



SILENT COUP: THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S NOT SO SECRET WAR ON TRUMP

By Carol Rushton



Rush Limbaugh calls it the “deep state.” Mark Levin calls it a “silent coup.” Others have called it a “shadow government.” The mainstream media and their surrogates, both Democrats and establishment Republicans, ridicule those who say it exists. But Trump has been under attack by forces within our own government even before he took the oath of office in January 2017.

Is there such a thing as a “deep state” or “shadow government”? Is so, what is it? And what does it have to do with our new president and his administration?

For years, those who have studied our country's radically progressive foreign and domestic policies, no matter who is elected as president whether Democrat or Republican, have attributed this to the activities of those behind the scenes, in the “shadows” inside and outside of our government, working to implement a “New World Order.” While their long-term agenda is to impose a one-world government upon the entire world, no matter if we want it or not, their short-term goal is clearly to use Obama administration “holdovers” still working throughout our vast, government bureaucracy to sabotage and bring down, if possible, the new president and his administration.

This may seem like an incredible and laughable charge to make until the evidence is examined concerning the two Trump administration officials who have come under fire in just the first few months: Retired Army Major General and former National Security Advisor Mike Flynn and former U.S. Senator and Attorney General Jeff Sessions.

Target Number One: National Security Advisor Mike Flynn



Retired Major General Michael T. Flynn had a very distinguished 33-year career with the United States Army, the majority of that time in the intelligence field in active field operations with the military. Before he was appointed director of the Defense Intelligence Agency in 2012 by President Barack Obama, Flynn co-authored *Fixing Intel: A Blueprint for Making Intelligence Relevant in Afghanistan*, in which he called for a sweeping overhaul of the United States' intelligence operations in order to improve intelligence gathering while protecting intel sources among Afghans. Flynn also co-authored a book, *The Field of Fight: How We Can Win the Global War Against Radical Islam and Its Allies*. With enough medals and decorations on his uniform to bury a tank, Flynn was a natural pick for Trump as his National Security Advisor.

Flynn had barely started his tenure as National Security Advisor when he came under attack from U.S. government officials. These officials, who were never named by media outlets and news networks, claimed Flynn had conducted “unauthorized” discussions with the Russian ambassador to the United States, Sergey Kislyak when Flynn was part of Trump's transition team and before he had actually become the new president's National Security Advisor. These discussions supposedly included the topic of sanctions against Russia, which both the government officials and the news media repeatedly characterized as “inappropriate” and “potentially illegal” (Washington Post, February 9, 2017, “National Security Advisor Flynn Discussed Sanctions With Russian Ambassador”).

The Democrat Party had already alleged for weeks that Hillary Clinton lost the election because Trump and those involved in his campaign had colluded with Russia to steal the U.S. presidential election, an election that Clinton was supposed to win. Already excited by the charge that Trump did not win the presidency legitimately, the news media flooded the American airwaves with the Flynn-Russian “scandal” numerous times each day. You could not turn on your radio, your television, or go on to the Internet without being confronted with this non-story. Because of the continuing rumors and innuendos, Flynn was pressured to issue a statement that sanctions were not part of any discussions with the Russian ambassador. After a few weeks, Flynn seemed to backtrack on this statement and said he couldn’t remember, that he had had many discussions with many people during the transition period and could not recall the exact details of every telephone call or conversation. Flynn was shortly forced to tender his resignation on February 13, 2017.

Why was Flynn attacked by people within the United States government? Wasn’t the Trump administration now in charge? Who would have an ax to grind against Flynn? These were questions that the news media never seemed to bring up.

Surely, it must be because Flynn is a life-long member of the Republican Party. Although Flynn was an advisor on Trump’s campaign team, a quick check of Flynn’s bio on Wikipedia shows that Flynn is actually a registered Democrat and describes himself as a “pro-life Democrat.”

Wikipedia reveals some clues as to why government officials, holdovers from the Obama Administration, would be hostile to someone like Flynn serving in such an important and sensitive position, advising the president of the United States.

