

Request for Preliminary Standards-Based Review

Inspector General,

I respectfully submit the enclosed memorandum and supporting materials for your consideration and request a preliminary, standards-based review of the matters described therein.

This submission concerns the planning, drafting, and dissemination of the October 19, 2020 Public Statement on the Hunter Biden Laptop commonly referred to as the “Letter of 51.” The memorandum applies established analytic integrity standards and intelligence tradecraft practices as diagnostic frameworks to evaluate whether the conduct at issue exhibits actions consistent with coordinated intelligence deception operations, and to assess the resulting implications for institutional integrity, public trust, and the use of professional US intelligence authority in public-facing contexts.

The enclosed materials do not assert criminal findings or seek adjudication of protected speech, but rather request evaluation of whether the conduct at issue, when assessed using those intelligence and analytic frameworks, reveals indicators of coordinated deception activity by US intelligence professionals warranting further inquiry.

I respectfully request acknowledgement of receipt and an indication of whether this submission will be accepted for preliminary review within 30 days. I am available to discuss at your will.

Respectfully,

Thomas C. Kuhns

Former Director – Analytic Tradecraft Development, Performance, and Quality

Thomas C. Kuhns



MASTER MEMORANDUM

INTRODUCTION – WHY THIS REVIEW MATTERS

My name is **Thomas C. Kuhns**. I am a former Senior Intelligence Officer and former advisor to the Deputy Director of National Intelligence under President Obama. I spent most of my intelligence career leading and managing **Analytic Integrity and Standards programs across the Intelligence Community (IC)**, for which I received multiple agency- and IC-level awards.

This assessment is not a political statement. It is based on the research and analysis of testified behavior, language choices, omissions, coordination, and effects attributable to intelligence tradecraft.

This analysis is grounded in my expertise applying analytic integrity standards and intelligence tradecraft to evaluate raw and finished intelligence assessments/judgements. Those standards provide a framework to identify politicization, bias, and analytic weaknesses, as well as to identify whether intelligence tradecraft itself has been misapplied or misused.

Applying this framework, the planning, drafting, and dissemination of the Public Statement on the Hunter Biden Emails (commonly referred to as the “Letter of 51”) exhibit characteristics consistent with coordinated intelligence deception operations and tradecraft, which warrants a standards-based review to assess whether the conduct constituted a deception operation involving trained US intelligence professionals targeting the American People.

I did not set out to reexamine the “Letter of 51.” I had not reviewed it closely at the time of its publication, but recent developments prompted a closer look. Upon reading the statement in full, I noted significant deficiencies in how its bottom-line judgment was communicated—particularly given that it was authored by experienced intelligence professionals at a moment requiring heightened analytic care and precision. This prompted a line-by-line review of the statement’s drafting, editing, and release process, the results of which raised serious concerns regarding the potential misuse of intelligence tradecraft in a public-facing context, with implications for analytic integrity, institutional trust, and democratic processes that went beyond “politics as usual.”

This review identified conduct raising serious concerns regarding breaches of intelligence professional ethics and analytic integrity, as well as activities consistent with coordinated intelligence deception operations involving expertise across intelligence collection, analytic, and operational domains.

The key question involves the presence of intelligence deception tradecraft targeting the American People by US Intelligence Professionals.

This memorandum explains why.

KEY ANALYTIC FRAME

A prior congressional review by the **House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence** examined some aspects of the Letter of 51, focusing primarily on issues of political coordination, campaign contact, disclaimers, and whether the statement constituted protected speech by former officials.

That review did not assess the Letter of 51 using **intelligence deception or influence tradecraft diagnostic frameworks**, nor did it evaluate indicator density, verification avoidance, language strengthening, distribution-channel messaging, or effects optimization. It did not examine whether trained intelligence professionals misused their expertise in analytic and operational tradecraft to shape public perception while preserving plausible deniability, as formal intelligence deception operations often do.

