

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

IX. PRESSURE ON INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ANALYSTS REGARDING IRAQ'S WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (WMD) CAPABILITIES

(U) An essential component of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's review of the intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capabilities has been examining the objectivity and independence of the judgments reached by the Intelligence Community (IC) and whether any influence was brought to bear on IC analysts to shape their assessments to support policy objectives.

(U) On June 11, 2003, Senator Pat Roberts, Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI), held a press conference with Senator John Warner, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC), and Representative Porter Goss, Chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI). Chairman Roberts announced that the SSCI had been conducting a thorough and bipartisan review of intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs and ties to terrorists, and made a public call for officials to come forward and contact the Committee if they had information about intelligence analysts having been pressured to alter their assessments. Following the press conference, Chairman Roberts reissued this call in a press release which said,

I am concerned by the number of anonymous officials that have been speaking to the press alleging that they were pressured by Administration officials to skew their analysis, a most serious charge and allegation that must be cleared up. I can tell you the Committee has yet to hear from any intelligence official expressing such concerns. If any officials believe, however, that they have been pressured to alter their assessment, they have an obligation and I encourage them to contact the Committee for confidential discussions.

(U) Chairman Roberts issued this call a third time at a closed Committee hearing on June 19, 2003, at which senior representatives of the IC and many of the primary analysts involved in drafting and coordinating the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on *Iraq's Continuing Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs* were present. Chairman Roberts asked,

Did any of you ever feel pressure or influence to make your judgment in the 2002 National Intelligence Estimate or any other intelligence product conform to the policies of this or previous Administrations? The second part of that is, has any

[REDACTED]

analyst come to you or expressed to you that he or she felt pressure to alter any assessment of intelligence? And finally, if you did feel pressure or were informed that someone else felt pressure, were any intelligence assessments changed as a result of that pressure?

(U) Chairman Roberts issued the same call for analysts or officials to come forward to the Committee at least six more times in the summer of 2003.

(U) In addition to these calls, throughout the Committee's review, Committee staff asked whether any analysts had been pressured to change their analysis or assessments and about how they had developed their assessments. Committee staff also made efforts to contact individuals mentioned in press articles or who, through other means, had come to the Committee's attention as possibly having information about analysts who had been pressured.

(U) The Committee did not find any evidence that intelligence analysts changed their judgments as a result of political pressure, altered or produced intelligence products to conform with Administration policy, or that anyone even attempted to coerce, influence or pressure analysts to do so. When asked whether analysts were pressured in any way to alter their assessments or make their judgments conform with Administration policies on Iraq's WMD programs, not a single analyst answered "yes." Most analysts simply answered, "no" or "never," but some provided more extensive responses. Some of their responses are below:

- A Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) biological weapons (BW) analyst said, "No, never. Never. Matter of fact, the assessments we make have always tried to – we always tried to be as accurate and always as truthful as we can, and it might be that our assessments suited what they needed. But we were never pressured to make an assessment a certain way or anything."
- The National Intelligence Officer (NIO) for Science and Technology said, "my answer to all of those is there was no pressure on me throughout that entire period. I did not have any analysts come to me with any information about the fact that they were feeling pressure to change their judgments. And I was certainly not aware of any, whether I heard it or not. So there were really no – as far as I'm concerned, there were no such things happening."
- A CIA chemical weapons (CW) analyst said, "there was no pressure at all. They didn't tell us what to say or anything like that."

[REDACTED]

- Another CIA CW analyst said, “I did not feel any pressure, nor would I have done anything if they tried to pressure me.”
- A Department of Energy (DOE) nuclear analyst said, “. . . no one influenced me. I think the NIE as it stands, although it was a rushed process like we talked about, but as it stands our position is adequately represented in there.”
- A National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC) analyst said, “my assessment was based purely on, as I’ve said and I keep saying, on my research and what I was able to find out and then thinking about it and writing and giving out the information.”
- A Department of State Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) WMD senior analyst said, “Not at all. . . . INR has a pretty solid track record of stating its views, whether they are in sync with the prevailing winds of policymakers, but we have never shied away from stating our view where it diverges . . .”
- A Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) nuclear programs division chief said, “We had absolutely no contact with Administration or policy folks while we were preparing our work. We had no internal or external influences on what [the analysts’] judgments were.”

