

PBS NewsHour for December 9, 2019

PBS NewsHour (formerly The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer) PBS NEWSHOUR 6:00 PM EST

December 9, 2019 Monday

Copyright 2019 MacNeil/Lehrer Productions All Rights Reserved

Section: NEWS; International

Length: 9047 words

Byline: Amna Nawaz, John Yang, Paul Solman, Lisa Desjardins, Yamiche Alcindor, Nick Schiffrin, William Brangham, Judy Woodruff

Guests: Jared Bowen, Craig Whitlock, Amy Walter, Tamara Keith, John Carlin

Highlight: The Department of Justice releases its findings on the investigation that became the Mueller report. Democrats in the U.S. House put forth their arguments for impeaching the president. A classified trove of documents on Afghanistan is published, revealing the lies and distortions at the heart of America's longest war. Alanis Morissette's 1995 album is featured on Broadway. Amy Walter and Tamara Keith discuss the latest moves from the Democratic campaign trail.

Body

JUDY WOODRUFF: Good evening. I'm Judy Woodruff.

On the "NewsHour" tonight: the origins of the Russia inquiry. The Department of Justice releases its findings on the investigation that became the Mueller report.

Then:

DANIEL GOLDMAN, Democratic Counsel: We are here today because Donald J. Trump, the 45th president of the United States, abused the power of his office, the American presidency, for his personal and political benefit.

JUDY WOODRUFF: The evidence is presented. Democrats in the U.S. House put forth their arguments for impeaching the president.

And the Afghanistan papers. A classified trove of documents is published, revealing the lies and distortions at the heart of America's longest war.

Plus: "Jagged Little Pill," Alanis Morissette's landmark 1995 album, is back, angry as ever, and now on Broadway.

ALANIS MORISSETTE, Musician: I love anger. You know, and if I'm going to be one-dimensionalized as anything, I will take anger. I think it's a gorgeous life force.

JUDY WOODRUFF: All that and more on tonight's "PBS NewsHour."

(BREAK)

JUDY WOODRUFF: A long-awaited report into the origins of the probe into Russian interference in the 2016 election has found no evidence of a political conspiracy against the president.

But the Justice Department's inspector general criticized the FBI's handling of wiretap applications used in the early stages of the investigation.

Our William Brangham was at the Department of Justice today. He's been looking into this 400-plus pages of the report, and he joins me now.

William, you have the report right next to you.

Tell us, first of all, the headlines from this.

WILLIAM BRANGHAM: The headline, as you touched on, is that the inspector general that there was found no political bias in the origins of the Russia report.

As we have been reporting for years now, President Trump has constantly said this was a witch-hunt, that bad cops in the FBI ginned up this investigation illegally to put him in jeopardy.

And this report quite clearly says that that's not true.

I'd like to read you this one key quote from the report. It says -- quote -- "We didn't find documentary or testimonial evidence that political bias or improper motivation influenced the decisions to open four individual investigations."

So, they're saying also that there was no role played by the infamous Steele dossier in the beginning of this investigation. And it also says that the FBI, contrary to the president's assertions, didn't spy on his campaign.

Let's listen today. The FBI director, Christopher Wray, came out after this report was released. Here's what he had to say.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, FBI Director: I think it's important that the inspector general found that, in this particular instance, the investigation was opened with appropriate predication and authorization

The inspector general did find a number of instances where employees either failed to follow our policies, neglected to exercise appropriate diligence, or in some other way fell short of the standard of conduct and performance that we and that I, as director, expect of all of our employees.

WILLIAM BRANGHAM: So, while you can read part of this report as a rebuttal of the president's theories all along, it certainly seemed like his mind wasn't changed by this.

The president also, after the report came out today, had this to say about the investigation:

DONALD TRUMP, President of the United States: They fabricated evidence, and they lied to the courts, and they did all sorts of things to have it go their way. And this was something that we can never allow that to happen again.

The report actually, and especially when you look into it and the details of the report, are far worse than anything I would have even imagined. This was an overthrow of government. This was an attempted overthrow, and a lot of people were in on it. And they got caught.

JUDY WOODRUFF: So, William, the president is saying that there's evidence here of bad behavior by the FBI. Is that what's in this report?

WILLIAM BRANGHAM: That's right.

I mean, the president is right in that regard. The other headline really coming out of this report is that the inspector general found a lot of what he argues were serious mistakes made by FBI agents after the investigation was

launched, specifically looking at the FISA warrant that they used against one Trump campaign aide named Carter Page.

The inspector general said that there were omissions and errors and embellishments in these documents. The FISA warrant, if you remember all of this, is, if you want to open a foreign intelligence investigation into a person, you have to present this court with a warrant.

And the inspector general says that in the FBI's case, the warrants that they put forward left evidence out that didn't bolster their case. They looked over contradictory information, and basically didn't provide truly scrupulously factual warrants.

This is another quote from the report today, specifically about this criticism -- quote -- "That so many basic and fundamental errors were made by three separate hand-picked teams on one of the most sensitive FBI investigations raised significant questions regarding the FBI's chain of command's management and supervision of the FISA process."

In fact, today, in this report, the inspector general announced that the FBI will now be conducting an audit of how they undergo these FISA warrants going forward.

JUDY WOODRUFF: So this report is from the inspector general at the Department of Justice.

The man who heads the Department of Justice, the attorney general, William Barr, put out a statement that was critical of this, which is interesting.

WILLIAM BRANGHAM: It is. Interesting is a nice way to put it. It's a very, very divergent reaction going on here.

As you remember, Attorney General Barr has long said he thought spying did occur against the Trump campaign. He has been publicly suspicious of the origins of the Russia probe. Again, this report seems to have changed his mind not one bit.