This review does not revisit questions of political propriety or speech. It addresses an analytic gap left unexamined by prior review: whether the Letter's language, authoring process, editing decisions, and release mechanics exhibit the indicators, motive, and effects of a coordinated deception or influence operation as understood in US intelligence and National Security doctrines.

Accordingly, this assessment is **complementary**, not contradictory to prior congressional findings. It applies a different analytic lens—one grounded in intelligence professional tradecraft standards and diagnostics—to identify realities prior reviews did not evaluate.

A line-by-line review of the Letter of 51 reveals heavy use of **deception tradecraft by skilled authors**. A review of the operational elements surrounding the statement—authoring, editing, and release—reveals evidence of an **organized, managed, and coordinated Deception Operation** conducted by US intelligence professionals.

In the intelligence profession, **deception is assessed by indicators and effects—not by confessions of intent**. When senior intelligence tradecraft experts systematically violate analytic standards in a single, directionally beneficial way—while avoiding readily available disconfirming information—that behavior constitutes evidence of **knowing misuse**, not error.

CONTEXT

In October 2020, approximately three weeks before the presidential election, the *New York Post* published a story concerning emails from a laptop belonging to Hunter Biden.

Within days, 51 former intelligence and national security professionals organized and released a public statement asserting that the material's emergence bore "the hallmarks of a Russian information operation."

The statement carried extraordinary weight because it relied explicitly on the **professional credibility of former senior intelligence and national security officials.**

WHAT WAS KNOWN AT THE TIME

At the time the statement was published:

- The FBI had possessed the laptop since 2019;
- FBI analysis judged that the laptop showed no signs of foreign tampering;
- The FBI was actively using the laptop as evidence in ongoing criminal investigations; and
- The DNI stated publicly there was no intelligence indicating Russian involvement.

Based on testimony and public accounts, **none of the authors or signatories sought confirmation from the FBI.**

Notably, **no former or current FBI officials—despite the Bureau's custodial and investigative role—were included in authoring or review.**

Several authors held active security clearances at the time and chose not to seek confirmation.

All the authors have a large social and professional network that includes former and current FBI professionals; no one asked.

The primary author, former Director of CIA Analysis Michael Morell, did not request classified or unclassified confirmation from the responsible authority.

Former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper strengthened the language of the statement during the editing process without seeking classified confirmation, which he was permitted to do as a former DNI.

Knowingly avoiding the primary authoritative source when clarity is readily available constitutes **purposeful omission**.

WHY INNOCENT EXPLANATIONS FAIL

There are only three plausible explanations for this omission:

1. Incompetence
2. Negligence
3. Purposeful avoidance of disconfirming information

Given the seniority, experience, and analytic background of the authors, incompetence is implausible.

Negligence at this level remains professionally disqualifying.

Purposeful avoidance of disconfirming information is the most consistent explanation for the observed behavior.

My analysis of the statement's authoring, editing, and release process further supports the conclusion that the activity constituted a **coordinated Deception Operation** conducted by US intelligence professionals.

OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS – DECEPTION INDICATORS

A review of the Letter's operational processes (authoring, editing, and release) reveals the application of operational and analytic deception tradecraft by individuals with the expertise to employ it effectively.

Indicator 1 — Trained Actors with Intelligence Tradecraft Expertise

The organizers and principal authors of the Letter of 51 were senior intelligence professionals, including former CIA operational and analytic tradecraft experts with decades of experience producing intelligence for senior policymakers.

At this level of seniority:

Thomas C. Kuhns

- familiarity with communication tradecraft best practices is assumed
- familiarity with analytic standards and rigor is assumed
- awareness of information effects is intrinsic
- deviations from tradecraft norms carry heightened analytic significance

Systematic tradecraft violations by highly-experienced practitioners materially reduce the plausibility of innocent explanations. **Expertise collapses the margin for error.**

Indicator 2 — Coordination and Deliberate Orchestration

The Letter of 51 was not a spontaneous expression of individual speech. It involved:

- centralized planning, drafting, editing, and release
- evidence of leadership and direction beyond the identified primary author
- deliberate recruitment of select signatories
- planning and sequencing of release
- coordinated dissemination through select media outlets

These features indicate **organized activity by trained intelligence professionals**, not ad hoc commentary. Coordination is a core operational indicator distinguishing deception operations from decentralized misinformation or individual speech.