According to his bio on Wikipedia, Flynn “was reportedly effectively forced out of the DIA after clashing with superiors over his allegedly chaotic management style and vision for the agency. In a private e-mail that was leaked online, Colin Powell said that he had heard in the DIA (apparently from later DIA director Vincent R. Stewart) that Flynn got fired because he was ‘abusive with staff, didn’t listen, worked against policy, bad management, etc.’ According to *The New York Times*, Flynn exhibited a loose relationship with facts, leading his subordinates to refer to Flynn’s repeated dubious assertions as ‘Flynn facts’.”

Chaotic management style? Abusive with staff? Made up his own facts? Flynn could not have had the distinguished, 3-decade plus career in the U.S. military, received numerous awards, and risen to positions of authority within the military if any of these things were true.

What is more likely is what Wikipedia reveals after Flynn retired from the military. “According to what Flynn had told in one final interview as DIA director, he felt like a lone voice in thinking that the United States was less safe from the threat of Islamic terrorism in 2014 than it was prior to the 9/11 attacks; he went on to state that he was pressed into retirement for questioning the Obama administration’s public narrative that Al Qaeda was close to defeat. Journalist Seymour Hersh wrote that ‘Flynn confirmed [to Hersh] that his agency had sent a constant stream of classified warnings . . . about the dire consequences of toppling [Syrian President] Assad.’ Flynn recounted that his agency was producing intelligence reports indicating that radical Islamists were the main force in the Syrian insurgency and ‘that Turkey was looking the other way when it came to the growth of the Islamic State inside Syria’.

According to Flynn, these reports ‘got enormous pushback from the Obama administration,’ who he felt ‘did not want to hear the truth.’ According to former DIA official W. Patrick Lang: ‘Flynn incurred the wrath of the White House by insisting on telling the truth about Syria . . . they shoved him out. He wouldn’t shut up.’ In an interview with Al Jazeera, Flynn criticized the Obama administration for its delay in supporting the opposition in Syria, thereby allowing for the growth of Al Nusra and other extremist forces: ‘when you don’t get in and help somebody, they’re gonna find other means to achieve their goals’ and that ‘we should have done more earlier on in this effort, you know, than we did.’”

Wikipedia also states that Flynn is a board member of ACT! For America, conservative American-Lebanese Bridget Gabriel’s organization, “and sees the Muslim faith as one of the root causes of Islamist terrorism. He has described Islam as a political ideology and a cancer. He stated in a Twitter post that ‘fear of Muslims is RATIONAL’ and included a video link claiming that Islam wants ‘80% of people enslaved or exterminated,’ which fits in with Muhammed’s goal of a global caliphate.”

The Washington Free Beacon reported, “According to White House officials speaking to the Free Beacon, Michael Flynn’s resignation was coordinated by a group of former Obama officials and loyalists who wanted to protect the Iran Deal from its largest critic. The effort included planting stories meant to discredit Flynn, the national security advisor to President Trump.

“The abrupt resignation Monday evening of White House national security adviser Michael Flynn is the culmination of a secret, months-long campaign by former Obama administration confidantes to handicap President Donald Trump’s national security apparatus and preserve the nuclear deal with Iran, according to multiple sources in and out of the White House who described to the Washington Free Beacon a behind-the-scenes effort by these officials to plant a series of damaging stories about Flynn in the national media.

“The effort, said to include former Obama administration adviser Ben Rhodes—the architect of a separate White House effort to create what he described as a pro-Iran echo chamber—included a small task force of Obama loyalists who deluged media outlets with stories aimed at eroding Flynn’s credibility, multiple sources revealed.”

In the middle of this soap-opera type drama with Flynn, a little-known California congressman in the House of Representatives, Devin Nunes, made a very critical observation. “‘There does appear to be a well orchestrated effort to attack Flynn and others in the administration,’ Republican Rep. Devin Nunes, who chairs the House select intelligence committee, told Bloomberg. ‘From the leaking of phone calls between the president and foreign leaders to what appears to be high-level FISA Court information, to the leaking of American citizens being denied security clearances, it looks like a pattern’” (The Daily Caller, February 14, 2017, “America Witnessed A ‘Well Orchestrated Effort’ To Oust Mike Flynn”).

