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Mike Hurley 8/12/11
To: aalbion@gmail.com, Scott Allan, Chris Kojm, Barbara Grewe, Barbara Grewe

From: Michael Hurley (mihurley@hotmail.com) This sender is in your contact list.
Sent: Fri 8/12/11 6:41 PM
To: aalbion@gmail.com; Scott Allan (sallan2004@yahoo.com); Chris Kojm (cakojm1@msn.com); Barbara Grewe (bgrewe@starpower.net); Barbara Grewe (bgrewe@aol.com)

FYI.

mh

From: pdzon@eservices.virginia.edu
To: mihurley@hotmail.com
Subject: Re: Contact Data
Date: Fri, 12 Aug 2011 17:20:53 +0000

Mike,

Clarke’s statements are pretty wild. This also feeds stuff in a new book by someone named Kevin Fenton, who has long been part of the 9/11 internet skeptic community, called "Disconnecting the Dots."

I’m surprised that Clarke said these things. It will lend an entirely different level of credence to some bad charges. This topic was picked over pretty carefully by us, by the Justice IG, and by the CIA IG. What puzzles me about Clarke’s statement is that it is hard to believe he would say these things if he had actually read the pages in our report that discuss this topic. We and others pieced together a rather detailed and banal story. Are we to believe that all those details were concocted (by Tom Wilshire?). And no one can deny that the CIA was aware of and posed no objection to the FBI hunt for Mihdhar that began in late August 2001 (after some foolishness over the information sharing/"wall" misunderstandings). The CIA was not responsible for the lackluster quality of that hunt.

Thus, even if Clarke’s theory was true, the FBI might have jumped out and found Mihdhar, or Dale Watson might have told Clarke about their hunt for him (what he complains the CIA did not tell him). But in fact, as far as I can remember, the case didn’t even get up to the level of Dale Watson’s attention. So I can’t figure out how Clarke’s theory could hang together.
To: Ben-Veniste, Richard  
Sent: Sat Jul 30 09:35:27 2011  
Subject: RE: Help!

Richard,

Apologies, I was at a party until late last night and didn’t see this email until this morning. The discussion you are interested in is on page 132 and 133 of the Report. In late 1998 Clinton authorized CIA-managed Afghan Tribals to be paid whether they captured OR killed bin Laden. A separate memorandum of notification prepared in February 1999 authorizing the same arrangement for Northern Alliance members working with the CIA is somewhat more ambiguous. That’s because Clinton had crossed out key language in the draft and substituted more ambiguous language. When we interviewed him in April 2004, he couldn’t recall why he did that. See Report page 133.

Tenet did testify that he believed he had all the authority he needed to kill UBL. I’m pretty sure he said that when he testified at our public hearings in late March 2004. He likely also said it in one of the three private interviews we had with him at CIA hq’s in winter 2004.

Does this help?

Mike

Subject: Help!
Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2011 20:38:50 -0500
From: RBen-Veniste@mayerbrown.com
To: mihurley@hotmail.com

Mike,

Can you point me to the authorization Clinton gave Tenet to capture or kill UBL, or to Tenet’s testimony that he had all the authority he needed to kill UBL?

Many thanks!

Richard
Mike Hurley  5/07/11
To: Carie Lemack

From: Michael Hurley (mihurley@hotmail.com)  This sender is in your contact list.
Sent: Sat 5/07/11 10:45 AM
To: Carie Lemack (carie_lemack@yahoo.com)

Carie,

Thank you for your moving piece in today's Washington Post. I admire so much everything you have done and are doing to keep us safe.

Much love,

Mike

GUCCIFER
Chris,

When you advise Lee that all Commissioners should look at the Afterword, suggest you include this thought:

Philip's perfectly entitled to make the arguments he makes. But they should be in a separate article.

This Afterword to the new edition of The 9/11 Commission Report, however, will take the place of Chapters 12 and 13. It therefore becomes part of the book; as it will be between the same two covers, readers will assume it has the imprimatur of all the Commissioners. It's only right then that all Commissioners have a chance to approve it.

Mike
Hi Nicole,

Hope you had a great weekend.

It's important that I speak to Tom, Monday morning, if at all possible. It concerns the Afterword that Phil Zelikow has drafted to the new edition of The 9/11 Commission Report. I know Tom has taken a look at it, but there are a couple of things I’d like to draw his attention to.