Indicator 3 — Selective Information and Purposeful Omission

Intelligence deception is defined as **the deliberate inducement of false beliefs in a target audience to achieve an outcome based on information other than the truth.**

The organizers admittedly did not seek the best possible source of information – confirmation from the custodial investigative authority. They also did not include one former FBI professional in their process.

Instead, they relied on weak, media-based sourcing contrary to analytic best practices.

At the time of publication:

- the FBI had possessed the laptop and its contents for approximately one year

- the FBI had assessed that the laptop/material showed no signs of foreign tampering
- the FBI was actively using the material in criminal investigations

This information would have weakened the organizer's chosen bottom line.

In intelligence doctrine, **avoidance of primary authoritative sources when clarity is readily available constitutes purposeful omission**, particularly when undertaken by experienced analytic professionals.

Indicator 4 — Authority Laundering and Effects Optimization

The operational design of the Letter of 51 relied on **credential-based authority rather than evidentiary disclosure**.

Key features include:

- foregrounding former intelligence and national security titles
- absence of supporting evidence
- language structured to survive scrutiny while inviting a singular inference
- misleading framing in the release email to select media outlets

Downstream media amplification converted analytic caveats into public certainty. **The operational effect was predictable and foreseeable, particularly to professionals trained in information effects.**

The coordinated release occurred within a narrow electoral decision window, amplifying impact while minimizing opportunity for verification or rebuttal. Timing functioned as an operational force multiplier.

Indicator 5 — Evidence of Deception Tradecraft in the Letter Itself

Media, congressional, and political reviews of the Letter of 51 were not structured to identify deception indicators and did not reveal deceptive practices identified in this analytic and operational review.

My line-by-line examination of the letter revealed **repeated misuse** of analytic tradecraft and the application of deception tradecraft techniques, including:

Deception Tradecraft Technique	Description	Foreseeable Impact on Audience
Authority Laundering / Credential Bundling	Use of senior intelligence titles and collective credentials to elevate unsupported or unverified judgments.	Suppresses skepticism and accelerates acceptance based on perceived institutional authority.
Probabilistic Framing without Evidentiary Disclosure	Use of analytic-sounding probability language absent transparent evidentiary support.	Creates false confidence in the underlying assessment.
Collective Endorsement Framing	Presentation of assessments as a unified professional judgment rather than individual opinion.	Signals artificial consensus and suppresses alternative interpretations.
Coordinated Amplification	Simultaneous or near-simultaneous dissemination by multiple credentialed individuals.	Amplifies perceived legitimacy through repetition and volume.
Inference Stacking	Layering multiple inferential claims absent direct evidentiary grounding.	Creates the appearance of analytic rigor without substantiation.
Caveat Shielding	Pairing disclaimers with authoritative assertions to limit accountability.	Preserves persuasive impact while reducing perceived responsibility.
Timing Exploitation	Release at a decision-critical or high-salience moment.	Maximizes behavioral impact on the target audience.
Impact-aware Messaging	Use of language known to influence perception and behavior.	Shapes audience response in predictable ways.
Authority-based Heuristic Substitution	Reliance on perceived expertise as a substitute for evidentiary evaluation.	Short-circuits independent critical assessment.
Suppression of Alternative Hypotheses	Presentation of an analytic judgment without articulating plausible alternative explanations or competing hypotheses.	Narrows perceived analytic space and elevates the presented judgment as the only credible explanation.

Random error does not produce multiple, mutually reinforcing deception tradecraft techniques compressed into a single, brief statement. The density of deception techniques in such a short document is itself evidence of intent.

This is not how intelligence professionals inform or warn. This is how intelligence professionals shape perception.