(U) Committee staff also had an extensive discussion with the CIA’s Deputy Director for Intelligence (DDI) about whether CIA analysts had been pressured. She told Committee staff that,

There clearly was hard questioning on a lot of what we did. There was regular interaction with policymakers coming back to certain points or issues repeatedly, which I think, if an analyst wanted to view that, might be able to say or might think of that as some sort of if not pressure then some sort of a reluctance to accept the answer they were given. On the other hand, it can also be new developments and oftentimes what these repeated going back to the same subject matters would be is, a new report would come in on something and the policymaker would then say what do you make of this. And I think that’s kind of what you expect in an environment where you’ve got the kind of relevancy that the intelligence community has with this Administration.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(U) The DDI added that no analysts had ever said that they did take this kind of questioning as pressure, nor did she believe that analysts ever changed their assessments as a result of this questioning. She told Committee staff that the examples of repeated questioning were related to terrorism issues, and not about Iraq's WMD capabilities.

(U) Committee staff also interviewed Richard Kerr – who had been tasked by the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) in February 2003 to review national intelligence on Iraq – and two members of Kerr's team. Kerr's team did not conduct any interviews during the review, but told Committee staff that some individuals did approach them informally to say they believed extensive questioning was a form of pressure on analysts. Kerr's team also reviewed questions from policymakers that had been posed to intelligence analysts. Based on his review of these questions, Mr. Kerr and the team believed that there were "a lot" of questions regarding both Iraq's WMD capabilities and connections to terrorists and in some instances were repetitive. He said some individuals complained to the team members informally that this was a form of pressure on analysts, but he was unable to tell Committee staff specifically whether analysts or managers of Iraq WMD capabilities had complained of this type of pressure. One of the team members said that no one complained to her regarding this type of questioning on WMD. None of the team members said they believed extensive or repeated questioning was improper. Mr. Kerr told Committee staff he believed the questioning was not unusual and said, "it is not at all unusual for analysts to feel they are being pushed by one group or another." Mr. Kerr and the team concluded that even if the repeated questioning was an attempt to pressure analysts, "there was never anybody who changed a judgment as a result of that." None of the team members would provide to the Committee the names of the individuals who had approached them.

(U) Committee staff asked some CIA analysts covering Iraq's WMD programs specifically about visits from the Vice President to question analysts. These analysts said they believed the visits were intended to gather information, not to pressure analysts to come to particular judgments. For example, the Deputy Director of Analysis at the DCI's Weapons Intelligence, Nonproliferation and Arms Control Center (WINPAC) told Committee staff that he was involved in several of the meetings and said,

I think I've mentioned before, with the Vice President and I think that there's no question they had a point of view, but there was no attempt to get us to hew to a particular point of view ourselves or to come to a certain conclusion. It was trying to figure out why do we come to this conclusion, what was the evidence, a lot of questions asked, probing questions, but no pressure to get us to come to a particular point of view.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(U) The DDI told Committee staff that the Vice President had visited CIA about five to eight times total between September 2001 and February 2003 and that she had participated in most, if not all, of the sessions. She said usually a group of analysts and their collection counterparts would brief the Vice President on key findings on a particular issue. She said "he was usually in receive mode during the presentation and then asked questions afterwards." She said "they were really good exchanges. I think the analysts felt that he was listening. Like I said, he was in a receive mode during their presentations. It wasn't interrupting from the start with let me give a different point of view or don't you think this or anything along those lines."

(U) One of the CIA delivery analysts told Committee staff that he thought the purpose of the visits was "factfinding." He said,

They wanted to know what our analysis was. They listened and that was it. There was no pressure back on us to change it or to manipulate it in any way. They just wanted to know what our analysis was, and we told them and that was it.

