

EXAMINING THE INVESTIGATION INTO
THE DNC AND RNC PIPE BOMBS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE REMAINING QUESTIONS
SURROUNDING JANUARY 6, 2021

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2026

Serial No. 119-50

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



Available via: <http://judiciary.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2026

62-624

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JIM JORDAN, Ohio, *Chair*

DARRELL ISSA, California	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Member</i>
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	JERROLD NADLER, New York
TOM McCLINTOCK, California	ZOE LOFGREN, California
THOMAS P. TIFFANY, Wisconsin	STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
CHIP ROY, Texas	ERIC SWALWELL, California
SCOTT FITZGERALD, Wisconsin	TED LIEU, California
BEN CLINE, Virginia	PRAMILA JAYAPAL, Washington
LANCE GOODEN, Texas	J. LUIS CORREA, California
JEFFERSON VAN DREW, New Jersey	MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania
TROY E. NEHLS, Texas	JOE NEGUSE, Colorado
BARRY MOORE, Alabama	LUCY McBATH, Georgia
KEVIN KILEY, California	DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina
HARRIET M. HAGEMAN, Wyoming	BECCA BALINT, Vermont
LAUREL M. LEE, Florida	JESÚS G. "CHUY" GARCÍA, Illinois
WESLEY HUNT, Texas	SYDNEY KAMLAGER-DOVE, California
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	DANIEL S. GOLDMAN, New York
BRAD KNOTT, North Carolina	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
MARK HARRIS, North Carolina	
ROBERT F. ONDER, Jr., Missouri	
DEREK SCHMIDT, Kansas	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	
MICHAEL BAUMGARTNER, Washington	

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE REMAINING QUESTIONS SURROUNDING JANUARY 6, 2021

BARRY LOUDERMILK, Georgia, *Chair*

H. MORGAN GRIFFITH, Virginia	ERIC SWALWELL, California, <i>Ranking Member</i>
TROY NEHLS, Texas	
HARRIET M. HAGEMAN, Wyoming	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida

CHRISTOPHER HIXON, *Majority Staff Director*
ARTHUR EWENCZYK, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2026

OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
The Honorable Barry Loudermilk, Chair of the Select Subcommittee to Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021, from the State of Georgia	1
The Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Maryland	4

WITNESSES

Christopher M. Piehota, Principal Consultant, Deep Water Point & Associates	
Oral Testimony	8
Prepared Testimony	10
Thomas Anthony Speciale, II, Senior Advisor, Intelligence and National Security Alliance	
Oral Testimony	13
Prepared Testimony	16
John Nantz, Contributing Writer, Townhall Media	
Oral Testimony	19
Prepared Testimony	21
Michael J. Romano, Counsel, Lichten & Liss Riordan	
Oral Testimony	23
Prepared Testimony	25

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC. SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

All materials submitted for the record by the Select Subcommittee To Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021, are listed below	57
Materials submitted by the Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Maryland, for the record	
A statement Pamela Hemphill, convicted criminal for January 6, 2021	
An article entitled, "Former Pentagon chief: Trump gave no order to prepare troops before Jan. 6," Jul. 27, 2022, <i>The Hill</i>	
A fact check entitled, "Pelosi did not block the National Guard from the Capitol on Jan. 6," Jul. 23, 2021, <i>Associated Press</i>	
An article entitled, "Trump Forgets He Was President During Capitol Riot, Blames 'THE BIDEN FBI' for Jan. 6 in Dead-of-Night Post," Oct. 12, 2025, <i>Yahoo</i>	
A report entitled, "One Year Later: Assessing the Public Safety Implications of President Trump's Mass Pardons of 1,600 January 6th Rioters and Insurrectionists," Jan. 2026, <i>Staff Report, Democrat, Committee on the Judiciary</i>	
An article entitled, "Trump May Have Accidentally Pardoned the Jan. 6 Pipe Bomber," Jun. 6, 2026, <i>Politico</i>	

Materials submitted by the Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Maryland, for the record—Continued

A page entitled, “District of Columbia National Guard > About Us,”
District of Columbia National Guard

The document 18 U.S.C. 2384—Seditious conspiracy, Legal Information Institute, Cornell Law School

An opinion *Republican National Committee v. Nancy Pelosi*, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 22–659 (TJK), May 1, 2022

An article entitled, “Trump Impeached for Inciting Insurrection: President Trump became the first president to be impeached twice, after the House approved a single charge citing his role in whipping up a mob that stormed the Capitol. He faces a Senate trial that could disqualify him from future office,” Apr. 22, 2021, *The New York Times*, submitted by the Honorable Jasmine Crockett, a Member of the Select Subcommittee to Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021, from the State of Texas, for the record

Materials submitted by the Honorable Clay Higgins, a Member of the Select Subcommittee to Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021, from the State of Louisiana, for the record

A letter to the Hon. David Pekoske, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, from the Bennie G. Thompson, Chair of the Committee on Homeland Security from the State of Mississippi, and John Katko, former Ranking Member of the of the Committee on Homeland Security from the State of New York, Jan. 11, 2021