LEGAL AND ACCOUNTABILITY FRAME

If the primary intent had been to warn the American public, experienced intelligence professionals would have sought confirmation from the FBI, the custodial investigative authority. The deliberate decision not to do so—by individuals with the expertise and access to know better—renders the asserted “warning” rationale analytically implausible.

This also goes beyond “DC politics.” Coordinated and planned deployment of intelligence deception tradecraft through a public statement constitutes conduct, not protected speech, and warrants standards-based review.

If such conduct is found to have impaired or unduly influenced democratic processes, it may warrant examination under existing federal legal frameworks, including:

- Conspiracy to defraud the United States (18 USC. §371)
- False statements by material omission (18 USC. §1001)
- Election interference by misuse of authority (18 USC. §595)

These statutes are identified as **potential legal frameworks for review**, not as charging assertions, which are properly the province of investigative and prosecutorial authorities. The absence of enforcement does not negate their applicability.

CONCLUSION

The planning, creation and dissemination of the Letter of 51 by trained intelligence professionals possesses and meets the doctrinal definition and characteristics of a **Deception Operation**: *the conveyance of selected information and indicators to influence the motives and objective reasoning of a target audience.*

In this case, the target audience was the **American People**.

When trained US intelligence professionals and leaders misuse intelligence tradecraft to manipulate the American people rather than inform them, **accountability is not optional – whether they are employed by an agency or not**. It is essential to the preservation of institutional trust and democratic legitimacy.

Please see the following appendices:

- Appendix A: Public Statement on the Hunter Biden Laptop
- Appendix B: Analytic Tradecraft Standards
- Appendix C: Authoring, Editing, and Release Process
- Appendix D: Witness Testimony

Appendix A

Primary Source Document

Title

**Public Statement on the Hunter Biden Emails
(October 19, 2020)**

Description

This appendix contains the full, original public statement titled “**Public Statement on the Hunter Biden Emails,**” dated **October 19, 2020**, including the complete list of named signatories as released.

The document is attached in full as a primary-source exhibit.

Source and Provenance

The attached document was publicly released on October 19, 2020, and published by *Politico*.

It is reproduced here in its entirety from the Politico-hosted version of the statement.

No alterations, interpretations, annotations, or analytic judgments have been applied to the attached document.

Purpose of Inclusion

This appendix is provided to permit independent review of the exact language, claims, qualifiers, and representations made in the public statement by the signatories.

No analytic conclusions are drawn in this appendix. All analysis and evaluative discussion appear in the main body of the submission.

Document Metadata

Thomas C. Kuhns

Page 11 of 23

- **Document Title:** Public Statement on the Hunter Biden Emails
 - **Date:** October 19, 2020
 - **Classification:** Unclassified
 - **Distribution:** Public release via national media
 - **Contents:**
 - Full public statement text
 - Complete list of named signatories
-

**(Please see the separate included verbatim Public Statement. Also available:
<https://www.politico.com/f/?id=00000175-4393-d7aa-af77-579f9b330000>)**

Appendix B

Analytic Standards and Professional Obligations

B.1 Governing Analytic Standards

This appendix identifies the analytic standards and professional obligations governing intelligence analysis and intelligence-informed public commentary. These standards are established by Intelligence Community Directive (ICD) 203, which codifies core principles for analytic integrity across the U.S. Intelligence Community.

Core analytic standards include, but are not limited to:

- Objectivity and independence from political considerations
- Based on all available sources of information, classified and unclassified
- Proper expression of uncertainty and confidence
- Evidentiary sufficiency and transparency
- Clear distinction between evidence, inference, and judgment
- Avoidance of advocacy or misleading framing based on authority

Intelligence agencies teach, adopt, and evaluate analysis and judgements based on these standards as part of their analytic tradecraft.

B.2 Applicability to Former Senior Intelligence Officials

Although Intelligence Community Directives formally govern serving intelligence professionals, the analytic standards they codify reflect professional norms and tradecraft obligations that extend beyond formal government employment. Acceptance of the concept and canonization of “intelligence tradecraft” implies a profession with unique knowledge and skills developed through training, education, and experience.