Here's a statement he said today: "The inspector general's report now makes clear that the FBI launched an intrusive investigation of a U.S. presidential campaign on the thinnest of suspicions that, in my view, were insufficient to justify the steps taken. It is also clear that, from its inception, the evidence produced by the investigation was consistently exculpatory."

Again, this is just a very striking reaction. This is the attorney general taking direct aim at his own inspector general and saying that, in some sense, his findings documented in this huge report are not to be believed.

JUDY WOODRUFF: But, in so doing, he's completely in alliance with the president's view on this.

WILLIAM BRANGHAM: Exactly.

JUDY WOODRUFF: So, finally, William, we know this is not the end of this. There are still -- still several more shoes to drop. Tell us about that.

WILLIAM BRANGHAM: Yes.

On Wednesday -- the inspector general, Horowitz, who wrote this report, he will be testifying before the Senate on Wednesday. There is also a second broader investigation going on. Attorney General William Barr tasked Connecticut assistant U.S. attorney John Durham to lead a wider investigation, one that's now become a criminal investigation, also looking in the origins of the Russia investigation, how that went forward, and what role foreign countries might have played in that.

So, Durham is undertaking this much broader investigation. The president seems to be banking a lot on what Durham will find. And, in fact, Durham made the striking statement today where he said this: "Based on the

evidence collected to date, and while our investigation is ongoing, last month, we advised the inspector general that we do not agree with some of the report's conclusions as to predication and how the FBI case was opened."

Again, it's just a very striking point, where a U.S. attorney, who theoretically is underneath the inspector general, seems to be openly criticizing the inspector general.

JUDY WOODRUFF: So, you had the attorney general with a comment. You have this -- the other prosecutor, in effect, making his own reaction, as well as the president.

William Brangham, thank you very much.

WILLIAM BRANGHAM: You're welcome.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And now, for more on the inspector general's report, I am joined by John Carlin. He served as assistant attorney general for the Justice Department's National Security Division from 2014 to 2016, and he was also Robert Mueller's chief of staff when Mueller was director of the FBI.

And John Carlin joins me now from Phoenix, Arizona.

So, John, I just want to say at the outset that your name is mentioned in this 400-plus-page report in two footnotes. We have looked at them both. They are tangential references, so we're not going to go into that detail.

I do want to get, though, to the meat of this. What is your principal takeaway from it?

JOHN CARLIN, Former Justice Department Official: Well, Judy, after two years, a million documents, over, what, 50, 70 interviews by an independent inspector general, you have a conclusion that the FBI appropriately followed its procedures in opening the Russia investigation.

They followed the rules of the Justice Department and the FBI. And because they followed those rules, we had an investigation that led to the unpacking and discovery of an unprecedented Russian intelligence conspiracy, which cost tens of millions of dollars, included computer hacking, leaked documents, exploitation of social media campaigns, and has led to 30 successful indictments, in some cases convictions, of individuals for criminal misconduct.

JUDY WOODRUFF: But you also had, as William Brangham just laid out, description of errors made along the way by individuals in the FBI and others who were working on this investigation.

JOHN CARLIN: No, that's right and should be taken seriously.

But, first, to distinguish, what the inspector general found was that the investigation itself, the broad Russia investigation, was appropriately opened under FBI and Department of Justice procedures.

After it was opened, the inspector general details mistakes that were made in the application process regarding the investigation of one of the individuals, part of that broader investigation, and that those mistakes linked to the obtaining one application that was then renewed for a wiretap. And that's regarding Carter Page.

We should definitely -- and I think the FBI director, Christopher Wray, struck exactly the appropriate note in saying that any -- any type of mistake or misconduct in obtaining a wiretap under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court is serious, it should be looked at for process improvements, so that that doesn't occur again.

It doesn't change the fundamental funding, though, that that occurred after this investigation was launched and opened.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Right.

John Carlin, how do you account for the reaction of the attorney general, who clearly has problems with the thrust of this report?

JOHN CARLIN: Look, it's -- he, of course, is entitled to his own opinion, but his opinion is not the rules under which the then assistant director of the Counterintelligence Division, Bill Priestap, was operating when he opened the investigation.

And in some respects, good thing it wasn't, at least the way I'm interpreting the remarks, because if we had an Attorney General Barr's opinion, instead of the rules and procedures of the FBI, it seems like we would never have found out and held accountable numerous Russian agents for their attempts to interfere in the 2016 campaign.

I hope he applies a different standard when we're looking to determine foreign interference coming up in our 2020 election. And it sends an unfortunate message to the men and women of the FBI and the Department of Justice, thousands of career agents and prosecutors, who day to day are dedicated to protecting us from foreign threats against our nation, that their leader, the top official of the Justice Department, in no way recognizes what they did right.

JUDY WOODRUFF: John Carlin, former Justice Department official, thank you.

JOHN CARLIN: Thank you.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Our other big story tonight, impeachment.

The Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives met all today, hearing the evidence and the arguments for and against putting President Trump on trial.

Nick Schiffrin begins our coverage.

NICK SCHIFFRIN: Today, Democrats summed up their case for impeachment and sharpened their attacks on President Trump.

DANIEL GOLDMAN, Democratic Counsel: President Trump's persistent and continuing effort to coerce a foreign country to help him cheat to win an election is a clear a clear and present danger to our free and fair elections and to our national security.

NICK SCHIFFRIN: Republicans called the hearing a sham:

REP. JAMES SENSENBRENNER (R-WI): The lawyer is badgering the witness. We have to have some decorum in here.

NICK SCHIFFRIN: And called the Democrats' case an unfair rush to judgment based on secondhand information.

STEVE CASTOR, Republican Counsel: The impeachment inquiry record is riddled with hearsay, presumptions and speculation. To paraphrase Professor Turley from last week, the impeachment record is heavy on presumptions and empty on proof.

NICK SCHIFFRIN: This was Democrats' main attempt to narrate their story before submitting articles of impeachment.