(U) A CIA nuclear analyst said he had been in a meeting with the Vice President about Iraq-Libya issues and said that the Vice President asks a lot of questions, but said he never had the feeling that the Vice President was trying to lead any of the analysts down a certain path. The analyst said he believed the Vice President was interested in learning what the analysts knew and what they did not know.

(U) Committee staff also asked the former Assistant Secretary of State for INR about concerns that State Department leadership did not listen to INR analysis or had used CIA's analysis in speeches, rather than INR's analysis. The assistant secretary told Committee staff that,

Clearly, as I tell analysts, if [Secretary Powell] doesn't buy what we've told him, it's our fault, not his. We didn't do it well enough. We didn't provide him enough evidence. We weren't persuasive enough. So there's a certain responsibility we have to convince the policymaker to believe us, not somebody else.

The assistant secretary added,

That he doesn't always accept what we say I think is to his credit. If he believed everything that the Intelligence Community told him, including what INR tells

[REDACTED]

him, he'd be a fool. You should know better than anybody that a lot of the stuff [the IC turns] out is crap, and that a policymaker who sticks to that intelligence I don't want to even be in the same room with. They've got to know that the stuff isn't that good. So the notion that they sometimes disagree with us I find fine.

A. Allegations of Influence

(U) Committee staff did interview five individuals who had come to the Committee's attention as possibly having information that intelligence analysts' assessments had been influenced by policymakers. None of these individuals provided any information to the Committee which showed that policymakers had attempted to coerce, influence or pressure analysts to change their analysis or that any intelligence analysts changed their intelligence judgments as a result of political pressure. There was also no information provided to the Committee which showed that analysts had conformed their assessments to known Administration policies because they believed those assessments would be more widely read or accepted. The following describes information garnered from those interviews.

B. INR Analyst

(U) When Chairman Roberts asked whether analysts had been pressured to change their assessments at a Committee hearing on June 19, 2003, one analyst stood up and said that he had "some encounters involving some pressure" but noted that he had not changed his assessments as a result of that pressure. The analyst agreed to meet with Committee staff following the hearing to discuss the issue.

(U) The analyst told Committee staff that his concerns about being pressured were not related to Iraq, but rather to an incident that had occurred with the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security concerning Cuba's BW program. The analyst had received a routine request to declassify language concerning Cuba's BW program for a speech that the Under Secretary intended to give in an open forum. The analyst told Committee staff that the text of the Under Secretary's speech contained a sentence which said that the U.S. believes Cuba has a developmental, offensive biological warfare program and is providing assistance to other rogue state programs. The text also called for international observers of Cuba's biological facilities. The analyst said the portion of the speech he was given contained top secret codeword information.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(U) The analyst said he e-mailed the text to the demarche coordinator at the CIA who handles interagency reviews of declassification requests, with a note stating that INR “did NOT” concur with the Under Secretary’s text. The analyst proposed alternative language in the e-mail which said, “Cuba has demonstrated that it is committed to developing a highly advanced biotechnology infrastructure and to arranging foreign collaboration with rogue states that could involve proliferation of dual-use technologies to countries assessed to have BW programs.” The analyst said that he removed the text calling for international observers of Cuba’s biological facilities.

(U) The analyst said he made most of the changes to the speech because he was attempting to make the speech unclassified, not because he believed it was factually incorrect. He said that the only portion of the original speech language relating to Cuba’s BW program that differed from IC judgments was the use of the word “program” in the sentence, “Cuba has a developmental, offensive biological warfare program.” The analyst said the IC used the term “effort” rather than “program.” The analyst also said, however, that he removed the sentence calling for observers at Cuba’s biological facilities because “. . . in general we had real concerns about inspections or other people doing inspections of facilities, giving them a clean bill of health when we knew that it would be quite easy to hide illicit activity, so that the inspection methodology is problematic.” He also said that the text mentioned a specific facility which he believed would have exposed sources and methods.