These standards are particularly relevant to former senior intelligence officials who:

- Held leadership roles responsible for analytic integrity and standards enforcement.
- Taught, supervised, or evaluated analytic tradecraft.
- Served as senior intelligence customer briefers and presenters.
- Continue to invoke intelligence credentials and authority in public discourse.
- Continue to work on national security policy issues or analysis at US NGOs, defense and intelligence contractors, academia, etc.

When former senior intelligence officials issue coordinated public statements framed as intelligence-informed and tradecraft-backed assessments (while using their former official titles) these professional standards provide an appropriate benchmark for evaluating analytic rigor, integrity and true motives. The exact same way the Intelligence Community identifies the analytic shortfalls, bias, and motivations of its “authors” or intelligence officers.

B.3 Analytic Standards Relevance Mapping

Analytic Standard (ICD 203)	What the Standard Requires	Why the Standard Is Relevant in This Context
Objectivity	Analysis must be unbiased and independent of political considerations.	The public statement was issued during an active presidential election and framed as an intelligence-informed assessment while testimony indicates otherwise.
Proper Expression of Uncertainty	Analysts must clearly distinguish between evidence, inference, and confidence levels.	The statement advances probabilistic judgments while disclaiming direct evidence.
Evidentiary Sufficiency	Analytic judgments must be supported by sufficient and transparent evidence.	Assertions of "classic earmarks" are made without presenting underlying evidentiary support.
Distinction Between Analysis and Advocacy	Intelligence analysis must not advocate political or policy outcomes.	The timing and framing of the statement had foreseeable electoral implications.
Tradecraft Integrity	Analysts must avoid misleading framing based on institutional or professional authority.	The statement invokes collective senior intelligence authority in a public forum.

Judgements Based on All Available Sources of Information	Analysts must base their arguments, judgements, and assessments on all available sources of information, classified and unclassified.	None of the authors asked for a classified briefing on the most current information; and none checked with the FBI despite the Bureau's custodial and investigative role in the laptop.
--	---	---

B.4 Oversight Relevance

These analytic standards exist to safeguard public trust, prevent politicization of intelligence, and preserve analytic integrity. When intelligence professionals publicly invoke their authority in ways that raise questions regarding adherence to these standards, oversight review is appropriate to assess potential institutional and systemic impacts.

This appendix does not assert violations or intent. It provides the standards framework necessary for independent oversight and evaluation.

Appendix C — Authoring, Editing, and Release Process

Purpose

This appendix documents the **origin, authoring, drafting, editing, coordination, and dissemination** of the “Letter of 51,” based on **sworn congressional testimony and contemporaneous accounts** by participants.

The purpose is to determine whether the statement reflects **spontaneous individual expression** or **organized, effects-aware activity** by trained intelligence professionals.

This appendix reconstructs **process**, not motive. Questions of intent are addressed in the main memorandum and related appendices.

C-1. Origin of the Letter

Congressional testimony establishes that the initiative to draft the statement originated with **Michael Morell**, former Acting Director and Director of Analysis at the CIA.

Morell testified that:

- he drafted the letter following outreach from Antony Blinken from the Biden campaign;
- the letter was intended to influence public understanding during the 2020 election;
- the statement was produced rapidly following publication of the *New York Post* story on October 14, 2020.

The drafting effort began immediately after the media reporting and proceeded under significant time compression.

C-2. Drafting and Cross-Domain Contributions

Morell served as the **primary drafter** of the initial text.

Sworn testimony further establishes that **Marc Polymeropoulos**, a former senior CIA operations officer with extensive collection and operational experience, **provided multiple paragraphs** that contributed to early drafts of the letter.

This cross-domain drafting is analytically significant. The participation of:

- a senior **analytic authority** (Morell), and
- a senior **operations and collection professional** (Polymeropoulos)

produced a document combining analytic legitimacy with operational credibility. This structure expands perceived intelligence authority beyond analysis alone and signals access and expertise without evidentiary disclosure.