Democrats argue President Trump withheld military aid and a White House meeting with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky, so Zelensky would announce investigations into Democratic presidential candidate Joe Biden and the 2016 election.

The first article of impeachment is expected to accuse President Trump of abuse of power, as argued by Judiciary Committee Democratic counsel Barry Berke.

BARRY BERKE, Judiciary Committee Democratic Counsel: He put his political reelection interest over the nation's national security and the integrity of its elections. He did it intentionally. He did it corruptly. He abused his powers in the ways that the founders feared the most.

NICK SCHIFRIN: Democrats are also expected to accuse President Trump of obstruction, as described by Intelligence Committee Democratic counsel Daniel Goldman.

DANIEL GOLDMAN: President Trump launched an unprecedented campaign of obstruction of Congress, ordering executive branch agencies and government officials to defy subpoenas for documents and testimony.

NICK SCHIFRIN: Republicans argued the Democrats had failed to prove their case. Republican counsel Stephen Castor:

STEVE CASTOR: The inquiry has returned no direct evidence that President Trump withheld a meeting or security assistance in order to pressure President Zelensky to investigate former V.P. Biden.

NICK SCHIFRIN: Republicans also pointed out that, despite the delay, Ukraine did receive the military aid it wanted, and Zelensky repeatedly said he didn't feel pressure, including on his July 25 phone call with President Trump.

VOLODYMYR ZELENSKY, Ukrainian President (through translator): I have never felt any influence on me. And there are a lot of people in Russia, in the West and in Ukraine who would like to influence me.

STEVE CASTOR: President Zelensky never vocalized any discomfort or pressure on the call. Contrary to Democrat allegations, President Trump wasn't asking for a favor that would help his reelection. He was asking for assistance in helping our country move forward from the divisiveness of the Russia collusion investigation.

NICK SCHIFRIN: The Judiciary Committee is full of some of the most vocal and partisan-leaning members of the House.

REP. MATT GAETZ (R-FL): For the next four hours, you are going to try to overturn the result of an election with unelected people giving testimony?

REP. JERROLD NADLER (D-NY): The gentleman will suspend.

If the president puts himself before the country, he violates a president's most basic responsibility. He breaks his oath to American people.

NICK SCHIFRIN: And both sides took aim at each other's counsels.

Republican Jim Jordan criticized the House Intelligence Democrats' final report for including phone call records.

REP. JIM JORDAN (R-OH): Mr. Goldman, the Democrats -- did the Democrats publish phone records of the president's attorney?

DANIEL GOLDMAN: Mr. Giuliani, yes.

REP. JIM JORDAN: Did the Democrats publish the phone records of a member of the press?

DANIEL GOLDMAN: Yes, who was also involved in this.

REP. JIM JORDAN: Did the Democrats publish phone records of a member of Congress? They published the phone records of the president's personal lawyer, the phone records of a member of the press, and the phone records of the chairman of the Intelligence Committee's political opponent, Representative Nunes. That's what these guys did.

NICK SCHIFRIN: And after Berry Berke testified, he became the Democratic questioner.

BARRY BERKE: And you made a big point, sir, in your presentation that on that call President Trump didn't go further and tell President Zelensky that he wanted the investigation announced to help his 2020 election.

STEVE CASTOR: Yes, he definitely didn't talk about 2020.

BARRY BERKE: And, Mr. Goldman, would you agree that if President Trump was acting corruptly, wrongfully, abusing his power, that it was unlikely he was going to confess to Zelensky that he was asking for the investigation explicitly to help his 2020 election prospects?

DANIEL GOLDMAN: You almost never have a defendant or someone who's engaging in misconduct who would ever explicitly say, in this case, President Zelensky, I'm going to bribe you now, or I'm going to ask for a bribe, or I am now going to extort you.

That's not the way these things work.

NICK SCHIFRIN: Not present today, President Trump's lawyers. On Friday, White House counsel Pat Cipollone released a letter refusing to appear that warned: "Adopting articles of impeachment would be a reckless abuse of power by House Democrats, and would constitute the most unjust, highly partisan, and unconstitutional attempt at impeachment in our nation's history."

The Republicans call Democrats obsessed. The Democrats call the evidence overwhelming. And split along party lines, the committee is on the verge of passing articles of impeachment for the fourth time in history.

For the "PBS NewsHour," I'm Nick Schiffrin.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Our team is reporting from both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Lisa Desjardins joins us from Capitol Hill, where she spent most of today inside the hearing room. And Yamiche Alcindor is at the White House.

Hello to both of you.

Lisa, to you first.

What was it that, would you say, each side was trying to do today? And as you talked to members, did they tell you they think they're changing minds?

LISA DESJARDINS: Well, Democrats, I think, as Nick reported well, were trying to lay out a substantive case that the president abused his power and was corrupt.

Republicans did two things. They actually did answer that substance to some degree, more than we have seen in hearings before. But, Judy, they also were trying to point at what they saw was other wrongdoing, other subjects, not just the president, but the call log, for example, or Hunter Biden.

And they repeatedly raised points of order, sort of tried to shake up the hearing, make the hearing itself look like it wasn't on stable ground.

As for whether they changed minds, Judy, I will tell you this. This was the smallest crowd of any impeachment hearing I have seen so far. I asked one Democratic member what they thought of that. They said: We just don't know. We're hoping that we reach voters, but, obviously, there weren't as many voters in the room today.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And to you, Lisa.

We -- as we just heard Nick report, the White House decided not to put its side of the story forward. They didn't provide a lawyer, anybody to make a defense for the president.

How are they reacting to today, and how do they think the Republican -- how do the Republicans feel they made their case?

YAMICHE ALCINDOR: Well, the president at the White House spoke about the impeachment hearing. He said he watched a bit of this, but he said it was basically a disgrace and a hoax.

