

The Mystery of Prior Intelligence for Non-Occurring Events of Jan 6

Leo Goldstein¹

04/16/2023²

HIGHLIGHTS

Many people on all sides of the political spectrum criticized the Capitol Police Intelligence Department (IICD) for failure to stress and share prior information about the right-wing groups' plans to attack the Capitol. However, the opposite is true: there was no information about plans to attack the Capitol and any documents alleging such plans by Trump supporters were nothing more than malicious fabrications. These fabrications played a role in the unusual behavior of the Capitol police on Jan 6 and in falsely framing the events of Jan 6 as an attack by Trump supporters.

Introduction

This paper is based on the *Farnam Interview*,ⁱ the *Donohue Interview*,ⁱⁱ *FINAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL, Appendix 1. GOVERNMENT AGENCY PREPARATION FOR AND RESPONSE TO JANUARY 6TH*,ⁱⁱⁱ the *Republican Report of Investigation*,^{iv} and a few bits from the *Sund Interview*.^v It assumes familiarity with the *Partisan Special Event Assessment of 01/03*^{vi} and *The False Alarm – Gallagher's Email of 01/05*^{vii} by the author. These short articles review the *GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03*^{viii} and the *GALLAGHER email of 01/05*,^{ix} respectively. Annex A. *Pre-J6 Intel: Some Raw Data Analysis*, based on the *GOVERNMENT AGENCY PREPARATION*, starts at p.8.

Contradictory Intelligence

Except for supposed intelligence from the *GALLAGHER email of 01/05* and the *GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03* (neither was shared before Jan 6, except with Kim SCHNEIDER and Yogananda PITTMAN, respectively), no intelligence of any group attempting to storm the Capitol existed. Let us call it "GALLAGHER intelligence". Other assessments correctly pointed out that Trump supporters are back-the-blue, law-and-order folks.

The Select Committee did an exhaustive search for sources of intelligence, indicating prior intelligence about the January 6 events, and came up empty-handed. See *Annex A* of this paper. Somebody unfamiliar with social media might be moved by posts like those attached in the *GALLAGHER's email of 01/05*, but they are worthless for intel purposes. Every day, people make billions of social media posts. Anybody anywhere in the world can anonymously post anything on most social media networks, including theDonald[.]win. Third-party tips and opinions about such posts add a layer of hearsay, conflict of interest, or partisanship. Comparing such posts from **unidentified people** (which could be anti-Trump provocateurs, as happened many time earlier) with "chatter" between **known members** of terrorist

¹ contact@defyccc.com

² Updated since the original version of 04/11/2023.

organizations is invalid. Posts from unidentified people are unauthenticated, and cannot be considered an evidence.

Wrong Themes

The “GALLAGHER intelligence” and raw data, which was later interpreted as intel about the intent of right-wing groups to attack on Jan 6, were wrong on all specifics. Of all the themes that were raised in the supposed pre-J6 intel, none happened on Jan 6:

- a) Exploitation of the Capitol tunnels system – did not happen.
- b) Carrying firearms on Capitol grounds did not happen except by antifa.³
- c) Attempts to stop Congress members on their way to the Capitol – did not happen.
- d) Attempts to clog roads to or in DC – did not happen.
- e) Attempts to target politicians, judges, or senior military or law enforcement officers at their homes – did not happen.
- f) Organized attempt from the right to breach the Capitol has yet to be discovered, despite all the efforts expanded over more than two years.

Harms from the “Gallagher intelligence”

There are signs that the “GALLAGHER intelligence” harmed the defense of the Capitol. Illogical moving of the bike racks on the night before and/or morning of Jan 6 might be related to that.⁴

Later, it would lead to incorrect attribution of the attack to Trump supporters. It might have caused illogical and unexplainable actions of the USCP on that day, from firing chemical munitions into the peaceful crowd around 1:10 pm to opening the Capitol doors to rioters around 2:10 pm.

The GALLAGHER email of 01/05 is shown as false in *The False Alarm – Gallagher’s Email of 01/05*.

