

## The NY Times' Phony "Leak" on Secret CIA-Ukraine Program

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

**Glenn Greenwald (GG):** In the war in Ukraine, which is still ongoing, the only thing that has been surprising is that Joe Biden's request for \$60 billion more to send to Ukraine has been held up since September or early October, when he first made it. And that's the case, despite the fact that there is no question that majorities of the Senate and majorities of the House – people in both political parties want to send \$60 billion to Ukraine, on top of \$120 billion that we've already sent. Even though Ukraine is clearly losing the war and has no chance to achieve any of the ends. And the question has always been, and continues to be, why are people in Washington on a bipartisan basis, so desperate to send that \$60 billion there and keep this war continuing, keep this war going? And the only reason, at least for now, as to why that \$60 billion isn't approved is because the speaker of the House, Mike Johnson, knows that the minute he agrees to bring that bill to the floor, he will lose his speakership because members of the populist right are so opposed to the idea of sending billions to Ukraine that they will sabotage his speakership. And they've kept him in check. And yet now both political parties are working on a workaround to get it to the floor without Mike Johnson. And as I've always said from the beginning of this conflict over the \$60 billion, I will be shocked if that money doesn't end up in Kiev, because I've never in all the time I've been covering politics, seen the military industrial complex lose when it really mattered to them to get something. But the question was always, why does this war matter to them so much?

Today or yesterday rather, there was an article in The New York Times that I do think sheds light on it. Even though this is not an unauthorised leak. You don't hear people demanding the heads of The New York Times reporters who published this supposedly deeply secret information. You don't hear any suggestion that the DOJ is going to bring charges against them, or Ukraine war supporters advocating that they do, even though this is supposedly very sensitive information. And I believe that's because the power centres in Washington wanted

this to be out as a reason to try and convince Americans why Ukraine is so important to the United States. And this is The New York Times - not acting against the CIA, but serving as their spokesperson. And the headline was, quote, *The Spy War: How the CIA Secretly Helps Ukraine Fight Putin*. "For more than a decade, the United States has nurtured a secret intelligence partnership with Ukraine that is now critical for both countries in countering Russia." Now look at the framing of that. "This CIA relationship with Ukraine", says The New York Times, "is now critical for both countries in countering Russia." So, are you wondering at all why nobody is saying, oh, The New York Times published this sensitive information, they should be treated like Donald Trump and charged under the Espionage Act. Or like Julian Assange or like Edward Snowden. After all, they're supposedly leaking some very sensitive CIA intelligence here. About a, quote, "secret intelligence partnership with Ukraine." But the way you know that it was an authorised leak, a mandated leak, is the way it's framed. This is now a "critical" tool "for both countries in countering Russia". Obviously, anybody who sees Russia as a threat to the United States, – certainly which is almost the entire Democratic Party at this point, and large numbers of Republicans as well – would look at this and say, oh, this is another reason why we need to fight in Ukraine, because the CIA program that we have there is, quote, "critical for both countries", the US and Ukraine in countering Russia.

Here's what the supposedly adversarial-to-the-CIA-article says quote, "The underground bunker built to replace the destroyed command centre in the months after Russia's invasion is a secret nerve centre of Ukraine's military. There is also one more secret: -" that The New York Times is going to expose, because that's what they do. They expose the secrets of the powerful. Quote, "The base's almost fully financed and partially equipped by the CIA. The intelligence partnership between Washington and Kiev is the linchpin of Ukraine's ability to defend itself. The CIA and other American intelligence agencies provide intelligence for targeted missile strikes, track Russian troop movements, and help support spy networks. But the partnership is no war time creation. It took root a decade ago and has transformed Ukraine, whose intelligence agencies were long seen as thoroughly compromised by Russia, into one of Washington's most important intelligence partners against the Kremlin today." So you see, every paragraph is framed to convince Americans to support the CIA's policy. Because this CIA program that we have in Ukraine that we might lose if Ukraine loses has become, quote, "one of Washington's most important intelligence partners against the Kremlin today." And obviously people hear "the Kremlin" and they think, oh, that's the evil thing that's threatening us and therefore anything that is an important intelligence partner against the Kremlin, such as Ukraine, is designed to become of great importance to Americans. That's the point of this article, even though it's framed as an intrepid bit of exposure by The New York Times revealing the secrets of the CIA. It's obviously carrying its water propagandistically. Quote, "The listening post in the Ukrainian forest is part of a CIA-supported network of spy bases constructed in the past eight years that includes 12 secret locations along the Russian border."