That said, Republicans really outlined a new defense of the president today. They went after Ambassador Gordon Sondland, the E.U. ambassador, the European Union ambassador. They said that he was seen as an intelligence risk, that he was seen as problematic, and that people were wondering why he was still involved in Ukraine.

Now, Democrats and critics of the president will say that Ambassador Gordon Sondland was acting at that the direction of President Trump.

I spoke to the an attorney for Gordon Sondland, who said he didn't want to comment about Republicans going after Gordon Sondland specifically, but he said his testimony speaks for himself. And in his testimony, Gordon Sondland said that he thought the president was asking him to go forward with a quid pro quo and to pressure Ukraine to get an investigation into Joe Biden in exchange for that military aid.

Also, Republicans are going after Rudy Giuliani and trying to scapegoat him in some ways. They were saying that there was evidence that the president's personal attorney was acting not in line with what the president wanted him to do.

But over the weekend, President Trump said that he was aware of Rudy Giuliani being in Ukraine and that he was collecting information that might help him. The president also said that Rudy Giuliani might be coming out with some sort of report that might be filed to Congress or the attorney general.

So, even as Republicans are trying to, in some ways, throw people under the bus or scapegoat them, as Democrats would say, both -- the Republicans are really coming up short on that end.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Lisa, back to you.

Where do things go from here after today's long hearing?

LISA DESJARDINS: Buckle up, Judy. It's going to move very quickly.

Chairman Nadler said over the weekend that he does think they should -- they could have articles of impeachment ready for the committee to discuss this week. So, that means probably in the next three days, maybe four days.

They have not decided, our reporting is, exactly what those articles will be yet. We know that they will likely include abuse of power and some form of obstruction.

Now, what's interesting here, Judy, just in the past few minutes, Republicans put out -- I'm sorry -- Democrats, Jerry Nadler, put out a letter rejecting witness requests from Republicans.

Now, this means it's not clear if there will be any more hearings or any more witnesses in the House process. The next hour may be the final substantive hearing that we have before Democrats move to marking up articles of impeachment.

We don't know yet. But we're going to pay very close attention, because I do think it will move fast.

JUDY WOODRUFF: And finally, back to you, Yamiche.

How -- we know the White House wasn't participating in what's going on in the House. Assuming the House passes impeachment, it goes to the Senate for a trial, the White House is going to have to participate in that. How are they preparing?

YAMICHE ALCINDOR: The White House is taking a very different stance as it relates to the Senate than they did with the House of Representatives.

The White House is gearing up to have representatives come to the Senate and defend the president. I talked to a White House aide today who said he was 100 percent certain that there would be White House lawyers at that Senate trial. So, the White House has been really beefing up its staff.

The other thing to note is that, tomorrow, there's going to be some news here at the White House. The Russian foreign minister, Sergei Lavrov, is going to be meeting with President Trump.

And that's notable, because the last time the Russian foreign minister was here was in 2017. And President Trump was accused of disclosing classified information relating to an ISIS informant to Russia.

So people are going to be watching really closely how President Trump interacts with this Russian official yesterday (sic), because Democrats have been making the case that, really, all roads lead back to Russia, including with this Ukraine investigation.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Yamiche Alcindor, Lisa Desjardins, both of you all day long on this story, thank you very much.

In the day's other news: Russia's President Vladimir Putin and Ukraine's President Volodymyr Zelensky held their first one-on-one meeting. It came in Paris, after they met with French President Emmanuel Macron and Germany's Chancellor Angela Merkel for broader talks at a peace summit.

Putin and Zelensky said the meetings were positive, and they agreed on a prisoner swap. Russia backs rebel forces that control Eastern Ukraine.

North Korea sent hostile new words in the direction of President Trump today. Former nuclear negotiator Kim Yong-chol called the president -- quote -- "a heedless and erratic old man."

That came after Mr. Trump tweeted Sunday that North Korea's leader, Kim Jong-un, is -- quote -- "too smart" and has gone too far -- and has far too much to lose to return to open hostility.

Iran says that it is ready to swap more prisoners with the U.S. after an exchange on Saturday. Tehran freed a Chinese-American scholar who is accused of espionage. Washington released an Iranian scientist charged with violating sanctions on Iran.

In Tehran today, a government spokesman said the swap doesn't open the door to broader talks.

ALI RABIEI, Iranian Government Spokesperson (through translator): We are ready for cooperation to bring back all the Iranians unfairly imprisoned in America. But I emphasize that the prisoner exchange wasn't done based on negotiations.

JUDY WOODRUFF: At least four American citizens are currently being held in Iran.

Police in Hong Kong report that they have made 6,000 arrests during six months of pro-democracy protests. Today's announcement came after hundreds of thousands of protesters marched peacefully through the city on Sunday. Many carried banners and chanted "Fight for freedom." Officials approved the march in advance.

In France, mass strikes kicked off the workweek with near standstill commutes. Parisians crammed into the few available trains, as transit workers stayed off the job for a fifth day. And in Lille, train tracks at usually bustling stations were empty. The strikers are targeting President Emmanuel Macron's calls for pension changes.

The World Anti-Doping Agency banned Russia today from international sporting events for four years over state-sponsored doping. Russian athletes will still be allowed to compete at next Summer's Olympics in Tokyo and elsewhere, but not with their flag or their national anthem.

In Switzerland, the Anti-Doping Agency said that Russian authorities have only themselves to blame.

CRAIG REEDIE, President, World Anti-Doping Agency: Russia was afforded every opportunity to get its house in order and to rejoin the global anti-doping community for the good of its athletes and for the integrity of sport. But it chose instead a different route.

JUDY WOODRUFF: The Russians signaled that they will appeal to the Court of Arbitration for Sport.

