



**Sam Vinograd** @sam\_vinograd

30 Jul 19 · 8 tweets · [sam\\_vinograd/status/1156020310887415810](https://twitter.com/sam_vinograd/status/1156020310887415810)



Why this matters: [@ODNIgov](#) integrates intel and (is supposed to) provide it to policy makers so that they can formulate policies that keep Americans safe.

**Washington Post: Breaking News, World, US, DC News & Analysis**

Breaking news and analysis on politics, business, world national news, entertainment more. In-depth DC, Virginia, Maryland news coverage including traffic, weather, crime, education, restaurant review...

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/some-officials-fear-trump-will-get-the-...>

2. If the IC's number one intel customer - [@POTUS](#) - censors that intel because of his own insecurities or campaign agenda, policies aren't made based on actual intelligence. Or they aren't made at all.
3. If [@POTUS](#) cherry-picks intel, Americans' security is compromised in favor of the President's political and personal agenda.
4. Intel assessments aren't what a President wants to hear - they are what he needs to hear to approve policies that advance our security (vs mitigating his own insecurities).
5. If intel analysts are worried that the President either isn't digesting their analysis or that they'll be penalized for providing unbiased assessments that don't align with campaign pledges or his own "assessments" that could have a chilling effect on their work.
6. If the President (and members of his team) signal that the IC conducting counterintelligence work needed to keep us safe is off limits, that gives other countries (like Russia) the upper hand.
7. Intel assessments aren't about proving [@POTUS](#) right or wrong. They're provided as an input to the policy making process.
8. [@ODNIgov](#) is supposed to be the President's principal advisor on intelligence. He's there to advance US national security, not ameliorate the President's insecurities.

...