(U) The analyst said that the Under Secretary had obtained a copy of his e-mail to the CIA and called him in to the Under Secretary’s office. The analyst said the Under Secretary “berated him,” accused him of countermanding an Under Secretary and of trying to rewrite the Under Secretary’s speech. The analyst said that six months after the incident, when his new office director met with the Under Secretary, the Under Secretary asked to have the analyst removed from his current worldwide chemical and biological weapons portfolio. The analyst said he was not removed from his portfolio and did not suffer any negative effects professionally, however, he was instructed by his supervisors to limit his contact with the Under Secretary’s office.

(U) The analyst also told Committee staff that he believed there was “a hostile climate between [INR’s] judgments and what the [office of the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security] wanted to say.” He said INR, “was not being listened to,” but the office was listening to CIA instead.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(U) State Department e-mails provided to the Committee indicate that the analyst's supervisor contacted the Under Secretary's office following this incident to explain that the analyst should not have offered alternative language in his e-mail for clearance from the IC without discussing the matter with the Under Secretary. One of the supervisors noted that the analyst's "choice of the phrase 'does not concur' was entirely inappropriate." The supervisor's e-mail said that the INR interest is in ensuring that sources and methods are protected and that "policymakers know whether we think what they propose to say is clearly supported, unsupported, or pushing the evidence as evaluated by IC analysts." He indicated that the analysts was trying to flag where he believed the draft went beyond IC consensus. As mentioned previously, however, the analyst told Committee staff that the changes he had suggested were not because he believed the text deviated from the IC's judgment. He said the only difference between the speech text and the IC judgments was that the speech referenced a biological "program" while the IC used the term "effort." The text as rewritten by the analyst made more changes than replacing "program" with "effort."

(U) Ultimately, the IC cleared language for use in the speech which said, "The United States believes that Cuba has at least a limited offensive biological warfare research and development effort. Cuba has provided dual-use biotechnology to other rogue states. We are concerned that such technology could support BW programs in those states. We call on Cuba to cease all BW-applicable cooperation with rogue states and to fully comply with all of its obligations under the Biological Weapons Convention."

C. Former INR Office Director

(U) Committee staff contacted a retired Office Director in INR who had made comments in the press suggesting that analysts may have been pressured to change their analysis. At a press conference at the Arms Control Association on July 9, 2003 he said, "this administration has had a faith-based intelligence attitude, its top-down use of intelligence: 'we know the answers; give us the intelligence to support those answers.'" The Office Director had retired from INR in September, prior to publication of the National Intelligence Estimate (NIE), and said he had not been present in the office for two months prior to his departure. He had no direct knowledge of the drafting or coordination of the October 2002 NIE on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs.

(U) The Office Director said that during his tenure at INR he did not feel pressure from the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, or Director of INR on Iraq WMD issues. He said that INR felt protected from politics and was allowed to "call it like they saw it." He told Committee staff that

[REDACTED]

there had been an incident with an INR analyst and the Under Secretary regarding a Cuba BW issue, but said that the Under Secretary's office was not a problem in the case of Iraq. He also mentioned that the Arms Control and International Security Bureau did not like INR and preferred to work with the CIA directly. The Office Director did not present any information suggesting that analysts had been pressured or influenced to alter their assessments or views on Iraq, or that the Administration was only interested in receiving intelligence information which supported pre-conceived ideas.

D. Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) Senior Intelligence Analyst

(U) Committee staff contacted a DIA senior intelligence analyst who, in a previous assignment, had supported the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Special Plans and Near East/South Asia (NESA). The senior analyst's name had been provided to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Vice Chairman's staff by a former DIA intelligence analyst who believed the senior analyst had experienced pressure to change his analysis from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), specifically the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Special Plans and NESA. The senior analyst's name also came to the Committee's attention when he was mentioned in an October 22, 2003, *Washington Post* article as having sharply disagreed with the Deputy Under Secretary about "the imminence of the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's Iraq."