In an interview with Fox News, Nunes went further. “If [the Flynn conversation] was picked up inadvertently, then that would have had to have been approved by someone in the last administration to actually unmask his name so that the FBI or intelligence officials knew who it was on the other end of the phone talking to the Russian ambassador. If, in fact, the press reports are right, someone made the decision to deliberately listen to General Flynn’s phone calls and that is, I think, unprecedented, unwarranted and flat-out wrong” (Fox News, February 14, “Trump, GOP Lawmakers Eye ‘Illegal’ Leaks in Wake of Flynn Resignation”). Nunes also called for an investigation into why people within the federal government were leaking information to the press.

Target Number Two: Attorney General Jeff Sessions



Buoyed by their success at getting rid of Flynn, the “deep state” sources of the Flynn leaks turned their attention to their next target: Former U.S. Senator from Alabama and staunch Republican conservative Jeff Sessions, Trump’s new Attorney General.

Sessions had met with the Russian ambassador to the U.S. Sergey Kislyak a few times during the summer of 2016 in his position as a U.S. senator but was accused of deliberately misleading Congress during the Attorney General confirmation process when he did not inform Congress of these meetings. Democrats jumped on this “revelation” as a reason to call for Sessions’ resignation as Attorney General, charging that Sessions, a Trump supporter during the primaries, had talked about presidential campaign issues with Kislyak.

NY Senator Chuck Schumer was one of the first to attack. “Last night when I read the revelations . . . and his decision to mislead Congress about those contacts, I felt a knot in the pit of my stomach. The information reported last night makes it clear, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that Attorney General Sessions cannot possibly lead an investigation. . .with these revelations, he may very well become the subject of it” (CNN, March 2, 2017, “Sessions Did not Disclose Meetings With Russian Ambassador”).

Sessions fired back. “I never met with any Russian officials to discuss issues of the campaign. I have no idea what this allegation is about. It is false.” U.S. Senator from Texas Ted Cruz described the charges against Sessions as a “nothing burger” and “nothing but political theater.” Cruz stated further that “If the Russian ambassador had called

and asked for a meeting, I imagine I'd [have] taken the meeting" and that he had met with "six ambassadors in the last five months" (Washington Examiner, March 2, 2017, "Ted Cruz Defends Jeff Sessions: Russia News is a 'Nothing Burger'").

Meetings with ambassadors from countries all around the world is something U.S. senators do on a regular basis as part of their job. After doing a little digging, some news sites revealed that prominent Democrat members of Congress who supported Hillary Clinton during the 2016 presidential campaign also met with the Kislyak. However, because some Republicans also jumped on the bandwagon against Sessions, the Attorney General felt he had no choice but to recuse himself from all investigations concerning so-called Russian influence during the 2016 presidential elections. But Sessions steadfastly rejected calls for his resignation and is still serving as Attorney General.

Target Number Three: House Intelligence Committee Chairman Congressman Devin Nunes



California Congressman and House Intelligence Committee Chairman Devin Nunes has been very effective in asking the right questions about the leaks about Mike Flynn and Jeff Sessions. So of course, Nunes became the third target of the "deep state" officials.

Nunes was seen leaving the White House grounds on March 21, 2017 and afterward confidentially announced that "members of the Trump transition team had been legally, incidentally surveilled during the final months of the Obama administration" (New York Magazine, March 29, 2017, "Nunes Had Secret White House Meeting Before Claiming Trump Team Was Surveilled").

Nunes was promptly attacked by Democrats as being compromised in House investigations concerning Russia-Trump ties. Democrats demanded Nunes resign his committee chairmanship. Nunes refused. If Nunes had resigned from the House Intelligence Committee, the Democrats would not have been satisfied; they would have then demanded Nunes resign from his House seat.

The Bombshells: Susan Rice and Evelyn Farkas



One of the most prominent Democrats attacking Nunes was fellow California Congressman Adam Schiff, Nunes' counterpart on the House Intelligence Committee. Schiff had openly said there was evidence that Trump and his campaign had colluded with the Russian government to "illegally" defeat Hillary Clinton. But after Schiff was also allowed to view the same documents Nunes had seen previously, he refused to confirm that previous charge.

