcome. It was a pleasure.

**ZR:** And thank you for joining us in this two part discussion with Ray McGovern. In case you missed part one, please click on the link in the description. We also urge all of our viewers to join us on our alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram, YouTube can shadowban us at any time or censor us, so be sure as a precaution to join us on these alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram. And lastly, if you're watching this video, be sure to take into account that there is an entire team working behind the scenes from camera, light, audio, in the case of a German videos correction, translation, voiceover. And if you want us to continue providing you with independent, non-profit news and analysis, make sure to donate a small amount today. I am your host Zain Raza, see you guys next time.

**END**