³ The NBC News, <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/stun-guns-stinger-whips-crossbow-what-police-found-capitol-protesters-n1254127> | <https://archive.is/Witkq>

⁴ From an email exchange between the Architect of the Capitol Brett Blanton and his Chief Security Officer Valerie Hasberry on January 5, <https://justthenews.com/sites/default/files/2022-06/BlantonzemailJan52021.pdf>:

9:10 PM, Hasberry to Blanton: *“I wanted to pass on last minute changes for the security perimeter for tomorrow’s planned demonstrations. We received a late request to remove approximately 500 bike racks along [the F]irst street NE/SE, and along the south curb of Constitution Ave. between the North Barricade and First Street NE. My team was told the reason for the change was due to USCP’s concern that demonstrators would be trapped on the Eggs. This explanation did not track with past setups including those used in November and December. In addition, the change didn’t make sense from a security perspective.”*

9:21 PM, Blanton to Hasberry: *“This seems absolutely illogical. It removes a zone of defense. If you find out a logical impetus for the change, let me know ASAP.”*

This paper focuses on the GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03 and shows it as incompetent, corrupt, and malicious.

Julie FARNAM

Mysterious Hiring Process

Julie FARNAM was the author of the GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03 (about Jan 6), which played a central role in the misattribution of the Jan 6 Capitol invasion to Trump supporters. In hindsight, it seems intended for that exact reason by Sean GALLAGHER.

The role of the *GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03* in the false attribution of the Jan 6 Capitol breach to Trump and Trump supporters is comparable to the part of the *Steele dossier* in the Russia hoax.

Ms. FARNAM was hired as Assistant Director of the Intelligence and Interagency Coordination Division (IICD)⁵ in late October 2020 by the insistence of PITTMAN and GALLAGHER over the reluctance of USCP Chief Sund⁶. The position did not exist and was unnecessary because the division had only 10-12 employees. The position was specially created for her. She had no relevant experience, so the nomination was purely political. IICD dealt only with OSINT (Open-Source Intelligence). Ms. FARNAM was hired before the new Director and refused the offer of the retiring one to train her. Operating under the supervision of GALLAGHER, she rapidly degraded IICD capabilities⁷ and concentrated all the power in her hands.⁸

⁵ For the command structures of the Capitol Police see the *Rep. Report of Investigation*, p. 17

⁶ “So they initially was just hiring one [IICD Director], **but Chief Pittman and Chief Gallagher came after the process** and said, Hey, we also identified a number two that we think would be really good for the intelligence analysis -- analysts, and that was Julie Farnam.” – the Sund Interview. In fact, she had no intelligence experience at all.

⁷ “One IICD analyst testified to investigators: ‘That unit was disbanded by her almost on day one.’” – *Rep. Report of Investigation*, p. 3

“Upon her arrival, Farnam immediately began disassembling the open-source section ... The analyst team lead, however, described Farnam as non-responsive and hostile to the analyst’s effort to provide support.” – *Rep. Report of Investigation*, p. 52

“Analysts and other USCP sources interviewed by the Committee described how the changes implemented by Farnam undermined their work. Analysts testified to investigators that the section became “nonfunctional” immediately upon Farnam’s arrival. One analyst testified that Farnam’s changes—which were not formally communicated—stripped experts out of the roles in which their experience could be leveraged...” – *Rep. Report of Investigation*, p. 53

⁸ “The analyst further stated that **Farnam removed the open-source experts from the process to consolidate power for herself to the detriment of the safety and security of the Capitol**” – *Rep. Report of Investigation*, p. 54

“**If Farnam received an assessment and was not satisfied with the final product, she rewrote it. Analysts never saw the final intelligence product.** The final product was shared outside the division, but analysts still did not have access to the final version.” – *Rep. Report of Investigation*, p. 55

From the *Rep. Report of Investigation*: “Farnam’s only previous intelligence experience was in the Immigration Vetting Division of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Because Farnam had no relevant intelligence experience, Grahe [retiring IICD Director] intended to remain on the job to train her. According to a USCP source who testified to investigators, Farnam declined.” This might be because she or those who installed her were in a rush to replace effective leadership with partisan one and did not want the former leadership to be around.