At least five tourists are dead after a volcano erupted today off New Zealand's coast. Eight more are missing and feared dead. It happened on White Island in the Bay of Plenty, just north of the mainland. Dozens of people were exploring the area at the time. Most were evacuated, but some were critically injured.

Back in this country, the U.S. Supreme Court left in place a Kentucky law that mandates ultrasound exams for women who want abortions. The statute requires doctors to perform the ultrasound and show the images to the patient before any abortion procedure. An appeals court had upheld the law. The Supreme Court refused today to review that ruling.

On Wall Street, stocks pulled back, as investors kept watch on U.S.-China trade talks. The Dow Jones industrial average lost 105 points to close at 27909. The Nasdaq fell 34 points. And the S&P 500 slipped almost 10.

And former Federal Reserve Chair Paul Volcker died today. His passing came 40 years after he drove interest rates to record highs to tame double-digit inflation.

Economics correspondent Paul Solman looks back at Volcker's life and work.

PAUL SOLMAN: At 6'7", Paul Volcker was known as tall Paul. And, indeed, he towered over economic policy for more than 60 years.

President Jimmy Carter chose Volcker to head the Federal Reserve in 1979, when the U.S. faced runaway inflation. To bring prices under control, Volcker, never without a cigar, choked off the money supply, driving up interest rates to discourage lending and borrowing.

Volcker defended the policy on "The MacNeil/Lehrer Report" in 1981.

PAUL VOLCKER, Former Federal Reserve Chairman: The way you're going to get those interest rates down is by persisting in policies that will indeed continue to bring the inflation rate down. And at some point, this dam is going to break and the psychology is going to change.

PAUL SOLMAN: And sky-high interest rates, he figured, would have the desired effect, as they did, but caused deep recession and unemployment that reached nearly 11 percent. Homebuilders sent Volcker their protests scrolled on wooden planks. But Volcker stood tall.

PAUL VOLCKER: You can't deal with that problem by simply saying, we're going to let inflation go ahead.

PAUL SOLMAN: Volcker's policies may have cost Carter the 1980 election.

But in a statement released today, the one-term president said: "Although some of his policies as Fed chairman were politically costly, they were the right thing to do."

By 1983, inflation had come down dramatically, and President Ronald Reagan reappointed Volcker, a lifelong Democrat, as Fed chair. But the two soon clashed over the growing federal deficit, which Volcker feared might reignite inflation. Volcker left the Fed in 1987.

His last legacy, advising President Obama after the 2008 financial crisis, pressing to restrict commercial banks from making risky investments, a controversial reform known as the Volcker rule.

For the "NewsHour," this is Paul Solman.

JUDY WOODRUFF: Paul Volcker was 92 years old.

Still to come on the "NewsHour": a blockbuster trove of documents unveils the lies undergirding the war in Afghanistan; Amy Walter and Tamara Keith on the latest moves from the Democratic campaign trail; and singer/songwriter Alanis Morissette's "Jagged Little Pill," a milestone of '90s rock, opens on Broadway.

Today, The Washington Post has a blockbuster story, the results of several years of reporting and legal pursuit of government documents.

For the last 18 years, according to the government reports obtained by The Post, senior U.S. officials have been misleading the American public about the war in Afghanistan.

John Yang has the story.

JOHN YANG: Judy, it was called Lessons Learned, a project started by a special inspector general tasked with probing U.S. operations in Afghanistan.

And those lessons tell a very different private story, one of misguided and fatal dysfunction, that violently contradicts the narrative pushed by three successive U.S. presidents and their administrations.

GEORGE W. BUSH, Former President of the United States: There has been a lot of progress since 2001. After all, girls are back in school.

BARACK OBAMA, Former President of the United States: In pursuit of our goal, we're seeing significant progress.

DONALD TRUMP, President of the United States: We will see what happens. But we have made tremendous progress.

JOHN YANG: The Washington Post waged a three-year legal battle with the government to obtain these Lessons Learned.

Craig Whitlock is the lead reporter on the story. And he joins us now from the Post newsroom.

Craig, you read through some thousands of pages of these interviews. What was the big takeaway that you came away with?

CRAIG WHITLOCK, The Washington Post: Just how blunt the people in charge of the war were about the failings of the strategy, about why we were there, about who the enemy was.

One of the first quotes that leapt out at me was from Army Lieutenant General Doug Lute. He was the Afghan war czar in the White House for both Bush and Obama. And he said, we didn't have the foggiest notion of what we were undertaking in Afghanistan. We didn't know what we were doing.

He said, 2,400 lives lost, were they lost in vain?

When you see things like that from generals in charge of the war, they grab your attention.

JOHN YANG: And you talked to a lot of these people who were interviewed. Did you get any sense from them why they weren't -- they were saying these things in private to these -- the interviewers, but why they weren't saying these things in public?

CRAIG WHITLOCK: You know, that's a really good question.

And a lot of them haven't elaborated. I think what happened is, these people were being interviewed by another government agency, and many of them had assurances that they wouldn't be quoted by name, or that their comments wouldn't make it out without their approval.

And The Washington Post took the position that these are public records. These are people, senior government officials, criticizing the war from top to bottom, that the public has a right to know that.

So we have been fighting that for a long time. And we finally managed to pry a good number of them loose. But I think most of these people, they never -- they never thought they'd be quoted in public.

JOHN YANG: And you also say that these reports, as you say in the story: "Written in dense bureaucratic prose and focused on an alphabet soup of government initiatives, left out the harshest and most frank criticisms from the interviews."

Did you get a sense of why that was?

CRAIG WHITLOCK: Well, I asked the inspector general whose office was behind this project.

I said, here you have these commanders and ambassadors and White House officials all saying what a disaster the war was. How could you keep that from the public? If your job is to hold the government accountable for the war, how could you sit on this?

And I didn't get much of an answer. They said, well, maybe they would get around to it in a forthcoming report.