Now, by the way, on the question of why Russia might have looked over its border into Ukraine and regarded what they were seeing as threatening, is it possible that the fact that the

CIA, that there's a CIA-supported network of spy bases that have been constructed in the last eight years across 12 secret locations across the Russian border? Do you think this might be a reason why Russia took a look at what was going on in Ukraine and said, oh, this is very threatening to our security. The CIA now has 12 secret locations across our border on the Ukrainian-Russian border. Do you think if the Russian intelligence services or the Chinese intelligence services had a deep and long standing partnership with the Mexican government or the Cuban government that permitted it to build ten secret or 12 secret spying locations across our southern border that we might regard that as threatening? Looking over at what was going on in those countries? I think probably we would. Quote, "Obsessed with", quote, "'losing' Ukraine to the West, Mr. Putin has regularly interfered in Ukraine's political system, hand-picking leaders he believed would keep Ukraine within Russia's orbit." Okay, this is the kind of thing that genuinely drives me crazy. What has Russia been doing in Ukraine according to The New York Times? Russia, Mr. Putin specifically, has "regularly interfered in Ukraine's political system, even going so far as to handpick leaders they believe would keep Ukraine within Russia's orbit." This is exactly what the United States did in 2014 in Ukraine, exactly what the US did. They interfered in Ukraine's political system because they had a democratically elected president who the US perceived was closer to Moscow than they wanted them to be. And then we heard on the audio that leaked, Victoria Nuland and the ambassador, the US ambassador to Ukraine, handpicking the leaders that they believe would keep Ukraine within the US's orbit. Do you see the extent to which our media outlets, our corporate outlets, are completely subservient to the narrative and the agenda of the security state? They're accusing Russia of doing exactly what the United States did in Ukraine. And they're saying that unlike our efforts, Russia has, quote, "backfired because they drove protesters into the streets." What does that mean? Ukraine in 2010 elected a president whose constitutional office went to 2015. And in 2014 the US government in both parties announced – people like John McCain and Chris Murphy, a senator from Arizona, from the Republican Party, a senator from Connecticut, from the Democratic Party, went to Kiev and encouraged the protesters to overthrow their government. And Victoria Nuland went and handed out doughnuts from her pocketbook, which I'm certain she keeps there all the time. She was feeding and providing sustenance to these protesters because we wanted the government of Ukraine, the democratically elected government of Ukraine, removed, so that Victoria Nuland can handpick who would be running Ukraine. And The New York Times turns that around and says that's what Russia has been doing. Quote, "Mr. Putin has long blamed Western intelligence agencies for manipulating Kiev and sowing anti-Russian sentiment in Ukraine." I wonder where he got that idea. "Mr. John Brennan, former director of the CIA under President Obama, explained that to unlock CIA assistance, the Ukrainians had to prove that they could provide intelligence of value to the Americans. Mr. Brennan returned to Washington, where advisers to President Barack Obama were deeply concerned about provoking Moscow. The white House crafted secret rules that infuriated the Ukrainians, and that some inside the CIA thought of as handcuffs. Some of Mr. Obama's advisers wanted to shut the CIA program down, but John Brennan persuaded them that doing so would be self-defeating, given the relationship was starting to produce intelligence on the Russians as the CIA was investigating Russian election meddling."

And the article actually goes on to say that these CIA sites in Ukraine and the relationship with Ukrainian intelligence was crucial, to quote, "investigating Russian attempts to interfere in the 2016 election", meaning that these relationships with the Ukrainian intelligence that John Brennan had fostered under President Obama were crucial to spreading the lies of Russiagate. And as we've shown you before, there was reporting from Politico that described how Ukraine had basically gambled on the wrong leader by engaging in all kinds of conduct in 2016 to help the Democrats and Hillary Clinton win the election, assuming that Clinton would be the president and they would benefit the Ukrainians – what, as a result of that interference in our election by helping the Democrats? Everything that is being said here by John Brennan - oh, this is such an important program to us because that enabled us to investigate Russian interference, in other words, it enabled the CIA to fabricate and interfere in our 2016 election with the Ukrainians through this Russiagate fraud, is the reason that John Brennan is saying it's so important that we maintain these bases here. And obviously, when political liberals read this New York Times article, it's going to be like crack to them. In case you're wondering why nobody's concerned or angry that The New York Times spilled supposedly sensitive secrets, it's because the whole story is designed to show why Ukraine is so important to the United States, even though I've no doubt, that The New York Times story is true, that the CIA is all over Ukraine, that we have all kinds of spying and intelligence that goes on there, right on the Russian border. And perhaps someone might wonder whether or not the CIA expanding like bacteria, like a fungus, inside Ukraine up to the Russian border, might be a reason why Russia considered US presence and the US activity in Ukraine to be mildly threatening and provocative.