After Jan 6, Ms. FARNAM was promoted by PELOSI et al., along with Yogananda PITTMAN and Sean GALLAGHER.

Ms. FARNAM holds an MA Degree in Intercultural Relations.

FARNAM Personality

Ms. FARNAM is a grotesque combination of incompetence, partisanship, ideological extremism, and a manager from hell. Here, Ms. FARNAM answers questions from the Committee (Q/A).

“... the officers don't necessarily know what they're looking at, they don't understand intelligence, they don't know how to operationalize the intelligence.” – This is FARNAM’s expressed opinion about senior Capitol Police officers. These officers had been successfully protecting the Capitol for decades before she arrived, and some had backgrounds in military and intelligence. She did not have a shadow of the knowledge and experience they had. She spoke even more disparagingly about those who were under her command.

When answering whether the division under her command acted under guidelines respecting the First Amendment concerns, threshold predicates, and “all these things” (the IV Amendment, I think), she answered **NO**.⁹ Yet, the division seemingly did have these concerns in the guidelines and respected them until she arrived.

“We should've been doing that [mining the donald[.]win] ... today, where we know some of the bad guys on the internet hang out, we will regularly review, like, Telegram, and we'll regularly review, like, Gettr and Parler and BitChute and Gab and some of the other, like, icky alternative social media sites.”

Here, Ms. FARNAM demonstrates incompetence, partisanship, and arrogance off the charts.

1. She was hired to lead an OSINT team, working primarily with the Internet – and yet she did not know about the existence of Gab, Gettr, Parler, Telegram, and BitChute. Worse, she did not learn about the

⁹ Exact quote: “A: ... There's a number of, you know, kind of, steps they have to take before they reach the threat assessment, before they're able to draw one.

Q: Right. **There's issues of First Amendment concerns and threshold predicates, all these things.**

A: Right.

Q: Do you have those kinds of guidelines?

A: **Not in the sense that I think what you're talking about.**

Q: Okay.” - the Farnam Interview, pp. 32-33

existence of these social media sites in two months on the job! She was practically illiterate in what she was managing.

2. She called them “icky alternative social media”. Does she think that those who do not want to live under the censorship of Big Tech are enemies? It would be unbelievable if other high-level Democrat appointees (like Nina Jankowicz, the head of the proposed DHS Disinformation Governance Board, now a registered foreign agent)¹⁰ did not express similar views.

The GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03

FARNAM had a boss, Director Jack Donohue, but worked directly with GALLAGHER.¹¹

This is how Ms. FARNAM manufactured the *GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03* as follows:

- started with two versions of the assessment, written by professional IICD analysts, both concluding the OSINT indicates calls for peaceful protests;
- reversed their conclusions, replacing them with phony alarms about violence from Trump supporters;
- took pieces from both and added her text;
- deleted most of the factual evidence.^{12 13}

This sounds like an intricate fabrication, not legitimate intelligence work. But that was not enough; GALLAGHER asked to rewrite this assessment to make it more alarming. FARNAM and her boss Jack

¹⁰ <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/restoring-america/patriotism-unity/nina-jankowicz-disinformation-uk-foreign-agent>

¹¹ “[Q] And so what was the process for sharing intelligence with leadership? This is before January 6th, of course, leading up to it. A: I would provide it to Chief Gallagher primarily.” - the Farnam Interview, p. 16

¹² “So, leading up to this one, I took the good pieces out of those two drafts that we had and put it together with what we have here. And some sections of it, like the last section, I wrote exclusively. ...

[Q:] What about those initial assessments did you feel was not up to par? So I don't think they were well-written, number one. I don't necessarily think they included pertinent information or drew the correct conclusions.

