

Why I Won't Be Reading the Durham Report



by Roger L. Simon

Sometime around early afternoon on May 15, I heard that the Durham Report had finally made its appearance. I was surprised. I had forgotten all about it.

I had also pretty much forgotten about its author, special counsel John Durham, ever since he failed in his attempts to convict some minor miscreants in the Trump/Russia affair, including Clinton campaign lawyer Michael Sussmann, who was found not guilty of making a false statement to the FBI about not representing a client that he clearly did.

Durham didn't do much either to see a whole raft of evildoers too long to list get anything even approximating their just deserts. In fact, from former CIA chief John Brennan to former FBI head James Comey, it seems they all will get off scot-free

as their malign actions disappear in the ether of the statute of limitations.

I had been following all this closely for some time, especially at *The Epoch Times* in the excellent detailed discussions at “Kash’s Corner,” with Jan Jekielek interviewing attorney and former government official Kash Patel, whose knowledge of the investigation was among the most complete. For a while, I was optimistic, but as these trials misfired and no new information of substance emerged, I began to lose confidence in Durham and in our system. Alas, it was already waning.

It’s safe to say that, for now anyway, justice is dead in America, and therefore actually wading through the 300-plus pages of Durham’s report is time poorly spent, even though it evidently says what we have all known for a long time—that the investigation known as “Crossfire Hurricane” should never have happened.

I’m sure it’s also a scathing indictment of the FBI but, like Durham himself, ultimately a toothless one.

This is more like pallid wrist-slapping, and reminiscent of another report on FBI malfeasances that I did read by Department of Justice Inspector General Michael Horowitz. The IG detailed 17 examples in which the FISA [Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act] decisions tilted left but drew no conclusion of bias from that, despite the astronomical odds.

Both reports are in essence a new form of whitewash, a way of looking like things are being investigated and dealt with, while actually helping to sweep them down the now-famed memory hole. Nothing changes.

And both, of course, arrived late, particularly Durham’s. What took him so long? I’m not going to say this is deliberate, because it’s probably not, but the result is the same—less

impact—and that should have been taken into consideration.

The morning after, the FBI admits some “mistakes,” reminds us that they have new personnel (uh-hunh), and then goes, in Paul Simon’s lyrics, “Slip Slidin’ Away.”

The report also inadvertently gives ammunition to the mainstream media that has the same status quo as its goal. Here’s how The [New York Times](#) described the Durham Report minutes after its appearance:

“John H. Durham, the Trump-era special counsel who for four years has pursued a politically fraught investigation into the Russia inquiry, accused the F.B.I. of having ‘discounted or willfully ignored material information’ that countered the narrative of collusion between Donald J. Trump and Russia in a final report made public on Monday.

“Mr. Durham’s 306-page report revealed little substantial new information about the inquiry, known as Crossfire Hurricane, and it failed to produce the kinds of blockbuster revelations accusing the bureau of politically motivated misconduct that former President Donald J. Trump and his allies suggested Mr. Durham would uncover.”

Got it? The whole thing is ho-hum. It took four reporters to write that.

The NY Times goes on to note that the report was sent to Attorney General Merrick Garland on May 12 and released on May 15 without redaction, implying again that it was no big deal. And, considering what it could have been, it wasn’t.

The NY Times, as a reminder, was the news organization that won a Pulitzer for its reporting, by multiple reporters, on the Trump–Russia collusion that never happened, that was a politicized disgrace and a literal desecration of journalism. Needless to say, they don’t mention that in their Durham “overview,” nor do they mention that they have yet to return

the prize they got for lying.

So where are we after all this?

In light of the report, Donald Trump has called for the punishment of the likes of Brennan and Comey, something he has done for some time. May it happen someday.

As I was writing this, outsider presidential candidate Vivek Ramaswamy sent the following statement, "On March 5, I announced that I would shut down the FBI, and the Durham Report findings reaffirm my reason for why: when an agency becomes so corrupt and politicized, you cannot merely reform it."

True enough. But as of now, it seems nothing much is going to happen until the 2024 election.

The FBI remains under the control of Garland and Director Christopher Wray. Stonewalling of congressional committees and others will continue. Selective prosecutions also will continue, with major crimes at the highest reaches of our government ignored.

Read the Durham Report if you wish. I won't. I'm too deep into Dennis Prager's fascinating book "The Rational Bible: Exodus" to be distracted.

But remember this if you do read Durham. It was then-Attorney General Bill Barr who gave him his job.

First published in the [*Epoch Times*](#).