The CIA And Lockheed Martin. Dalliances Leave National Security Feeling Jilted.

Author : michaelbloomer

According to unnamed souces, national security has rarely felt more cruelly jilted, left unprotected and vulnerable, and for so little. Former CIA Director David Petraeus' (almost) clandestine affair with his biographer Joan Broadwell potentially left national security out in the rain without an umbrella.

And, last Friday we learned that Lockheed Martin Corp., the nation's premier defense and intelligence firm[1] found itself similalry ensnared as well. **Christopher Kubasik**, Lockheed's

(now former) Chief Operating Officer and, as well, its CEO-in-waiting, immediately resigned after a Lockheed investigation initiated on a tip by an employee disclosed he had a personal relationship with a subordinate. [2]

Both are men deep within America's national security apparatus, both are men carrying top secret security clearances, and both were men who at all times needed to scrupulously avoid any relationships that would put national security at risk.

What a spy novel *this* would make.

As for David Petraeus, congressional intelligence committees will push hard to discover whether there is cause for national security concerns. Petraeus, when chief intel officer of the CIA, carried in his head so-called "beyond top secret information," and more of it than all but a few government officials, indeed, if *any*. And as we all know (if not from our own experience) people get sloppy in their clandestine affairs. Whether Peraeus did so with Paula Broadwell will be examined in the weeks ahead, but certainly, national security was potentially left out on a limb.

This is not to question Petraeus's loyalty. It's his discretion that's important here. How careful was he with his secrets? The *New Yorker*'s Amy Davidson wondered:

> But an extramarital affair is, to say the least, a surprise, raising questions about whether some other element had been tangled up in the affair, or magnified or even more important than the affair. Was he or his security, or that of the C.I.A., compromised in some way by the affair? . . . In addition to the blackmail issue, one imagines that he will at least be asked about where he might have been with classified material. [3]

As for Lockheed Martin, in 2011 William Hartung wrote, "If you have a life, Lockheed Martin is likely a part of it," [4] and given that status Lockheed is a *de facto* government intelligence agency.[5] Like a demi-CIA, a few of the company's executives are thereby privy to "beyond top secret" government information. Christopher Kubasik was one of them.

And that has consequences. During a conference call last Friday, Lockheed Martin's Chairman and CEO Bob Stevens and others tried to reassure financial markets that despite Kubasik's resignation all was well at Lockheed Martin. Also speaking during the conference call, the new CEO-designee picked to replace Kubasik, Marilynn Hewson, offered this "[Lockheed] will move together beyond this *temporary distraction."* [6] No doubt, she's right, Lockheed *will* move forward; it *must*, after all Lockheed is, for better or for worse, a national security necessity. But as for their own "Petraeous affair" *is it*, as Marilyn Hewson asserted, a "temporary distraction"?

More importantly, *should* it be?

No, it should not. Given Christopher Kubasik's prior station at Lockheed one step below the tip of the corporate pyramid, and his consequent involvement in all things tip top secret, his actions, like Petraeus's, need more scrutiny than garden variety hanky-panky, which usually would be a non-public internal ethics affair for Lockheed Martin. This is different. Wow, is it different.

There's presently no indication that either man carelessly or accidentally passed along well-guarded secrets to their partners, but we do need to clear the air. Perhaps there's an extra hot seat available for Christopher Kubasik at the intelligence committee table where David Petraeus will soon be seated?

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

1. $41,537,519,292 revenue in 2011; the company receives one of every 14 dollars doled out by the Pentagon, the most of any firm Lockheed Martin FY2011 ?
2. *Announcing a leadership change.* Memorandum to employees, Bob Stevens, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Nov. 9, 2012. ?
3. Questions About the Petraeus Resignation, Amy Davidson, *New Yorker*, Nov/ 9, 2012. ?
4. *Is Lockheed Martin Shadowing You?*, William D. Hartung, Jan. 12, 2011. Concise and well worth reading. ?
5. Lockheed Martin, in the 1990s, developed an intelligence systems business that is second to none. Hartung wrote: "As a result, Lockheed Martin is now involved in nearly every interaction you have with the government." *Id.* ?
6. Conference call audio. ?