Here is Victoria Nuland – who, as we talked about before, ends up in charge of American foreign policy, no matter who you vote for. She was in the Clinton administration. She was Dick Cheney's top advisor for the Iraq War. She was then the US ambassador to NATO in the second term of the Bush-Cheney administration when all this talk about expanding NATO up to the Russian border began – with Condoleezza Rice and actually including Ukraine in it. She was part of the original provocation of Russia back in 2008 when she was working for George Bush. And then Barack Obama wins and she ends up at the Hillary Clinton State Department and then eventually runs Ukraine for John Kerry. The only time she was out of office was 2016 to 2020, when Donald Trump was elected. In case you're wondering why Neocons hate Donald Trump. And then as soon as Joe Biden got back into office, she was back in the State Department, where she continued to run Ukraine. And she's now been promoted to Assistant Deputy Secretary of State. So you can go vote for whoever you want – as long as you vote for someone other than Donald Trump, she's going to win. Obviously, if Nikki Haley won, she'd be right in the State Department. She thinks just like Nikki Haley. She thinks just like Joe Biden, because this bipartisan war establishment is the same. She went on CNN with Christiane Amanpour, who is a vocal supporter of the US support for the war in Ukraine – needless to say, she works for CNN – to continue to try and propagandise the public why Ukraine is supposedly somehow so important to the United States that we ought to support Joe Biden's request to give it another \$60 billion. Here's what permanent Neocon warmonger Victoria Nuland said.

**Christiane Amanpour (CA):** And I do hear you and the others in the administration and supporters talking about the vital necessity to do this. But as people say, hope is not a strategy. And do you have any actual belief or reason to believe that eventually this bill will be paid? And if not, how are you going to make sure Ukraine gets vital weapons and ammunition?

**Victoria Nuland (VN):** Christiane, I have strong confidence that when the House comes back after they've been out in their districts, hearing from the American people, after they have heard from Ukraine, they have heard from Europe – which, by the way, just passed 54 billion in additional aid itself – that we will do what we have always done, which is defend democracy and freedom around the world.

**GG:** In case you were wondering what the United States has always done when it was invading Iraq and removing the leader of Libya and leaving that country in ruins; and fighting a dirty war in Syria and leaving that country in ruins; and all the other wars that the United States has fought, it's the same thing that Victoria Nuland is now doing in Ukraine. They're fighting for freedom and democracy. This is what the United States has always done. As they fund and prop up the regime in Saudi Arabia and in Egypt. After they funded and supported the military coup in Egypt that removed the first ever democratically elected president from Egypt, because the Egyptians voted for the wrong person less than a year after he was in office, and was removed by a military coup. And [Egypt] is ruled to this day by a military dictator, El-Sisi, that the United States supports. This is what the United States has always done: fought for freedom and democracy throughout the world. The fact that Victoria Nuland can go and look into the camera with a straight face and say that to you, knowing that Christiane Amanpour, nor anybody else who is a working journalist in corporate media will challenge her on that, shows the contempt for your intelligence that these people have. The fact that they can tell you that this is what US foreign policy is and always has been.

**VN:** ...to defend democracy and freedom around the world, not just for victims of tyrants like Putin, but in our own interest in preserving a free and open international order. That's what we need to do. We've done it before. And by the way, we have to remember that the bulk of this money is going right back into the US economy to make those weapons, including good paying jobs in some 40 states across the United States.

**GG:** Now, do you know what's going on here? This is a liberal network, CNN, that speaks to American liberals and Democrats. There's no doubt about that. I could show you all night, pulling data that proves that only Liberals and Democrats listen to CNN, and this is a representative of the Biden administration who is convincing – trying to convince her audience that the war in Ukraine is worth fighting. And the message that she's delivering and that you're about to hear from CNN itself, is that there are two different ways. That you should be happy about the war in Ukraine. One is that, as The New York Times said, we have a CIA presence there. And so it helps the CIA, which Liberals love. And two, the new theory, the new message: oh, don't worry, this money we're spending goes into the pockets of the arms industry. And you're supposed to believe that it doesn't go to enriching the oligarchs

who control the arms industry. No, it's going to create good paying union jobs throughout the industrialised Midwest and keep the economy running. It's good for the American people. Like, maybe there's another way that we could create jobs beyond funding a war that is sending tens of thousands upon tens of thousands of unwilling young Ukrainian conscripts and increasingly middle aged Ukrainian conscripts to their death.

Thanks for watching this clip from System Update, our live show that airs every Monday through Friday at 7 p.m. eastern exclusively on Rumble. You can catch the full nightly shows live or view the backlog of episodes for free on our Rumble page. You can also find full episodes the morning after they air across all major podcasting platforms, including Spotify and Apple. All the information you need is linked below. We hope to see you there.

**END**

---

**Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:**

**BANKKONTO:**  
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.  
Bank: GLS Bank  
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600  
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

**PAYPAL:**  
E-Mail: [PayPal@acTVism.org](mailto:PayPal@acTVism.org)

**PATREON:**  
<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

**BETTERPLACE:**  
Link: [Click here](#)

The acTVism Munich e.V. association is a non-profit organization with legal capacity. The association pursues exclusively and directly non-profit and charitable purposes. Donations from Germany are tax-deductible. If you require a donation receipt, please send us an e-mail to: [info@acTVism.org](mailto:info@acTVism.org)