But I think there was a -- this was so explosive, what people were saying, I think another government agency just found it too hot to handle and decided it would be better to bury it.

JOHN YANG: But also, given the title of the project, Lessons Learned, you think they would want the harshest and most frank commentary to teach these lessons.

But they were not interested in sort of spreading this around the government?

CRAIG WHITLOCK: I think part of the issue here is, when they started this project in 2014, you have to remember, everybody assumed the war was coming to an end.

And I think they thought it was a safe time to do a Lessons Learned project and get people to look back in time to see what happened. Of course, at that point, President Obama said he was going to withdraw all troops by the time he left office. That didn't happen.

And then, when Trump took office, he's actually escalated the war. There are more troops there. The bombing from the air -- the air wars have intensified greatly. So, I think the war went on much longer than even this agency or anybody in government thought.

So I think it became much more sensitive, and they felt they had to keep it under wraps while the war was still going on.

JOHN YANG: And the people interviewed not only just talked about the military strategies, but also talked about the other strategies.

You pointed out that more than -- the amount of money that's been spent on Afghanistan, if adjusted for inflation, is more than the United States -- the United States spent on The Marshall Project after World War II.

And what's to show for it, as it were, from this report?

CRAIG WHITLOCK: Well, not much.

I mean, what we heard in interview after interview that these people gave, particularly aid workers in the field, military officers, diplomats, they all said, this was more money than they could possibly spend, that they were ordered by Congress and officials back in Washington during the Obama administration to spend, spend, spend as quickly as they could as much as they could.

And they were -- they really just graded on how much money they spent, not on whether these projects made any sense. And the people who had to do this, they said, not only didn't it make any sense, but it backfired because it

fueled corruption, it alienated the Afghan people against the Afghan government, and it just made everything much, much worse.

JOHN YANG: And you're going to have more coming up in The Post in the coming days?

CRAIG WHITLOCK: We are.

Every day, we're going to come out with a new volume. Tomorrow, we're going to have a piece on just how flawed the strategy was both for Bush and Obama, and, again, in the voices of the people who ran the war.

JOHN YANG: Craig Whitlock of The Washington Post with some very important reporting, thank you very much.

JUDY WOODRUFF: With eight weeks until the Iowa caucuses and 15 Democrats still vying for their party's presidential nomination, Amna Nawaz reports on how the top-polling candidates are turning their criticism on each other.

(CHEERING AND APPLAUSE)

AMNA NAWAZ: South Bend, Indiana, Mayor Pete Buttigieg today announced he will open all future fund-raisers to the press and make public the names of his top financial supporters, that after public pressure from fellow 2020 candidate Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren.

SEN. ELIZABETH WARREN (D-MA), Presidential Candidate: Americans are just sick of the typical politician who says one thing out in public and then goes behind closed doors. It's time for everyone in this campaign, including the mayor, to open up those closed-door fund-raisers and let the press come in.

AMNA NAWAZ: Warren herself faces criticism from Buttigieg for her closed-door events during previous Senate campaigns.

The two are also sparring over questions about who they represented while in private practice, Buttigieg as a consultant at McKinsey and Warren as a corporate lawyer.

Late on Sunday, Warren's campaign released additional client names and income totaling \$1.9 million over 25 years as a private attorney. Buttigieg has so far released information on the nature of his consultancy work, not a client list, citing a nondisclosure agreement.

But late today, McKinsey said it would allow him to disclose clients' names.

Meanwhile, in Nevada, Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders stayed out of fray, focusing more broadly on campaign finance.

SEN. BERNIE SANDERS (I-VT), Presidential Candidate: They say all those campaign contributions from the rich, they don't impact me.

Really? Then why do you think these guys are giving the money? Of course it impacts you.

AMNA NAWAZ: But former Vice President Joe Biden, asked about Buttigieg in an interview with Axios on HBO, noted the mayor's difficulty courting black voters.

JOSEPH BIDEN (D), Presidential Candidate: Mayor Pete obviously has had difficulty garnering black support in his home city.

I have never been uncomfortable or unwelcomed in the African-American community, and -- because they know I care deeply about the issues that affect them. And systemic racism still exists.

AMNA NAWAZ: Biden polls higher than any other candidate among black voters, but the candidates leading the polls so far are all white.

With just 10 days before the next debate, no candidates of color have made the cut.

New Jersey Senator Cory Booker, struggling to gain ground in national polls, has decried the party's qualification standards for putting more billionaires than African-Americans on the debate stage.

SEN. CORY BOOKER (D-NJ), Presidential Candidate: To win in the next election, we had -- we had massive drop-offs between 2012 and 2016 in African-American voting. And as a result of that, we lost three states. Whoever the next candidate is, they better have an authentic connection with African-American communities.

AMNA NAWAZ: Candidates still hoping to take part in next week's debate have until Thursday to meet the requirements.

And that brings us to Politics Monday with Amy Walter of The Cook Political Report and Public Radio's "Politics With Amy Walter," and Tamara Keith of NPR. She also co-hosts "The NPR Politics Podcast."

Welcome to you both. Good to see you.

Amy, I want to start with you.

Buttigieg has been under pressure to release, as we just reported in there, this client list from his time in McKinsey. McKinsey now says, you can release it.

I should also note that his campaign spokeswoman said they will be releasing that client list soon. We will keep an eye out for that.

Is there something on there that could damage him? Do voters care about this?

AMY WALTER, The Cook Political Report: Well, we will see what's on there and whether it matters.

But, look, it's pretty clear what's going on right now. Iowa, as Judy pointed out, is just two months away. Pete Buttigieg is now far and away the front-runner in Iowa. That used to be Elizabeth Warren's territory. She was seen over the summer as the candidate most likely to win the Iowa caucuses. She needs to get back into contention.

And the person that's standing in her way is Pete Buttigieg. So it makes perfect sense that she's going to be spending time trying to knock him off of the -- his first-place finish.