Now we know why. Journalists Mike Cernovich and Eli Lake reported that Susan Rice, President Barack Obama's National Security Advisor, was responsible for ordering that Trump campaign members be revealed as having discussions with Russian officials.

In "Top Obama Adviser Sought Names of Trump Associates in Intel" for Bloomberg News, Eli Lake reported the following in his blockbuster column of April 3, 2017.

“White House lawyers last month discovered that the former national security adviser Susan Rice requested the identities of U.S. persons in raw intelligence reports on **dozens of occasions** that connect to the Donald Trump transition and campaign, according to U.S. officials familiar with the matter . . .

“The intelligence reports were summaries of monitored conversations – primarily between foreign officials discussing the Trump transition, but also in some cases direct contact between members of the Trump team and monitored foreign officials. **One U.S. official familiar with the reports said they contained valuable political information on the Trump transition such as whom the Trump team was meeting, the views of Trump associates on foreign policy matters and plans for the incoming administration...**

“Rice herself has not spoken directly on the issue of unmasking. Last month when she was asked on the ‘PBS NewsHour’ about reports that Trump transition officials, including Trump himself, were swept up in incidental intelligence collection, Rice said: **‘I know nothing about this,’ adding, ‘I was surprised to see reports from Chairman Nunes on that account today.’**”

Just as a reminder, Susan Rice was the Obama administration official who made numerous appearances on news shows after the Benghazi attacks that killed U.S. Ambassador Chris Stevens, Information Officer Sean Smith and two CIA agents, Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods. Rice claimed that an obscure video ridiculing Islam’s Prophet Mohammed was responsible for inflaming Muslims throughout Africa and the Middle East to the point where they rioted and killed the four Americans in Libya.

Susan Rice *lie?* Perish the thought!

HotAir.com also observed in “Report: Susan Rice Requested ‘Unmasking’ of U.S. Persons in Raw Intel Connected to Trump” on April 3, 2017 that Eli Lake made a good point “elsewhere in his story in noting that this helps explain why Nunes had to make that mysterious trip to the White House grounds to view intelligence about surveillance of Trump transition staffers. If he was looking at requests from Susan Rice to ‘unmask’ American citizens in foreign intel reports, it stands to reason that they’d be on NSC computers there.”



All this was confirmed by former Obama administration Evelyn Farkas earlier in March 2017 in an interview with Mika Brzezinski on MSNBC’s “The Morning Joe” as reported by The Right Scoop website on March 29, 2017, “Whoa: Former Top Obama Official Actually Admits That They Spied on Trump’s Team.” The Right Scoop quoted an article originally found on Fox News.

“A former top Obama administration official has acknowledged efforts by her colleagues to gather intelligence on Trump team ties to Russia before Donald Trump took office and to conceal the sources of that intelligence from the incoming administration.

“Evelyn Farkas, deputy assistant secretary of defense under Obama, made the disclosure while on the air with MSNBC’s Mika Brzezinski.

“I was urging my former colleagues, and frankly speaking the people on the Hill, it was more actually aimed at telling the Hill people, get as much information as you can, get as much intelligence as you can, before President Obama leaves the administration, because I had a fear that somehow that information would disappear with the senior [Obama] people who left, so it would be hidden away in the bureaucracy . . . **that the Trump folks - if they found out how we knew what we knew about the Trump staff dealing with Russians -** that they would try to compromise those sources and methods, meaning we no longer have access to that intelligence.”

At first, Rice said she didn’t know what people were talking about; she knew nothing about any surveillance of Trump campaign staffers, let alone revealing their identities from telephone conversations they thought were private. But the pressure on Rice kept building until she finally had to admit that she had been involved in “unmasking” of the

identities of some American citizens but denied that there had been any political motivation in it at all (Front Page Magazine, April 4, 2017, “Susan Rice Admits ‘Unmasking’ Some Wiretapped Americans”).

The same article revealed that in an interview with MSNBC, Rice refused to say “whether she had viewed intelligence involving Trump and his aides. She said that information is classified.”

