

Fwd: Re: Hello From John Kiriakou

From **Paul Baird** [REDACTED]
 To **ramolad** <ramolad@hushmail.com>
 Sent Wednesday, September 28, 2016 at 10:48 PM
 Replied **Yes**
 Encrypted **No**
 Signed **No**

Typos again...time...corrected.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Paul Baird** [REDACTED]
 Date: Thu, Sep 29, 2016 at 12:40 PM
 Subject: Re: Re: Hello From John Kiriakou
 To: ramolad@hushmail.com

Hi again,

I don't mean to imply that I doubt that they keep a few Dudley-Doright types in the dark (no, I'm not a cartoon fan but that's today's simile theme) and use them but, like the TV presenter that doesn't want to accept that some of what they're reading out is sourced from surveillance on targets when many others say that's a time-honoured practice, I question the honesty of someone who defends by saying the CIA wouldn't do that to American citizens as it's not authorised to...and needs a clear and present danger to do it o/s??? Oh, paleez. That's like saying Nixon would never commit an impeachable, treacherous offence because he was President or that the bullet-ridden body dripping with blood over there must be the result of an accident because it's against the law to kill someone. People break rules even though there's been more evil committed by those following orders than those refusing to do so. As that Stasi boss said...(approx)... "It is naive in the extreme to think that you can give a government the power to spy (that's the ability to spy, regardless of whether it's in a CIA charter or whatever) on its people and expect that they will do anything except abuse that power". What the CIA is supposed to do and what it does are two different things. Any honest person can see that and will admit it. The CIA is not a conversation stopper for no reason; people know they are an evil organisation.

And doing the right or brave thing on one matter does not mean that person is right or brave on all matters. From my dealings with people, good and bad, on all of this one of the harsh (but true) things I've noticed about human nature is that people see honesty as a cake; to take a slice here and there as you like but never to accept the whole thing. So who is honest? Where is the line? I say it's absolute honesty, even as to the faults of your colleagues and yourself or you might as well talk about degrees of dishonesty and the topics on which you are dishonest. This I see absolutely clearly and this alienates most as very, very few these days are honest with themselves let alone anyone else.

Again, quoting what his agency is and isn't officially entitled to do is a dead giveaway and something I've come across many, many times, esp. from public servants. It's ignorant. It's dishonest. It is a form of cowardice. And like honesty, bravery is sliced (though that's more understandable, esp for someone who's been jailed under the US fascist regime).

A "staged" situation can involve most players, eg a ten man sting on one dupe OR it can involve a few criminal elitists and many honest players who have no idea they're even being played. Allowing Snowden, Kiriakou and others to take information and spread it without being murdered first is a decision made at the top and most of the rest just follows. (To be brief, they tie it to false flag terrorism and use it to get people to surrender rights for safety). MSM may be given permission to run leaks but the judges and others involved just play their role. Like with an "alien abductee"...NASA and the military stage a yes / no event but they all know what's happening and it's the No's that organise it. The dupes are the abductees and we the audience hearing the story.

We also have the celebrity worship problem that, like token charity, slices of honesty etc, blinds us as we're all looking for heroes, people to respect. Guess what. The only true heroes are dead ones...eg the guy that doesn't just save one from the fire or sinking ship but goes back again and again until he fails and dies trying. Personally I see very few and those with one quality lack others...including my insignificant, scared little self.

It's getting heavy. Enough said. If you can convince John you deserve any praise you get and I'll be the first to applaud. Keep trying until he refuses to answer your emails. Good luck. ☺

Regards,
 Paul.

On Thu, Sep 29, 2016 at 11:52 AM, <ramolad@hushmail.com> wrote:

Well let's see if he writes back--we can't tell can we whether he is doing what he thinks he should do--disbelieve--in this case or if he genuinely does not know what is going on.

I suspect the CIA practices treachery within the ranks as well as without--meaning they deliberately keep the clean-shaven crew in the dark....just to keep some of their covers authentic-seeming maybe.

Air America? Not cognizant of this...

Did mention MK ULTRA. Will try all that though if he responds..

You don't really mean everything was staged in his case though I hope. The Senate torture report and everything it revealed was not kindly to the reputation of the CIA. His being incarcerated etc--how could that have been staged, I mean for what purpose. I will pull up a few more videos of his on Youtube, to get a sense of who he is, but I do think he is being deceived, like the rest of us, re. the true nature of the CIA.