(U) The senior analyst told Committee staff that the *Washington Post* article was incorrect because he "never discussed the imminence of the Iraqi threat" with the Deputy Under Secretary. When asked whether he felt any pressure himself, or was aware of any analysts within the DIA who believed they were pressured by anyone in the Administration, particularly by any Department of Defense officials, to change their assessments on Iraq's WMD programs or links to terrorism, the senior analyst said, "no," but said he thought that, ". . . generally it was understood how receptive OSD civilians were to our assessments and what kind of assessments they would not be receptive to." When asked to provide some examples of how this affected analysis, the senior analyst said he was not able to provide any examples related to Iraq. The senior analyst added that, regarding his briefings on the probable Iraqi military reaction to a U.S. operation, "I don't think [the Deputy Under Secretary] had a lot of disagreement with that."

(U) The senior analyst did provide an example of a brief on Israel that he said had not been well received in which he said that the Israeli Defense Forces had "assassinated" terrorist leadership. He said the Deputy Under Secretary told him that the word "assassinated" was very sensitive and said he should not use it. The senior analyst then told the Deputy Under Secretary

[REDACTED]

that he was only using a word that the Israeli press uses and said the Deputy Under Secretary then asked him if the *Jerusalem Post* used the term "assassinations." The senior analyst told him that three Hebrew journals used the term and he later brought copies of those articles, with highlighted examples of the word "assassinated" to the Deputy Under Secretary. He said that, nevertheless, he never again used the word "assassinated."

(U) The senior analyst also said that he believed the Deputy Under Secretary had been "abusive." When asked for an example of how the Deputy Under Secretary had been abusive, the senior analyst said he was briefing on the number of casualties on each side of the Israel-Palestinian conflict and the Deputy Under Secretary, "raised his voice and waved his hand and said, 'I don't want to hear about that. Tell me what's happening on the ground in Afghanistan.' " The senior analyst said that was the only instance of "abuse," and said that this prompted him to stop briefing the Deputy Under Secretary and to send his subordinates to conduct the briefings instead.

(U) The senior analyst said these briefings prompted him and the Deputy Under Secretary to "mutually back [] away" from dealing with each other. The senior analyst said that after this, he was excluded from several bilateral military coordination meetings with foreign governments which the Deputy Under Secretary had attended. He said that he was excluded by the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. When asked why he believed he was excluded from the meetings, the senior analyst said that, "I think personalities are involved." When asked later whether he was excluded from the meetings because of personality differences or because the Deputy Under Secretary disagreed with his analysis, the senior analyst said, "I think it was a combination of both," but he could not provide any examples, other than the Israeli Defense Force issue, of when the Deputy Under Secretary disagreed with his briefs.

(U) The senior analyst also said that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs began to present a separate policy brief on the potential connection and danger of WMD and terrorists, rather than use a DIA briefing, in the bilateral military coordination meetings. He said the brief was "highly selective," but said that he did not believe the assistant secretary misrepresented the evidence and said although he believed this was unusual, he did not think there was anything improper about it. He said that he and other analysts in DIA had the opportunity to review and make comments on the brief and said that the Assistant Secretary of Defense was receptive to his comments.

(U) When asked if the senior analyst could explain how his belief that OSD civilians were only receptive to certain assessments may have impacted analysis, the senior analyst could

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

not provide any examples of an effect on DIA assessments or analysis. The analyst said he believed, "analysts were free to make assessments they ordinarily wanted to make, subject to quality control in our agency," and said, "that has never been an explicit sense or understanding," that analysts were making their assessments more in line with what people wanted to hear rather than what the intelligence said. When asked whether analysts refrained from writing assessments that they wanted to write because they believed no one was receptive to the analysis, he said, "I can't say that specifically." He said that he believed, ". . . that is the sort of thing that would have influence on analysts," but again could provide no examples that it did happen. In fact, when staff pointed out that the senior analyst had earlier said the DIA terrorism analysts did not change their assessment on Iraq's links to al Qaeda, even though they were aware that OSD would have liked the analysts to outline more conclusive links, he said, "No, they didn't. I don't think anybody changed their assessments." When asked if preexisting opinions within OSD had any effect on the work that was done at DIA, the senior analyst said, "I can't specifically point to any. I cannot."

E. Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) Senior Intelligence Officer

(U) Committee staff also contacted a DIA senior intelligence officer (SIO) whose name had been provided to the Vice Chairman's staff by a former DIA intelligence analyst who believed the SIO had information about the OSD pressuring analysts.

(U) The SIO told Committee staff that he worked with the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Special Plans and NESAs regularly and said that he did not have any information that the Deputy Under Secretary had pressured analysts or coerced them to alter their assessments. The SIO said that the Deputy Under Secretary had very strong views and sometimes did not agree with the SIO's analysis, but said the SIO was always encouraged to brief on whatever information he had to provide. The SIO said that the Deputy Under Secretary asked tough questions and pressured analysts to have the intelligence to back up what they were saying, but never pressured them to come up with judgments to match preconceived notions.

F. Former Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Desk Officer

(U) Committee staff contacted a former desk officer in the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Special Plans and NESAs who had come to the Committee's attention through press accounts of the desk officer's experiences.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(U) The desk officer told Committee staff that she never worked the Iraq issue and had no direct knowledge of any attempts to pressure or coerce intelligence analysts. She obtained the information that she provided to Committee staff based on looking at the secret level intranet in the Pentagon and through discussions with colleagues.

(U) The desk officer told Committee staff that a DIA senior intelligence analyst had told her that he had been pressured by the Deputy Under Secretary to change a briefing he was giving on Iraq and that he refused to change the briefing because the intelligence did not support the Deputy Under Secretary's conclusion. She said that after this incident the senior analyst was excluded from bilateral exchange visits. Committee staff interviewed the DIA senior intelligence analyst (See page 280) who said that he had not been asked to change any briefings on Iraq, but said he was asked not to use the word "assassinations" when giving a brief on the Israeli Defense Force. He provided no information to show that he had been excluded from the bilateral visits because of his analysis.

(U) The desk officer told Committee staff that she believed there was a hostile environment between the Office of Special Plans and the DIA, but could not provide any examples of a hostile climate between anyone at the Office of Special Plans and the DIA, other than the senior analyst mentioned previously. She said that she believed talking points used by the Office of Special Plans exaggerated intelligence assessments, but she could not provide any examples of instances where the points differed from analysis at the time they were used.

(U) When asked whether she had any evidence of the Office of Special Plans attempting to pressure CIA analysts she said that she had heard the Deputy Under Secretary make negative comments about the CIA's analysis but said she could not say that the office pressured CIA. The desk officer also made several accusations that Administration policy speeches included information that was not supported by intelligence, specifically on issues such as the threat of Iraq's unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), alleged attempts to acquire uranium from Niger, and attempts to acquire aluminum tubes for use in a centrifuge enrichment program, but she was unaware that publicly released intelligence showed that the IC had in fact published finished intelligence products making each one of these assessments. She had no direct knowledge to support any claims that intelligence analysts were pressured and much of what she said is contradicted by information from other interviews and intelligence reporting.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G. Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Pressure Conclusions

(U) Conclusion 83. The Committee did not find any evidence that Administration officials attempted to coerce, influence or pressure analysts to change their judgments related to Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities.

(U) [REDACTED]

(U) [REDACTED]

(U) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(U) [REDACTED]

(U) [REDACTED]

(U) Conclusion 84. The Committee found no evidence that the Vice President's visits to the Central Intelligence Agency were attempts to pressure analysts, were perceived as intended to pressure analysts by those who participated in the briefings on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs, or did pressure analysts to change their assessments.

(U) [REDACTED]

(U) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]