Such pairing is consistent with **deliberate credibility engineering**, not ad hoc commentary.

C-3. Editorial Review and Language Shaping

Testimony indicates that the letter underwent **multiple revisions** and was subject to **senior-level editorial input** prior to release.

Notably:

- senior former intelligence officials reviewed and influenced language;
- edits strengthened the certainty and authority of the Russia framing;
- internal caveats were preserved while the overall inference path was maintained.

Multiple witnesses described the removal of draft language that was viewed as “**too political**” or overtly partisan. This included language that explicitly defended Vice President Biden’s actions and framed opponents’ claims as false.

The removal of overt advocacy while preserving persuasive structure **reflects effects-aware language refinement** designed to maximize impact while maintaining plausible deniability.

C-3A. Senior-Level Editorial Strengthening of Attribution Language

Email correspondence between Michael Morell and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper documents deliberate senior-level editorial strengthening of the letter’s attribution language.

In this exchange, Clapper proposed replacing softer, subjective phrasing describing the “feel” of a Russian operation with stronger tradecraft language asserting that the material bore “all the classic earmarks of a Soviet/Russian information operation.” Morell subsequently confirmed that this editorial suggestion was accepted and incorporated into the final version of the letter.

This change is analytically significant. The revised language increased certainty and authoritative tone **without the introduction of new evidence** or consultation with the custodial investigative authority.

For trained intelligence professionals, elevating indicator-based language into stronger attributional phrasing under these conditions constitutes confidence laundering and pattern substitution, not neutral clarification.

C-4. Recruitment of Signatories and Credential Amplification

After drafting, the letter was circulated for signatures among a **select group of former intelligence and national security officials**.

Testimony and records indicate that:

- recruitment was **deliberate and targeted**, not open or spontaneous;
- seniority, Russia-related credentials, and institutional pedigree were emphasized;
- signatories were used to amplify authority and perceived consensus;
- no former FBI officials were included, despite the FBI's custodial and investigative role.

This recruitment approach multiplied credibility while dispersing accountability across a large group of endorsers.

C-4A. Signatory Recruitment, Credential Engineering, and Stated Purpose

An email sent by Michael Morell to prospective signatories documents explicit coordination, political timing awareness, and intent behind the drafting and dissemination of the "Letter of 51." In the email, Morell stated that he and Marc Polymeropoulos drafted the statement because they believed "the Russians were involved in some way" in the Hunter Biden email issue and because they anticipated that President Trump would raise the issue during the upcoming presidential debate.

Morell further stated that the purpose of the letter was "to give the VP a talking point to use in response." The email also reflects deliberate recruitment and credential optimization, including discussion of highlighting signatories' Russia-related experience, sequencing sign-ons, and making participation conditional on who else agreed to sign.

These statements are analytically significant. They document contemporaneous acknowledgment that the letter was designed to serve a specific political utility, timed to

an electoral event, and amplified through curated intelligence community credibility. Such conduct is inconsistent with neutral analytic warning behavior and reflects organized, effects-aware influence activity.

Appendix C Subsection

C-5. Media Coordination and Release

Sworn testimony and contemporaneous records establish that the release of the “Letter of 51” was coordinated in advance and under direction, not incidental.

Specifically, the record confirms that:

- media outreach was planned and coordinated prior to public release;
- specific journalists and outlets were deliberately targeted;
- the media outreach email drafted and sent by Josh Shapiro, an experienced crisis communications professional, **asserted Russian interference as a fact**, stating:
 - “The real power here however is the number of former, working-level IC officers who want the American people to know that once again the Russians are interfering.”
- sequencing and timing of release were deliberately managed to maximize immediate dissemination and amplification.

This framing is analytically significant. **While the letter itself explicitly stated that the signatories did not know whether Russia was involved and possessed no evidence of Russian attribution, the release email conveyed a level of certainty not supported by the content of the letter.**

For trained intelligence professionals familiar with information effects, placing a stronger attribution claim in the distribution channel while preserving caveats in the signed document **constitutes effects optimization and confidence laundering, not neutral transmission.**

C-6. Verification Decisions

Across multiple transcripts, witnesses acknowledged that:

- no participant sought confirmation from the FBI;

- no effort was made to consult the custodial investigative authority;
- the decision not to verify was conscious, not inadvertent.