Particularly with the one that Debbie did, a lot of it was -- she had a lot of good information there, but there was no analysis piece. So there were multiple pages of, okay, this Facebook page says that they're going to be coming, and this one does, and three people are interested, and six people liked it, or whatever it was. So it's good information, but I don't know if we needed, you know, posts saying, like, all these Facebook people are coming, rather than just saying there are multiple Facebook pages. **Both of them concluded that the protests -- or, a lot of them are calling for peaceful protests.** I'd have to go back and look at Stephan's version to see if he mentioned armed individuals. **I know Debbie's did not mention the words "violence," "violent extremists," "White supremacists," "militia."** **Those were things that did not appear in the assessment, and, to me, that lacked, based on what I was seeing.**

Q: Okay. You may have mentioned this, I think, but did you use part of their assessments in crafting yours?

A: Yes. I took different pieces that I thought should go into the final one.

[Q:] Did Jack Donohue have any role or play a role in the drafting of that?

[A:] He didn't draft. I believe he reviewed.” - the Farnam Interview, pp. 20-21

¹³ “with the January 3rd assessment, I wrote a good chunk of that on my own.” - the Farnam Interview, p. 15

Donohue wrote separate documents, and GALLAGHER selected FARNAM's,¹⁴ which she admitted was too strongly worded, despite her lack of experience. This is how it ended up so political and contradicting common sense and other assessments.

"Supporters of the current president [sic] see January 6, 2021, as the last opportunity to overturn the results of the presidential election. This sense of desperation and disappointment may lead to more of an incentive to become violent. Unlike previous post-election protests, the targets of the pro-Trump supporters are not necessarily the counter-protesters as they were previously, but rather Congress itself is the target on the 6th..."

The first statement is nonsense, considering there were no results of the election at that time, and the Jan 6 session was supposed to determine the results of the election. *"to overturn the results of the election"* is a Democrat propaganda talking point. That session was the main hope of Trump supporters. This hope was the feeling among the Trump rallygoers rather than desperation or disappointment. Given at least six procedurally valid objections expected to be made on the joint session, each requiring at least 2.5 hours to settle, the session was unlikely to end on Jan 6. Trump supporters could not become "desperate" or "disappointed" that day.

The assessment is not even trying to appear impartial. It seems the true desperation was manipulating the narrative to attribute violence to Trump and his supporters falsely. She is openly anti-Trump and against Trump supporters. The assessment does not even consider the threat of violence from the side of the Democrat supporters – despite the events of spring-summer of 2020.

The *Report of Investigation* later found that *"The source of the intelligence that led Farnam to conclude the Capitol was a target is unclear,"* a polite way to say that she made that up. Also, nothing publicly available sources (including the "GALLAGHER intelligence" and the *GOVERNMENT AGENCY PREPARATION*) indicate no such threat. Also, this "finding" appeared neither in earlier nor later assessments.¹⁵

The fact that GALLAGHER had requested a rewrite of the assessment and inclusion of "stronger language" was confirmed by Jack Donohue.¹⁶

¹⁴ *"on January 3rd, Chief Gallagher asked us to rewrite the conclusion. Because he was saying, you know, we're seeing lots of bad things. So he sent that to both Jack and I, and both Jack and I wrote a conclusion. And, when I sent mine, I sent it forward to Sergeant Cook, who is Chief Gallagher's assistant. And I said, 'I wrote one. It might be too strongly worded. Jack also wrote one. I'll let you guys decide which one to put into the assessment.' So Jack did draft something that didn't end up making it into the assessment."* - the Farnam Interview, p. 20

¹⁵ *"However, there was no relevant or underlying information along these lines in prior assessments, nor in three subsequent Daily Intelligence Reports. Farnam admitted she should 'have given those reports more attention on January 4, 5, and 6.'" - the Report of Investigation, p. 63*

¹⁶ *"Q: Ultimately, was what Ms. Farnam drafted what was incorporated into the final assessment?
A: Yes.*

Q: Did you take Mr. Gallagher's direction to mean that the language should be stronger, that it needed -- in what direction did -- you said a little bit more. What did you take that to mean?

There was an audio briefing on this assessment the next day. FARNAM remembers only that GALLAGHER and PITTMAN were attending, and Chief Sund was not even invited.¹⁷ It is a curious combination – requesting a stronger language, not distributing the assessment containing it, and omitting the critical information from it in later assessments!