Sent using Hushmail

On 9/28/2016 at 9:08 PM, "Paul Baird" [REDACTED] wrote:

That's about it.

Whether it's a policeman, a politician, a spy, a businessman, a soldier, a minister or anything else...If someone is so defensive of their own that they cannot admit that there are criminals in their ranks then, like the fool or the coward, they are of no use to us. For anyone from the worst of all of the sub groups, the CIA, to defend them on matters like this...well that makes them untrustworthy themselves. Maybe, like Snowden, he is a brave man but he has to see that he's been used too. Everyone of interest is monitored 24/7, esp. all agency personnel, all military, all MPs and all celebrities. If they want to stop them, they can. If they go public, despite the role playing and even the incarcerations, it was meant to be staged for the public.

When it looks like he's a lost cause try mentioning Air America and trafficking, MK Ultra, the Kennedy assassinations and such and see if he still responds. Even if he's one of the gung ho types that thinks like something out of a Captain America cartoon he's lying to himself if he thinks they're all Jack Ryan types.

Regards,
Paul.

On Thu, Sep 29, 2016 at 10:47 AM, <ramolad@hushmail.com> wrote:

Well, exactly. I did see your email last night and thought it was rather interesting abt the NSA and FBI whistleblowers you mentioned vs the CIA.

The CIA is a very very odd agency from what I can tell. On the one hand, wears a face of extreme rectitude, the face projected possibly by the best guys there, the ones who actually buy the story abt its dire importance and great good work overseas--meanwhile everyone knows they've been running terrorist gigs for decades and continue to do so--but there may just be this miasma inside the Beltway, that he buys into too...

I hadn't expected him to write back and say what he did though--which is why I wrote back, looked like there was a little glimmer there of possibility.

The monitoring bit--yeah, I get that.

I'm not holding my breath.

Sent using Hushmail

On 9/28/2016 at 7:57 PM, "Paul Baird" [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi,

His defence of the agency he worked for is, as I implied first time, a clear problem it will be hard to get past. Other agencies do this but not the CIA..oh no. (They're just the worst terrorist group and the greatest threat to democracy on the planet). People who are unwilling to face the full truth about their employers, even after whistleblowing on them, are no use to us. Again...I have a dozen NSA names, a dozen FBI names but not one genuine CIA person that can be trusted.

Keep trying but I think it's a lost cause.

Regards,
Paul.

On Thu, Sep 29, 2016 at 9:44 AM, <ramolad@hushmail.com> wrote:

Paul--

This has it all--top's my last note to him.
Sent him to yr. site...

Ramola

Sent using Hushmail

----- Forwarded message from ramolad@hushmail.com -----

Date: Wed, 28 Sep 2016 22:25:10 +0000

Subject: Re: Hello From John Kiriakou

To: "JOHN/C KIRIAKOU" <[REDACTED]>

I don't profess to know the whole truth here, John. What you point out indeed is our official understanding. But the CIA has and does engage in domestic activities in the US, as per various reports; and as per that Sue Bromley note in Moral Science, the CIA is engaging in human subject research inside the US, which they will not provide details about.

Plus, we mustn't forget recent history: The book "The CIA Doctors" by Colin Ross, M.D. in conjunction with the Church Committee Report and ACHRE's final report show us the CIA was indeed experimenting on Americans...

Perhaps other agencies are involved, I don't know. Karen Stewart of the NSA has spoken out about the NSA, NSA Security, and the Florida FBI being involved; I have interviewed her.
--articles on my site.

Targeting appears to be one thing, experimenting another--one seems to permit the other. Agencies and military seem to be working together--and isn't that a publicly reported fact anyway, with all the info on JTRIG, etc.? Neuro-crime/the Dept of Justice/FBI/DHS/NSA may all be involved.

I'm not saying I have all the answers--but I am definitely studying this field, and seeking to write about it. In fact, have been working on an article lately titled Open Season on Targets, which explores this very thing, how exactly people are being targeted and enrolled into experimentation programs--need to do a bit more on it but will publish it soon.

Best
Ramola

Sent using Hushmail

On 9/28/2016 at 6:02 PM, "JOHN/C KIRIAKOU" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I think you're wrong on one count, Ramola. The CIA is prohibited by law from targeting American citizens inside the US, without exception, and they are prohibited from targeting Americans overseas unless the President declares that person a "clear and present danger" to the US. See Anwar al-Awlaki as an example. If there is such experimentation on Americans, it would come from other agencies.

Best,
John