I'm departing for London early Monday afternoon and it would be great if we could have the conversation before I leave.

My mobile is: 703 402 3801

Many thanks.
Hi Julie,

Lee Hamilton called me this morning. We had a 20 minute chat. Lee wanted to talk about the allocation of radio spectrum to first responders issue. I’m pretty up to speed on the issue and I suggested that he and Tom support a portion of the spectrum being allocated to first responders and not agree with the FCC’s proposal to "auction" off the band of spectrum in question to private telecom companies. Lee agreed with that and I’ll write that portion of the Statement accordingly.

I used the call to bring Lee up to date on where I am in the drafting of the Statement. Let him know that I’m working with Chris Kojm on this—he was quite happy about that.

Also picked his brain about what we should say about DNI reform. I told him what I thought and he basically agreed. The conversation we had gave me a good sense of what he wants and will help me write that section of the Statement.

Lee was happy with the call.

As I write this note, I’m sitting in a Continuing Legal Education course (this one entitled “Legal Issues Arising from the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill”), at the University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, MN. I’m able to use my laptop in these courses and I should be able to use at least a couple of hours each day during the classes to work on the Statement draft. And I can email over the University’s wi-fi system. So, I think this is going to work out fine.

Best,

Mike
Also, if PZ plays the card that he's under tight deadlines from Norton, Tom and Lee have to be prepared to use the 'nuclear option.' Talk to the head of Norton about what they (Tom & Lee) think the afterword should look like.

Mike

--

Mike -- Great arguments. I will use them!

thx, Chris

Chris,

When you advise Lee that all Commissioners should look at the Afterword, suggest you include this thought:
Mike -- Great arguments. I will use them!

thx, Chris

Chris,

When you advise Lee that all Commissioners should look at the Afterword, suggest you include this thought:

Philip's perfectly entitled to make the arguments he makes. But they should be in a separate article.

This Afterword to the new edition of The 9/11 Commission Report, however, will take the place of Chapters 12 and 13. It therefore becomes part of the book; as it will be between the same two covers, readers will assume it has the imprimatur of all the Commissioners. It's only right then that all Commissioners have a chance to approve it.

Mike
Hi Chris,

I’m working on the part of the Statement assessing Congressional Reform. As you know, Congress has done little, if anything, to reform the way it oversees the IC and DHS. Our recommendation has been pretty much stymied.

I want to say something insightful about this problem and what needs to be done. Congressional Reform is not my area of expertise. I have dug up, though, something kind of interesting and I’d appreciate your thoughts.

Bill Perry and Steve Hadley chaired an Independent Panel on the Quadrennial Defense Review. The panel was sponsored by USIP and stood up at the request of Bob Gates and with Congressional authorization. A number of other distinguished defense experts served on the panel, including the 9/11 Commission’s own John Lehman.

The panel issued its final unanimous report on July 29, 2010.

It made many recommendations. Among them, the panel felt that Congressional oversight of military, homeland security, intel was not functioning well and pretty much was not up to the challenges of the 21st Century. Accordingly, and reaching back into Congressional history, the Panel recommended resurrecting something called The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. This Committee dates back to the 30s or 40s and has popped up at a couple of key junctures in the last 70 years or so. Among other things, in the past, it has redrawn the lines of committee jurisdictions in both Chambers. Perry, Hadley and their fellow panelists think this is imperative for rationalizing Congressional Oversight and thereby improving our security.

Their report is 140 pages or so. I have pulled out the page and a half dealing with this interesting proposal and attached it to this email. Please give it a read.

I haven’t yet called this to Tom and Lee’s attention and have no idea if they are aware of the report or this recommendation in particular. Given Lee’s knowledge of, respect for, Congressional history/precedent, it strikes me this might appeal to him. If Tom and Lee go along with it, maybe they can just say in the written Statement that they endorse the Perry-Hadley recommendation. In the first batch of text I sent you, you’ll see a bracketed placeholder for this, I think under the heading “Conclusion.” What do you think?

I’m kind of doubtful we’re ever going to get any traction toward Congress reforming itself unless something like what Perry and Hadley propose comes to pass.

Mike
Hi Chris=2C

I'm working on the part of the Statement assessing Congressional Reform. As you know=2C Congress has done little=2C if anything=2C to reform the way it oversees the IC and DHS. Our recommendation has been pretty much stymied.
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