The Grand Jury indictment, *United States of America v. Brian J. Cole, Jr.*, in the United States District Court, the District of Columbia, Dec. 16, 2025

Materials submitted by the Honorable Troy Nehls, a Member of the Select Subcommittee to Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021, from the State of Texas, for the record

An article entitled, “Biggest investigation in FBI history still has Merrick Garland in the hot seat,” Jan. 5, 2022, *CNN*

An article entitled, “Trump is elected 47th president, soundly defeating Harris to retake White House,” Nov. 6, 2024, *Los Angeles Times*

Materials submitted by the Honorable Barry Loudermilk, Chair of the Select Subcommittee to Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021, from the State of Georgia, for the record

A press release entitled, “Governor Pritzker’s Sanctuary Illinois Released More than 1,700 Criminal Illegal Aliens Including Murderers, Pedophiles, and Kidnappers,” Dec. 8, 2025, *Department of Homeland Security*

A press release entitled, “Sanctuary New York Released Nearly 7,000 Criminal Illegal Aliens Including Murderers, Terrorists, and Sexual Predators,” Dec. 1, 2025, *Department of Homeland Security*

A press release entitled, “Transcripts Show President Trump’s Directives to Pentagon Leadership to ‘Keep January 6 Safe’ Were Deliberately Ignored,” Sept. 20, 2024, *Committee on House Administration*

An article entitled, “Pelosi admits blame for ‘stupidity’ in Jan. 6 security failures in newly released video: ‘I take full responsibility,’” Aug. 28, 2024, *New York Post*

EXAMINING THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE DNC AND RNC PIPE BOMBS

Wednesday, January 14, 2026

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
REMAINING QUESTIONS SURROUNDING JANUARY 6, 2021

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Washington, DC

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:23 p.m., in Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, the Hon. Barry Loudermilk [Chair of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Loudermilk, Griffith, Higgins, Nehls, Hageman, Crockett, Moskowitz, and Raskin.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The hearing will now come to order.

Welcome, everyone, to the first hearing of the Select Subcommittee To Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding the January 6, 2021, events, entitled “Examining the Investigation into the DNC and RNC Pipe Bombs.” Thank you, Ranking Member Raskin and the Members of the Select Committee and witnesses, for joining us here today.

I note that a quorum is present. Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time.

I’ll now recognize myself for an opening statement.

I’ve been investigating the remaining questions surrounding January 6th for three years. When this particular Subcommittee was formed in September of last year, I directed my team that oversight of the FBI’s investigation to the DNC and RNC pipe bombs would be a top priority.

In many ways, the bizarre constellation of facts surrounding the discovery of the pipe bombs is emblematic of the many unresolved questions about January 6th that remain today.

What information did Federal law enforcement have, when did they have it, and what did they do with it?

How did the Joe Biden and Merrick Garland’s Department of Justice prioritize the apprehension and prosecution of Americans trespassing on restricted Capitol Grounds relative to the apprehension of the pipe bomber?

How is it that the Biden–Wray FBI was able to flawlessly execute a cellular dragnet to capture the information and eventually

apprehend those trespassing at the Capitol, but failed to exercise the same investigative technique into the pipe bomber?

How is it that the Democrat-controlled Select Committee to investigate January 6th managed to write a final report in which they cover more than 700 pages and eight chapters without ever mentioning the pipe bombs until an appendix in the back of the report.

Was information related to the pipe bombs part of the more than one terabyte of information that the Select Committee failed to retain, and in some cases deleted from computers just days before the Republicans took over the Majority in 2023?

These questions and many more remain unanswered.

The significance of the pipe bombs and how the events of January 6th unfolded cannot be overstated. The evidence suggests that the pipe bombs' discovery diverted significant law enforcement attention and resources away from the Capitol at the exact time they were needed most.

It's hard to comprehend why both the Wray FBI and the Select Committee, despite their shared zeal for bringing to justice those who trespassed at the Capitol, have shown little effort or interest regarding the pipe bombs.

As a quick refresher, at 17:49 p.m. on January 5, 2021, a suspect placed a pipe bomb next to a bench beside the Democrat National Committee headquarters building, then placed a second device in an alley near the RNC. Fortunately, neither pipe bomb detonated.

After laying in plain sight for nearly 17 hours, both devices were independently discovered on January 6th within a few minutes of the vote to certify the election results.

On January 6th, at 1:05 p.m., Capital Police responded to a pipe bomb reported at the RNC and at the same time that protesters began surging outside the Capitol and the legislators prepared to certify the vote. The Capitol Police Chief had to split his team, sending significant resources to handle two pipe bomb incidents.

In addition to diverting resources away from the Capitol, the security perimeter set up around the DNC due to the discovery of the pipe bomb prevented Capitol Police from receiving the delivery of an additional 400 bike racks that had been requested to serve as protective barriers.