This is analytically significant. For trained intelligence professionals, the deliberate choice not to seek readily available authoritative clarification **reflects verification avoidance**, not oversight.

C-6A. Pre-Publication Clearance Request and Time Compression

An email submitted by Michael Morell to CIA for pre-publication clearance further illustrates effects-aware process behavior. In the clearance request, Morell characterized the submission as a “rush job” that “needs to get out as soon as possible,” while preemptively asserting that the statement contained “no classified information.”

Notably, the email explicitly acknowledged uncertainty regarding what the Intelligence Community or the FBI knew about the matter, while no effort was made to seek clarification from the FBI prior to release.

For a former Acting Director of CIA and Director of CIA Analysis, the combination of urgency, preemptive minimization of review scope, and acknowledgment of unresolved authoritative knowledge is analytically significant. This pattern reflects **time-driven effects optimization and verification avoidance**, not neutral or deliberative warning behavior.

C-7. Operational Significance

The process documented above exhibits multiple characteristics inconsistent with spontaneous individual expression, including:

- centralized direction, management, and drafting;
- cross-domain authoring (analysis and operations);
- senior-level editorial refinement;
- deliberate credential amplification;
- coordinated media dissemination;
- effects-optimized timing;
- conscious verification avoidance.

Taken together, these features indicate **organized, effects-aware activity by experienced intelligence professionals**, rather than decentralized commentary or informal warning.

C-8. Relevance to the Main Memorandum

This appendix supports the memorandum's assessment that the "Letter of 51":

- was **planned, shaped, and coordinated by trained intelligence professionals**;
- reflected professional awareness of information effects;
- and functioned operationally as an **influence activity**, not a neutral analytic warning.

Questions of intent, professional responsibility, and analytic integrity are addressed in the main memorandum and in Appendices D, E, and F.

Appendix D

Witness Testimony and Transcribed Interviews Description

This appendix contains verbatim, redacted transcripts of congressional interviews and related testimony conducted as part of congressional inquiries into the October 19, 2020 public statement titled “Public Statement on the Hunter Biden Emails.” The documents are included as primary-source exhibits and are reproduced without interpretation or analytic commentary.

Source and Provenance

The attached transcripts were produced by congressional committees and released in redacted form. They are included here in their original form as obtained by the complainant. No alterations, summaries, or annotations have been applied.

Purpose of Inclusion

This appendix is provided to permit independent review of sworn or transcribed testimony by individuals involved in the drafting, coordination, signing, or dissemination of the public statement. No analytic conclusions are drawn in this appendix. All analysis and evaluative discussion appear in the main body of the submission.

Included Testimony (Inventory)

Appendix ID	Witness	Document Title	Notes
5a	James R. Clapper	Clapper Transcript (Redacted)	Former DNI; Co-drafter ‘hallmark’ edit; signatory
5b	John O. Brennan	Brennan Transcript (Redacted)	Former CIA Director; signatory
5c	Michael J. Morell	Morell Transcript (Redacted)	Former Acting CIA Director; Director of Analysis; Principal organizer/drafter

5d	Marc Polymeropoulos	Polymeropoulos Transcript (Redacted)	Former CIA Operations Chief; Co-drafter
5e	Nicholas Rasmussen	Rasmussen Transcript (Redacted)	Former CIA Officer; Signatory
5f	Nicholas Shapiro	Shapiro Transcript (Redacted)	Former CIA Media; Letter media dissemination
5g	Kristin Wood	Wood Transcript (Redacted)	Former CIA Officer; Outreach and signature collection

(Please see the included testimonies for reference. They can also be found: Judiciary Committee Releases Transcripts of Intelligence Officials Who Discredited Hunter Biden Story | House Judiciary Committee Republicans)