The Assassination Project

*“There [were] **three analysts at least that were working on an assassination project for her.** They were told to research all political assassinations in the history of the world, worldwide. And I’m, when they told me that’s what they were assigned, I was like, ‘But that’s like a Ph.D. dissertation, that’s not an assessment document, or an intelligence document.’”* – an analyst’s testimony from the *Rep. Report of Investigation*, p. 57

I'll leave this odd piece of information without comments and interpretation.

Remarks

‘Farnam’ is frequently misspelled as Farham or Farnham.

In her interview, she shared the names of the analysts who worked under her.

Chief Sund noticed that *“Gallagher and Pittman really wanted to, you know, kind of control the information”* (the *Sund Interview*).

A: I took it to mean that it needed to be something that conveyed the -- a little bit more that conveyed the intensity of what we were seeing.

Q: So the overall analysis, right, concluded with these sort of two sentences. Quote, ‘This sense of desperation and disappointment may lead to more of an incentive to become violent. Unlike previous post-election protests, the targets of the pro-Trump supporters are not necessarily the counter protesters as they were previously, but rather Congress itself is the target on the 6th,’ end quote. So sentences like those, is it fair to say that was not a part of the sort of initial threat assessment before Mr. Gallagher asked you and Ms. Farnam to write that sort of last overall analysis paragraph?

A: Yeah, that’s true.

Q: Okay. That was added afterward, correct?

A: Yes.” – the *Donohue Interview*, pp. 41-42

¹⁷ “[Q]: Let’s move to a conference call that I know -- a briefing that you and Jack Donohue held on January 4th highlighting the warning from the January 3rd assessment.

A: Uh-huh.

Q Who spoke at that briefing?

A: I did.

Q: Okay. And who was invited to attend?

A: I don’t know. I’d have to look at the calendar invite. I did not send the invites.

...

A: My understanding is that Chief Sund was not invited.

Q: Okay. Is there anyone, any name that you can tell me you know was invited?

A: Chief Gallagher, Chief Pittman were there for sure. And I’m not sure who else.” - the *Farnam Interview*, p. 34

The Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack was unilaterally selected by the Democrat delegation, so its conclusion and selection of evidence are partisan.

Some of the plans, attributed post-J6 to Trump supporters, were made by far left militant organizations (including ShutdownDC and Sunrise) on before the 2020 Election day, as seen in a leaked [Zoom call](#).¹⁸ Some actions proposed in that call actually happened on Jan 6.

Annex A. Pre-J6 Intel: Some Raw Data Analysis

Appendix 1. GOVERNMENT AGENCY PREPARATION FOR AND RESPONSE TO JANUARY 6TH of the FINAL REPORT of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (*GOVERNMENT AGENCY PREPARATION*) is a place where one would expect most prior intelligence.

It claims, "Prior to January 6th, numerous government agencies received intelligence that those descending on The Mall for a rally organized by the President were armed and that their target may be the Capitol. The intelligence community and law enforcement agencies detected the planning for potential violence directed at the joint session of Congress. That intelligence included information about specific planning by the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers militia groups who ultimately led the attack on the Capitol."

The text contains 207 references, creating the impression of a well-sourced document. The impression is false. I have reviewed all the primary sources (i.e., having CTRL number) referenced in Appendix 1 and found none substantiating any of these claims. The Oath Keepers are not even mentioned in any available primary source.

The Select Committee Sources

All sources fall into one of three categories:

- a) Social media posts and comments by unidentified users. Some of them advocated violence on Jan 6, but in forms that cannot be carried out without large, organized groups, and no such groups existed. Considering the lack of identity, it is not even possible to determine the political persuasion of the posters. Some of these posts had been reviewed by law enforcement and found to be below the threshold of concern. It is not clear whether attempts to ID the posters had been made.
 - b) Tips about social media posts described in (a).
 - c) Opinions about social media posts described in (a), possibly combined with other topics.
- None of them have intelligence value or can serve as evidence.