Andy McCarthy, former assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, columnist, and author, doesn’t buy any of it. In an article published on April 4, 2017 by National Review, “Susan Rice’s White House Unmasking: A Watergate-style Scandal,” McCarthy states bluntly that the White House does not investigate anyone. Only three agencies in the United States government perform intelligence gathering of any kind: The FBI, CIA, and NSA. As a White House employee, Rice only reads the intelligence information provided by these three agencies.

McCarthy continues unsparingly. “Understand: There would have been no *intelligence* need for Susan Rice to ask for identities to be unmasked. If there had been a real need to reveal the identities - *an intelligence need based on American interests* - the unmasking would have been done by the investigating agencies. The national security adviser is not an investigator. She is a White House staffer. The president’s staff is a *consumer* of intelligence, not a generator or collector of it. If Susan Rice was unmasking Americans, it was not to fulfill an intelligence need based on American interests; it was to fulfill a *political desire based on Democratic-party interests*” (National Review).

McCarthy was not the only one to condemn Rice. Fox News reported the analysis of Rice’s conduct by two intelligence experts. According to Fox, retired U.S. Army Lt. Col Tony Shaffer “has experience in intelligence operations focused on foreign actors in which U.S. citizens’ involvement could surface” (FoxNews.com, April 5, 2017, “Susan Rice’s Alleged Unmasking Requests Not So Routine, Ex-Officials Say”).

Shaffer said, “From my direct experience dealing at this level, [unmasking requests by the national security advisor are] never done. The national security adviser person is a manager position, not an analyst position. You have analysts in the intelligence community whose job is to sort through who is doing what with what. Susan Rice is a senior manager looking over the entire intelligence community. She should not have time to be unmasking individuals having conversations. It’s insane. It’s never done.” Shaffer also said that “a U.S. citizen’s interaction with a foreign target is not typically reason enough to unmask an American.”

Conclusion

When Barack Obama was running for president in 2008, conservative Israeli news media outlets reported several times about Obama campaign staffers contacting Hamas officials before the November 2008 elections. Hamas, which means “chaos,” is one of the most vicious terrorist organizations in the world. Hamas terrorists have killed hundreds of Israelis and wounded thousands more since the 1980s. The Hamas Charter blatantly states that its goal is the total destruction and elimination of the Jewish State of Israel. Although this did not interest the American press at all, Trump campaign officials talking to a Russian ambassador pales in comparison to this outrageous behavior. Also, in 2015 President Obama blatantly and openly interfered in the Israeli elections by giving hundreds of thousands of U.S. taxpayer dollars to a group in Israel trying to overthrow the conservative Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu (The Washington Times, July 12, 2016, “Obama Administration Sent Taxpayer Money to Campaign to Oust Netanyahu”). Liberals had no problem with Obama’s interference in the elections of our only friend and ally in the Middle East but Trump campaign staffers can’t even have legitimate meetings with Russian officials? Talk about the pot calling the kettle black!

All this talk about Russian influence in the 2017 U.S. presidential campaign is utter nonsense. Russia did not influence one American to vote or not vote for Donald Trump. However, the evidence is absolutely clear and irrefutable: Obama administration officials deliberately have tried to destroy the presidency of Donald Trump even before it started. If not for the courageous determination and dogged investigations of Congressman Devin Nunes and independent conservative news sources, they would have been successful.

It doesn't take much to imagine that those responsible for this unprecedented "silent coup" go beyond Susan Rice. I would not be surprised if this scandal involved those in President Obama's inner circle, including the former president himself.

This is where the real investigation should be conducted, not on this phony "Russian election influence" nonsense. All Americans, whether Republican, Democrat, or Independent should be outraged and demand that everyone in the Obama administration who took part in trying to unseat a legally elected president should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, ending up with those responsible wearing bright orange jumpsuits in a very secure facility with bars on the windows. I won't hold my breath that this will ever happen.

Editor's Note: *Carol Rushton is a prolific writer and broadcaster in the areas of Bible Prophecy and current events. She is an expert on the Middle East, having lived in Israel for several years.*

Reprints of this publication may be obtained from:

Southwest Prophecy Ministries

P.O. Box 58043, Oklahoma City, OK 73157

5 copies for \$5.00; 25 copies for \$15.00; 100 copies for \$60

You can listen to our weekly radio broadcasts at www.swpm.us