

Mike Benz: The CIA, The Oil & Gas Industry, And Hunter Biden In Ukraine

Posted By **Tim Hains**
On Date May 28, 2024

"Foundation For Freedom Online" director Mike Benz speaks with Dan Bongino about the intersections between the U.S. intelligence community, the oil and gas industry, and Hunter Biden in Ukraine.

DAN BONGINO: The Hunter Biden/Burisma/natural gas/CIA story, everybody basically had their hand in the pot. Everyone was making money. It was about influence and money and it explains how they work. If you could just kind of dig into why the CIA was protecting Hunter Biden, you explain it better than anyone, so take it away.

MIKE BENZ: There's a long history of the CIA's role in the oil and gas industry. This is something that goes back a very long time. You can argue even back to 1953 when the CIA toppled the government of Iran to prevent the nationalization of the oil. You can go back to the 1960s when George Bush Senior began his intelligence career, before he was president of the United States or vice president under Reagan or even before he was the CIA director in 1976. Before that, he came from the oil/intelligence world. He was the CIA's liaison to oil companies in Latin America and that's why he created Zapata Energy Offshore in Colombia and whatnot. There's a long relationship between the CIA. If people want to do further reading on this, you can read [the book "Private Empire" about ExxonMobil and its relationships with the U.S. government and the intelligence services](#). Dick Cheney runs through this story obviously with Halliburton, which coincidentally owns the oil and shale refining rights in Ukraine.

You had in Ukraine, this Grand Ukraine Energy Play by corporate and financial stakeholders on both sides of the political aisle, which is that Russia has \$75 trillion worth of natural resources in Russia. It is the most resource-rich country on earth, but most of it, the vast majority of it is unexploited. But Russia itself, its economy was destroyed during the 20th century and as it rebuilds itself, it rebuilt itself through basically two things, its export of its natural gas, principally to Europe, and its arms industry, which has been the bane in the side, the thorn in the side, of the US foreign policy establishment for many years now.

If you remember, the Obama administration tried to invade Syria, but we were repelled because Russia provided Syria with the air defense systems, right? Look at what just happened in Niger just now, we just got kicked out of Niger and that's because Russia was providing small arms to the army there. So if we can bankrupt Russia, there's

no opposition essentially to US military hegemony.

So there's a DOD interest in bankrupting Russia. There's a State Department interest in bankrupting Russia and taking all of their deal flow and having it transferred essentially as windfall profits to US or to NATO-based companies.

This is where the natural gas story comes in. Russia used to provide 100% of the natural gas to Europe through the incredible, it sits on basically the world's second largest supply of natural gas. And it all used to run through Ukraine, either Ukraine or in a direct pipeline to Germany, but we know what happened to the German pipelines. But Ukraine was the great transit point. Not that Ukraine, Ukraine has a fair amount of unexploited natural gas and this is what Burisma was doing. But most of it, most of Ukraine's financial gift and most of its annual revenues come from the gas transit fees that it has because it is the locus point of the East-West connective tissue.

So you have basically 100 years of gas pipelines that Ukraine is central to running through. So if you can simply rewire the gas so that it no longer comes from Russia, it no longer comes from Ukraine's East, but it comes from Ukraine's West, for example, by piping in U.S. LNG or British LNG up through Poland, through the Baltic Sea, and then connecting it directly to Ukraine, you have the same gas architecture. You don't need to build a whole new web of energy infrastructure, which is very expensive to build and maintain. You simply reroute it and now you have basically a trillion-dollar market that's captured by the West rather than by the East.

There was a plan in motion that goes back at least about a decade to have this happen. As Putin was reasserting himself on the world stage, he began to use gas diplomacy to win back countries in Central and Eastern Europe that had been folded into NATO or were trying to be folded into NATO to bring them into the Russian orbit again. This was called Energy Gas Diplomacy. The U.S. State Department, beginning in about 2006, began to coerce European countries to buy more expensive, Western gas than the natural gas that was coming from Europe in order to prevent Russian economic influence over their own politicians. These countries didn't want to go along with it, but they ended up doing it anyway because of pressure from the U.S.

And then when Crimea happened in 2014, a lot of this was also because of this same gas story. If anybody follows any of the CIA cutouts in this space, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Center for European Policy Analysis, the Atlantic Council with seven CIA directors on its board, they are monomaniacally obsessed with getting the transfer of Russian gas.

Burisma played a very interesting role in this because Burisma was one of the biggest private sector gas companies in Europe that was providing this pipeline of endogenous gas into Naftogaz, the Ukraine state-owned company. Part of the reason we orchestrated the coup in 2014 to overthrow Ukraine was because the Ukrainian government

under Viktor Yanukovych had refused an IMF trade deal where, in order to assuage its debts to the IMF, Ukraine would have had to privatize Naftogaz and sell off their public gas company to private stakeholders from the George Soros financial crew, which he played a big role in that, amazingly.