Some social media posts (i.e., <https://thedonald.win/p/11R4q2aptJ/trump-tweet-daddy-says-be-in-dc-c/>), mentioned here, are mentioned in multiple pre-J6 documents, creating the impression that there was more source material than there was in reality.

¹⁸ <https://twitter.com/i/status/1367601360246607875>

The numbers correspond to the endnote numbers in the *GOVERNMENT AGENCY PREPARATION*.

From *INTRODUCTION*

1: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000091086/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000091086.pdf> : referenced as evidence that antifa and other left-wing groups did not plan to participate in Jan 6 events;¹⁹ what a joke!

From *INTELLIGENCE RECEIVED BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES*

10: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001473/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001473.pdf> : a repetition of unsolicited opinions of a private company SITE Intel Group.

11. CTRL0000000436 : n/a (cannot be found on govinfo.gov or elsewhere)

12. CTRL0000000091 : n/a

18-19. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000236995/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000236995.pdf> : a tip about social media posts.²⁰

20-26. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001509/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001509.pdf> : a repetition of unsolicited opinions of SITE Intel.²¹

27-28. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000000087/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000000087.pdf>: an email from a self-declared “internet expert of sorts” (“I’m legit. My father is decorated colonel and a JAG lawyer...”)

30. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001473/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001473.pdf>: another unsolicited opinion from SITE Intel.²²

31-32. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001527/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001527.pdf>: five links to posts on theDonald[.]win.

36-38: CTRL0000000002 : n/a

39/40. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000000083/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000000083.pdf>: an article on an unknown website redstatesecession[.]com, asking for addresses

¹⁹ The whole text: “Also several groups including Refuse Fascism and They Them Collective have encouraged participants to stay at home and protest via social media, even referencing the Refuse Fascism demo we have on the sheet, it does not appear to be a real demonstration.”

²⁰ From the tip: “CLOG THE ARTERIES OF OUR CAPITOL WITH ALL THE JUNKERS YOU CAN MUSTER!!! Build the blockade with parked, disabled junk vehicles by the hundreds.”

²¹ “Fwd: “Armed and Ready, Mr. President”: Demonstrators Urged to Bring Guns, Prepare for Violence at January 6 “Stop the Steal” Protest in DC”

²² “FW: [EXTERNAL EMAIL] - Neo-Nazi Calls on D.C. Pro-Trump Protesters to Occupy Federal Building”

and routes of politicians, judges, and lobbyists.²³ The article had been evaluated as below the threshold level.

42. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000930224/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000930224.pdf> : 27 pages, of which only a few are relevant: FBI emails from before Jan 6.

Examples are p. 7,²⁴ p. 8,²⁵ and p. 10.²⁶ None of them mention any confirmed threats against the Capitol. Some suspicions and tips are refuted. Some tips that were filed came from mentally unstable people and QAnon believers. Emails from Jan 6 (pp. 18-19)²⁷ suggest an increased number of complaints (tips) and verbally threatening social media posts on the previous day, but this had to be expected.

44. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001766/pdf/GPO-J6-DOC-CTRL0000001766.pdf> : Gallagher's email mentions an attachment, but the attachment is not in the source.

²³ "An website called Red State Secession has posted an article requesting that users submit addresses of residences and offices of politicians, judges, and lobbyists. They are also asking for those individuals' routes..."

²⁴ "The following information is current as of 3 January 2021 at 0800. This is for FBI internal use only.

(U//LES) A review of open source, law enforcement, and liaison information suggests a sizable number of people plan to attend a series of loosely affiliated rallies in Washington, DC on 6 January 2021. Counterprotestors are aware of many of these plans and continue to organize events in opposition . To date, FBI Washington Field Office (WFO) is tracking four predicated domestic terrorism subjects traveling to the AOR for unknown purposes as well as **a collection of unsubstantiated reports of threats** to the city, protest participants, and/or US Government officials." –does not say how serious the predicated cases are and with which side they are associated. Emphasis is added.