It's also really clear that the two of them need Iowa as a springboard. They are seeing, not only have they both been front-runners in the polls at certain points during this campaign, but both of them are expecting to use Iowa to springboard them to a really strong stand in New Hampshire.

And that, they think, will help them go to Nevada and South Carolina, places where they're not polling as well, because, as we heard in that opening, they're not doing quite as well, especially Pete Buttigieg, with voters of color.

AMNA NAWAZ: Tam, when you look at this larger conversation around transparency, this battle between Warren and Buttigieg so far, it strikes me that we're having it on the Democratic side at the same time we have a president who hasn't released his tax returns.

Is there just a different bar? Is this -- and a different bar for Democratic voters in particular?

TAMARA KEITH, National Public Radio: Well, there is a battle of radical transparency going on, on the Democratic side.

But this is about the Democratic primary. And they are signaling that they will be different than President Trump. Now, of course, they will all be different than President Trump. You have -- Vice President Biden has had reporters in his fund-raisers all along. Elizabeth Warren has not been having those big fund-raisers.

You have -- Bernie Sanders released his tax returns. And he was one of the more reluctant ones in 2016. He didn't release his tax returns, but, this time, he did. And then you have President Trump, who is literally in court every few days fighting to keep his records sealed.

AMNA NAWAZ: And -- sorry, go ahead.

(CROSSTALK)

AMY WALTER: No, and it's also -- what Tam points out is important is, in Democratic primaries, the things that may be animating voters aren't necessarily things that animate independent voters or voters who aren't voting in the Democratic primary.

But it is pretty clear that what they're also doing here with this sparring back and forth -- and I think we will see it on the debate stage too -- is, who can stand up when Trump hurls accusations at you? Who's going to be able to, when they get punched, be able not only to take it, but be able to counterpunch really quickly?

AMNA NAWAZ: Amy, something you have looked at, though, is when two candidates kind of hone in on each other and start sparring like this, it's often an opportunity for other candidates who are not involved in that crossfire to rise.

AMY WALTER: That's right. That's right. It's always -- to rise up.

AMNA NAWAZ: Who benefits from this?

AMY WALTER: Yes.

I mean, I think if you are somebody like Amy Klobuchar, you're watching this and saying, maybe this is my opportunity now. I have been sitting in fifth place. And maybe if the shine comes off those top two candidates, they drop a little bit, it gives me an opportunity to just focus on my message while not coming under attack. They're all going to be focusing on each other.

I think it's probably good for Joe Biden too for the spotlight to be off with him. Every time the spotlight is on him, it's usually for not good reasons. We're talking about something -- one of his weaknesses.

Now the focus on the challenges for Buttigieg and Warren give him an opportunity to make his case.

AMNA NAWAZ: Well, the spotlight is going to be on a few more candidates. There's another Democratic debate coming up. We're a few days away from the qualifying deadline.

That debate is going to be December 19 in Los Angeles. We at "NewsHour," of course, are co-hosting with our friends over at Politico.

But take a look at the candidates who have qualified so far. Just a reminder, we still have a few days before the qualifying deadline. All six candidates -- there you have Biden, Buttigieg, Klobuchar, Sanders, Steyer, and Warren.

All six candidates who have so far met all of the thresholds to qualify are white. If you take a look at the four candidates who are on the cusp, potentially, they have met one debate qualification, not yet the either, both Congresswoman Gabbard and Mr. Yang, I believe, have to make one more poll to qualify, and could still do so.

There's a divide there, very clear.

AMY WALTER: Yes.

AMNA NAWAZ: And, Tam, you and your colleagues have been talking to Democratic voters out there.

For a party that so desperately needs voters of color to rally and be enthusiastic behind it, is that a problem, an all-white debate stage?

TAMARA KEITH: Well, a lot of my colleagues have been out talking to Democratic voters, as you say.

And, sometimes, what they're hearing from voters of color who are Democrats is this sort of whisper of, well, we want to take on Trump. We think that maybe -- maybe somebody like a Biden or a Sanders or a -- like, they -- they wonder whether a candidate of color can take on Trump.

There are a lot of -- as you talk to Democratic voters, a lot of Democrats are still sort of replaying 2016, trying to figure out what went wrong, what they can do this time to beat the president. And you hear in these sort of whispered tones a number of people I talk to, women, saying, oh, I don't know if women -- if a woman can beat Trump.

And my colleagues who've been out in an Iowa just in the last week have heard voters of color saying, well, we don't -- we just don't know if if -- maybe -- maybe we need a white guy to take on President Trump.

(CROSSTALK)

AMY WALTER: Well, yes.

And let's be clear too, when we look at the -- I don't know -- we get the farm team of potential presidential candidates, there aren't a whole lot of women and people of color there. Look at governors. Look at senators.

The only two African-American senators in the entire United States Senate are currently running for president, or were. Obviously, Kamala Harris just dropped out.

So the pool is not that deep. And of the folks who are in the pool, they're actually running. What needs to happen is, the Senate needs to and governorships need to look a lot more like the Democratic coalition in the House. That actually is much more reflective of the Democratic electorate, the House caucus, which is majority female and non-white.

And that is what, eventually, the theory is that the Senate and governorships would look like. But we're not there yet.

AMNA NAWAZ: Amy, before we go -- rather, Tam. I apologize.

I want to get your take on this long awaited release of the watchdog report, the Justice Department's inspector general. Very quickly, in 30 seconds, what did you make of the response from President Trump and his attorney general?

TAMARA KEITH: The response from President Trump and his attorney general was almost like they were looking at a different inspector general's report.

But they -- the president and Attorney General Barr have wanted to focus on sort of discrediting the entire investigation. And Barr, much as he did with the Mueller report, came out, made a statement saying, this is what I see in here.