...

If you can cut Russia off and force these countries to buy much more expensive Western-based gas, a lot of this just comes down to the logistics of the price system, which is that a natural gas pipeline is much cheaper than liquefying natural gas in Houston, shipping it across the Atlantic Ocean 5,000 miles, sending it to a port in Poland, running that through a connective tissue in Slovakia and then pouring it into Ukraine, then de-liquefying the gas. It's just way more expensive so countries don't want to do it. So the State Department has played a major role in coercing foreign governments and pressuring them and doing regime change operations to make sure that there are pliant puppet governments all over Central and Eastern Europe that are down with this plan.

You have to understand the CIA is not the big boss of all this. They're not even the brains of all of this. They are the gimp of all of this. They are the assistant squad to the State Department.

We have three departments that are foreign-facing that comprise our "department of dirty tricks" that are allowed to do supra-constitutional activity, so to speak, in the name of helping, you know, "for the benefit of US citizens." We have our Department of Defense, our military, which is for national security. We have our, but the State Department and CIA have a much broader mandate. They operate under something called "national interest," which means if we think it's good for us, if it helps us economically, then we can do it. We don't even need a defense justification.

The CIA was created because the State Department needed some sort of cloak-and-dagger mechanism to be able to achieve State Department goals without having State Department fingers on it. This is what the plausible deniability doctrine of the CIA is. They can do all sorts of dirty things. They can blow up a pipeline, they can overthrow a government, they can rig elections, or rig media ecosystems in foreign countries. And there's no diplomatic blowback because the US government didn't do it. "It just happened by itself." But it was happening because it wasn't really by itself. It was the CIA engaged in these covert actions that range from subterfuge, sabotage, and demolition to corporate espionage.

And that corporate espionage side is where you get to the Burisma story. Burisma was a mostly Russian-dominated private gas company within Ukraine. And Ukraine at the time in 2013-2014, Ukraine was very much split between its Ukrainian half and its Russian half. The country is basically split down the middle in its east-west. This is how the civil war played out when we overthrew the government in 2014, the entire eastern half of the

country seceded in a breakaway state and Crimea ended up joining the Russian Federation in a democratic referendum, essentially.

At this point, we descended on... Well, it goes back before that. If you look at Victoria Nuland's speech in 2013, she talked about how the U.S. State Department provided \$5 billion worth of support to the civil society organizations that orchestrated the color revolution there. The right-sector mobs that effectively January Sixed -- if you believe the official story -- surrounded the parliament building, ran the president out of the country, and installed a new unelected government. When Victoria Nuland gave that speech about providing financial support to those groups, she was doing it in front of a sign for Chevron and Royal Dutch Shell, which were two of the big oil and gas companies that had each made a \$10 billion investment in Naftagaz, which Burisma is the feeder to. These were the major oil and gas companies sponsoring the State Department conference on the coup.

...

DAN BONGINO: How were they so stupid though? This blob has this amazing interest. My people are already emailing me... How were they so dumb to put a Hunter Biden face on it, thinking no one would figure out there was a moneyed interest in the blob? Didn't it expose the blob?

MIKE BENZ: It's a very similar story to Jeffrey Epstein. If you recall, Alex Acosta, when he was being nominated for Secretary of Labor, was asked, "Why didn't you go after Epstein in the 90s? Why did you give him a sweetheart deal?" He said, "I was told to back off the case because he belonged to intelligence." That's a direct quote.

This is what the CIA does. One of the things they do is interface with the Justice Department. If you remember, Bill Barr was the head of the Justice Department during the Trump term while all this was happening with Hunter Biden. Bill Barr started his career in the Central Intelligence Agency. The Washington Post even reported how he was the janitor for Iran-Contra, blocking Congressional oversight of the CIA's role in the scandal. He's basically been the mop-up man for the CIA and then he was the head of the Justice Department twice. There's a long history of the CIA's role in tilting the Justice Department to protect their own criminals because, under the CIA's plausible deniability doctrine, they have a license to crime as long as they maintain plausible deniability.

Just one more thing on Hunter Biden. Hunter Biden was on the chairman's advisory board of NDI, the National Democratic Institute, which is a CIA cutout. That is the DNC branch of the National Endowment for Democracy, which was literally created by a letter from CIA director Bill Colby in the 1980s when he said the CIA used to get caught directly funding people, so they want to set up a National Endowment for Democracy so it doesn't look

like CIA fingerprints are on it. How the hell does Hunter Biden get on the chairman's advisory board of the most prolific CIA cutout in the entire country?