²⁵ "(U) WFO is tracking the following 16 Guardians as of 8000 on 3 January 2020:

(U//FOUO) <blank> notification from <blank> Missouri which stated he had a "hunch" that on January 6, 2021 that there would be a chemical or biological attack in a water reservoir in Washington D.C. and that there should be extra security at the inauguration. Duty Agent created a Guardian and contacted the complainant. **The caller to the complainant may have mental issues and referenced Q'Anon**, someone named General Ezra who is one of the "Twelve Horsemen", someone else with Seal Team Six and the Red Pill Society. The Guardian was transferred to the <blank> field office for further interviews.

2. (U//FOUO) NTOC tip from a complainant in Georgia. Complainant advised Enrique Tarrío and the Proud Boys will be in DC on 01/06. Complainant states "These men are coming for violence. They will cause mass unrest, destruction, and potentially kill many people in the streets of DC on January 6th. They will roam the streets incognito attacking anyone they deem as antifa ... " (**A review of the Tarrío posts submitted did not reveal any call for violence.**) (Closed and linked to another Tarrío Guardian. Tarrío appears to reside in Miami.)" – End of the page. There is no next page. Emphasis is added. 'Guardian' probably means an entry in eGuardian, the software used by fusion centers.

²⁶ Jan 4, MPD Partner Briefing Highlights: "No credible threats have been identified for the 6 January Event."

²⁷ "A total of 10,250 complaints were processed yesterday [January 5] by NTOC with 5,189 being related to social media posts which were related to political matters."

Table of Contents

HIGHLIGHTS	1
Introduction	1
Contradictory Intelligence.....	1
Wrong Themes.....	2
Harms from the “Gallagher intelligence”.....	2
Julie FARNAM.....	3
Mysterious Hiring Process.....	3
FARNAM Personality	4
The GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03	5
The Assassination Project	7
Remarks	7
Annex A. Pre-J6 Intel: Some Raw Data Analysis.....	8
The Select Committee Sources	8
From <i>INTRODUCTION</i>	9
From <i>INTELLIGENCE RECEIVED BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES</i>	9
Table of Contents.....	11
Reference	11

Reference

ⁱ *Farnam Interview by the SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL*, December 15, 2021, Washington DC. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-TRANSCRIPT-CTRL0000034626/pdf/GPO-J6-TRANSCRIPT-CTRL0000034626.pdf>

ⁱⁱ *Donohue Interview by the SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL*, Jan 31, 2022, Washington DC. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-TRANSCRIPT-CTRL0000039558/pdf/GPO-J6-TRANSCRIPT-CTRL0000039558.pdf>

ⁱⁱⁱ *GOVERNMENT AGENCY PREPARATION FOR AND RESPONSE TO JANUARY 6TH*, *Appendix 1* in the FINAL REPORT of the SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-REPORT/pdf/GPO-J6-REPORT-4-1.pdf>

^{iv} *REPORT OF INVESTIGATION; Security Failures at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021*. Republican Congress Members. Around December 22, 2022. https://banks.house.gov/uploadedfiles/final_report_of_investigation_real.pdf

^v *Sund Interview by the SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL*, Apr 20, 2022, Washington DC. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-J6-TRANSCRIPT-CTRL0000071087/pdf/GPO-J6-TRANSCRIPT-CTRL0000071087.pdf>

^{vi} *Partisan Special Event Assessment of 01/03*, Leo Goldstein, 4/6/2023. <https://defyccc.com/wp-content/uploads/J6-prior-SEA.pdf>

^{vii} *The False Alarm – Gallagher’s Email of 01/05*, Leo Goldstein, 4/3/2023. <https://defyccc.com/wp-content/uploads/J6-Intelligence-Letter.pdf>

^{viii} *GALLAGHER-FARNAM Assessment of 01/03*, 1/3/2021. <https://context-cdn.washingtonpost.com/notes/prod/default/documents/7297e02f-a2e0-4890-b2df-eeadcc920d50/note/ca3b675f-7f49-4662-821a-b41d00d0c251>.

^{ix} *GALLAGHER email of 01/05*, 1/5/2021. <https://justthenews.com/sites/default/files/2022-06/GallagherFado010521EmailWAttachments.pdf>