AMNA NAWAZ: Tamara Keith and Amy Walter, that is Politics Monday.

Good to see you both.

AMY WALTER: Thank you.

TAMARA KEITH: Thank you.

JUDY WOODRUFF: "Jagged Little Pill," Alanis Morissette's Grammy Award-winning album released in 1995, became the angry and raw soundtrack of a generation.

Today, it is the basis of a musical that has just opened on Broadway.

Special correspondent Jared Bowen of WGBH caught up with the show as it made its pre-Broadway run in Boston.

The story is part of our ongoing arts and culture series, Canvas.

JARED BOWEN: It came out of nowhere. Released just before summer in 1995, the album "Jagged Little Pill" tore into culture with all the ferocity its title would suggest.

The lyrics were all those of a teenager, Alanis Morissette, who had been a purveyor of pop in her native Canada. Today, she remembers she suddenly had something altogether different to say.

ALANIS MORISSETTE, Musician: I was giving myself permission to express exactly what was going on without sugarcoating it.

JARED BOWEN: Over the next year came a flood of singles that burned through the sheen of life. It was the anti-pop.

And writing was producer Glen Ballard, Morissette got real and raw.

ALANIS MORISSETTE: There was an urgency to the writing, definitely.

It was -- it was almost manic in a way, a very channeled experience, super exhausting, but really, really gratifying. And we got all the vocals on tape one or two takes 80 percent of the record or the original demos. So it was a very sacred experience, certainly.

JARED BOWEN: The record won five Grammys, went on to sell 33 million copies and is now among the bestselling albums of all time.

Do you look back at it now and -- what happened? What the heck happened?

(LAUGHTER)

ALANIS MORISSETTE: Good question.

You know, I mean, I make funny guesses at this, but some of it was that there was a movement, whether it was the feminist movement or consciousness evolution movement. And the wave was happening, and I feel as though I put my hand up and volunteered to be on the front top of the wave with my surfboard.

And I became a spokesperson of a kind for this emergence of an authentic experience of what it is to be human, what it was to be a woman in those times.

JARED BOWEN: Today, under the direction of Tony winner Diane Paulus, "Jagged Little Pill" is taking on a new life.

ALANIS MORISSETTE: The running joke became, you know, there was a circumstance in this story that was emerging, and I would say, I have a song for that. And they would say, of course you do.

(LAUGHTER)

JARED BOWEN: The musical centers on a middle-class family in Connecticut. Picture-perfect on the outside, they're unraveling from within, beset by a host of issues plaguing families today, from opioid addiction to sexual assault.

ALANIS MORISSETTE: I was up for it out of the gate. You know, I didn't want the songs to lead, as such. I wanted the songs to support the story, if that makes sense.

DIABLO CODY, Writer: The songs do an incredible amount of heavy lifting.

JARED BOWEN: Academy Award winning screenwriter Diablo Cody makes her theatrical debut with "Jagged Little Pill," writing the show's book.

With myriad projects in the works, Cody says she didn't have time for the show. But as someone whose adolescence was shaped by Morisette, she couldn't say no either.

DIABLO CODY: I couldn't not do it. Those are the projects that you can't walk away from, when you think to yourself, I will be consumed with jealousy and rage if somebody else gets to do this.

(LAUGHTER)

DIABLO CODY: Like, the ones where you just -- you can just see future you regretting not doing this.

JARED BOWEN: Here, Cody has created the family, and all the issues drowning them, as a metaphor for society, writ large, addiction chief among them, apt, she says, for a show called "Jagged Little Pill."

DIABLO CODY: Right now, we are in a place as a society where a lot of people are in desperate need of comfort and are feeling just kind of disenfranchised.

And so it honestly doesn't surprise me to see this, the crisis -- the opiate crisis. It just doesn't -- it feels sort of grotesquely appropriate to the times.

JARED BOWEN: As does Morisette's music, even though it's now more than 20 years old.

DIABLO CODY: It's crazy to me how well it holds up. There's no song that I hear and think, oh, that's juvenile, or, oh, I can't believe I thought this was profound when I was 16. If anything, it's more profound to me now.

ALANIS MORISSETTE: I can still sing it with as much conviction, perhaps even more, based on the fact that I think there's more receptivity to some of the topics that I dive into when I write.

JARED BOWEN: Including anger, a label that's always been synonymous with her work and which defines some of the show's younger characters.

ALANIS MORISSETTE: I love anger. You know, and if I'm going to be one-dimensionalized as anything, I will take anger. I think it's a gorgeous life force.

I think it gets a bad rap because of how it shows up destructively in the world. The acting out of anger in destructive ways is a big boo for me. But the actual life force itself, in the sense and the body of what anger is, and the heat, and the jaw clench, and the forward movement, I mean, it helps me, and others, I'm assuming, set boundaries, speak up for oneself, say no.

JARED BOWEN: Morisette says, when she finished the album, she had no idea it would be so successful.

ALANIS MORISSETTE: My dad said when I was younger, he goes: "Sweetheart, people are going to love you, people are going to hate you, and most people won't give a (EXPLETIVE DELETED)."

You know? And I said, OK, well, if that's the case, you know, I'm left with just defining myself, and trying things on for size, and seeing if they fit, and defining what my value system is, and how I want to show up, and how I don't want to show up.

And that's all I can continue to do.

JARED BOWEN: Morisette's intention has always been to make the music matter, a philosophy she now carries to the musical.

For the "PBS NewsHour," I'm Jared Bowen of WGBH in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

PBS NewsHour for December 9, 2019

JUDY WOODRUFF: "Jagged Little Pill" now a show.

And that is the "NewsHour" for tonight. I'm Judy Woodruff.

Join us online and again right here tomorrow evening. For all of us at the "PBS NewsHour," thank you, and we'll see you soon.

Load-Date: December 9, 2019

End of Document