

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 11:09 AM
To: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal); [Redacted]
Subject: [AIN] Final / NBC / Isikoff / Beale

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

[Large Redacted Block]

(b)(3)

Got it. After checking w/ folks here, you are correct.

You can say "The CIA confirmed that Beale has no affiliation with the CIA."

Dean Boyd
Director
CIA Office of Public Affairs

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

From: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal) [mailto:[Redacted]@nbcuni.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 10:51 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Re: John Beale case

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

Tx- a basic confirmation or statement wd be helpful.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 10:37 AM
To: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal); [Redacted]
Subject: RE: John Beale case

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

Hey Mike:

Let me check with my folks on this one and get back to you pronto.

Dean Boyd
Director
CIA Office of Public Affairs

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

From: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal) [mailto:[Redacted]@nbcuni.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 9:49 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: John Beale case

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

Dean—Just left you message. Doing something on the case of John Beale—the EPA guy who pled guilty to defrauding the govt. by claiming he was doing undercover work for the CIA. (His sentencing is next week.) Have interview with Patrick Sullivan, the EPA assistant IG who did the case and says his office confirmed with CIA that not only did Beale not work for the CIA, theres no record of him ever being to Langley. His exact quote: Beale’s claim that he was working for the CIA were a “complete fabrication,” said Sullivan . “He’s never been to Langley. The CIA has no record of him ever walking through the door.”

Can you something from you guys on whether that is in fact the case.

Mike

[Redacted]

(b)(6)

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 3:41 PM
To: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal)
Subject: RE: Final / NBC / Isikoff / Yemen CT

(b)(3)

Roger, understood. Events that have been alleged. Again, the comments must be attributed to Admin official.

As for lunch, I’ve find it impossible to get out of this building for anything and am daily stuck in meetings about meeting. Have only been able to get out to lunch once since I’ve been here. Sorry, but I’ll have to get back to you.

From: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal) [mailto:[Redacted]@nbcuni.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 3:29 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Final / NBC / Isikoff / Yemen CT

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

Dean—thanks. Got it and helpful enough But as long as were being precise in use of words, I didn’t “allege” these events! I was asking questions about what others are saying – to get the USG’s guidance about it believes to be the facts.

That said, what about that lunch we talked about? Pick some days.

Mike

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 3:24 PM
To: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal)
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Final / NBC / Isikoff / Yemen CT

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

Mike:

We have no guidance for you on either of the events you allege below. Feel free to say CIA declined comment.

If you need comments on the Administration’s CT policy, transparency, etc, feel free to use the following quotes from “an Administration official.”

- As a part of his commitment to transparency, in a comprehensive address at National Defense University on May 23, President Obama laid out the legal and policy framework for the U.S. counterterrorism strategy. The President directly addressed the issue of civilian casualties in his speech. He made clear that it is a hard fact that U.S. strikes have resulted in civilian casualties, a risk that exists in every war.
- In the President's speech, he addressed why the United States may choose to undertake strikes using drones. He said: Conventional airpower or missiles are far less precise than drones, and are likely to cause more civilian casualties and more local outrage. Invasions lead us to be viewed as occupying armies, unleash a torrent of unintended consequences, are difficult to contain, result in large numbers of civilian casualties and ultimately empower those who thrive on violent conflict.
- In addition, he said: To do nothing in the face of terrorist networks would invite far more civilian casualties -- not just in our cities at home and our facilities abroad, but also in the very places where terrorists seek a foothold. Remember that the terrorists we are after target civilians, and the death toll from their acts of terrorism dwarfs any estimate of civilian casualties from drone strikes.
- By narrowly targeting our action against those who want to kill us and not the people they hide among, we are choosing the course of action least likely to result in the loss of innocent life.
- U.S. counterterrorism operations are precise, lawful, and effective and the United States does not take lethal strikes when we or our partners have the ability to capture individual terrorists. Our preference is always to detain, interrogate, and prosecute.
- We take extraordinary care to make sure that our counterterrorism actions are in accordance with all applicable domestic and international law and that they are consistent with U.S. values and policy. Of particular note, before we take any counterterrorism strike outside areas of active hostilities, there must be near-certainty that no civilians will be killed or injured -- the highest standard we can set.
- While we will not be commenting on the details or locations of specific counterterrorism operations, the President has committed to undertaking these activities with the greatest possible transparency, and we will continue to share as much information as possible with the American people, the Congress, and the international community, consistent with our national security needs and the proper functioning of the Executive Branch.
- When there are indications that civilian deaths may have occurred, intelligence analysts draw on a large body of information -- including human intelligence, signals intelligence, media reports, and surveillance footage -- to help us make informed determinations about whether civilians were in fact killed or injured.
- Substantial information concerning U.S. counterterrorism strikes is collected through a variety of sources and methods. That information has been and will continue to be made available to appropriate committees in Congress. In order to preserve those sources and methods, however, we do not make the information publicly available.

Thanks,

Dean Boyd
Director
CIA Office of Public Affairs



(b)(3)

From: Isikoff, Michael (NBCUniversal) [mailto: [redacted]@nbcuni.com]

(b)(6)

Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2013 1:14 PM

To: [redacted]

(b)(3)

Subject: Yemeni strikes

Dean—On the matter we talked about....

- 1) Have interviewed today Faisal Bin Ali Gaber, an environmental engineer with the Yemeni Environmental Protection Agency, who described the killing of his brother-in-law, Salem Ahmed bin Ali Jaber, an imam, and his nephew, Walid Abdullah bin Ali Jabel, a local police officer, in a drone strike that killed five people in a village near Mukalla in eastern Yemen on Aug. 29, 2012. This strike was featured in the recent Human Rights Watch report and in his New York Times story last August...

<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/world/middleeast/with-brennan-pick-a-light-on-drone-strikes-hazards.html>

Gaber says that his brother in law had preached against Al Qaeda on the Friday before his death. According to his account, three apparent militants came to challenge him on his sermon when the drones strike occurred. He describes seeing body pieces and being in shock after the attack, and being told a few days later in a phone call from a Yemeni counter-terrorism official that the killing of his brother in law and his nephew was a "mistake." "I want an investigation and to know who all is responsible for these deaths and who will be held accountable...the whole village was terrorized by this strike," he said. He said people in his village were "very angry" about the strike and that at least two teenagers—one 14 and 16 -- joined Al Qaeda after the attack, neither of whom has been heard from since.

As you know, the President and CIA director Brennan has acknowledged civilian casualties from drone strikes. Brennan in his written response to Senate Intel said earlier this year that "in those rare instances, where civilians have been killed, action reviews have been conducted...and "if appropriate, provide condolence payments to families of those killed."

As far as the USG and CIA knows, is there any reason to question Faisal Bin Ali Gaber's account that his brother in law, the imam, and his nephew, the police officer, were the inadvertent casualties of the Aug. 29 strike? If not, is this a case where an after-action review was undertaken and is there any review or consideration of providing compensation to the families?

- 2) The Los Angeles times has recently reported on the death of the younger brother of a suspected Al Qaeda commander who was killed standing next to a car during a drone strike last June. A lawyer for Reprieve says that the younger brother, Abdualaziz Hassan Horaidan, was ten years old. What guidance can you give us on this—and whether there is an action after review undertaken?

Any comment and background guidance much appreciated.

Mike Isikoff



(b)(6)