The urgent need for 400 bike racks arose after nearly 500 racks were unexpectedly removed from the Capitol on the evening of January 5th. The removal of these bikes were, according to Valerie Hasberry, who was the Chief Security Officer for the Architect of the Capitol, she said this was absolutely illogical.

The discovery of the pipe bombs on January 6th further disrupted efforts to establish those boundaries and strained security resources.

The placement and timing of the pipe bombs' discovery proved critical in blurring the lines between public space and restricted Capitol Grounds and therefore made it easier for protestors to enter the Capitol Building on January 6th.

The Biden-Garland Department of Justice boasted that the Wray FBI pursued their investigations of Americans following the events at the Capitol on January 6, 2021, with, quote "unprecedented speed and scale."

We now know that for 47 out of Joe Biden's 48 months in office, the Wray FBI held in its possession the critical evidence identifying Brian Cole, Jr., as the pipe bomber, but failed to make any progress on the case.

In contrast, in October 2025, the Patel FBI put together a designated Red Team consisting of law enforcement officers from outside the FBI. Within six weeks of its creation, the Red Team identified Brian Cole, Jr., as a suspect using material and evidence the FBI had in its possession since February 2021.

On December 4, 2025, four years, 11 months, and two days after the event, the Patel FBI arrested Cole for allegedly planting the pipe bombs.

The FBI operational updates and internal after-action report paint a dismal picture of the Wray FBI's investigation of the bombs.

While there is evidence showing that some resources were dedicated to the investigation, there is also evidence that critical components of the investigation were slow-walked, and then resources were cut just two months in.

For example, CAST, the Cell Analysis Team, reported, quote, "difficulties in getting the Washington Field Office to accept help, deployment delayed."

Then, on February 26, 2020, the FBI noted that the Washington Field Office's pipe bomb investigation team was quote, "expected to decrease in the coming weeks." At the same time, the FBI was diverting resources from the case.

Given the significant evidence against Cole in multiple categories, it is difficult to understand how he was not identified as a suspect in the Spring 2021. Why did it take a team of non-FBI personnel who reexamined the evidence to develop Cole as a suspect? Was this merely incompetence? If so, what can be done to better equip our FBI?

The Wray FBI's failure to act on the evidence in their possession demands thorough examination. Additionally, there are still critical details regarding this case that must be understood.

First, what was the pipe bomb suspect doing on the phone during the course of planting the devices? Does this activity implicate any other suspects?

Second, on January 2025, my team issued a report that discussed the FBI's investigation into a computer search conducted after the pipe bombs were planted, but before they were discovered, a search that read: "Pipe bombs, D.C." Was this Cole?

If so, this is another key piece of evidence tied to Cole that was overlooked. If not, is the person who conducted that search tied to Cole?

Additionally, the FBI operational updates note two eyewitnesses who described the gray hoodie suspect as a White male. Did this influence the FBI's investigation?

Today, we hope our witnesses will shed light on the FBI investigative protocol to help us begin to unravel what went so wrong with the Wray FBI's management of this case.

I now recognize the Ranking Member, Mr. Raskin, for an opening statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you very kindly, Mr. Chair. Thanks to our witnesses for joining us.

I would like to begin by offering appreciation to the men and women of the FBI who apprehended the January 6th pipe bomb suspect. This has been a rare bright spot for Federal law enforcement over the last year.

I also want to thank the Capitol officers who defended us with such valor and such courage on January 6th, who defended the Members of the House, the Senate, our staffs, and everyone else who was caught up in the siege against the Capitol in the attempt to overthrow the 2020 Presidential election.

Those officers continue to defend us and continue to endure the abuse of the January 6th insurrectionists. Check out this video from what just happened last week on January 6th.

[Video shown.]

Mr. RASKIN. The abuse of our officers continues, just as the plaque, which was passed overwhelmingly by Congress to be installed in the Capitol complex, has still not been put up by Speaker Johnson.

Now, of course, the prosecution of Brian Cole, the pipe bomb suspect, remains ongoing. The full facts of the case have not yet emerged. Under our criminal justice system, of course, he is presumed innocent until proven guilty. This hearing is at best premature. I hope certainly it does nothing to recklessly endanger the prosecution of Mr. Cole.

Here is what we do know. We know that Brian Cole voted for Donald Trump twice. We know that in his own words he was inspired and incited by Donald Trump's big lie, the pathetic lie that the 2020 election had been stolen, a lie that has been debunked and repudiated by more than 60 different Federal and State court decisions across the land in every court that's looked at it, and of course was rejected by the Congress of the United States as well.

Mr. Cole told investigators he was in D.C. because he was going to protest in support of Donald Trump. He told the FBI that he believed the narrative that Trump had spread that the election was indeed tampered with, quote, "Someone needs to speak up, right?"

Well, like the thousands of Trump supporters who stormed the Capitol on January 6th, Mr. Cole did something more than just speak up. He set what the FBI concluded were viable explosive devices on Capitol Hill, near feet away from where thousands of people lived and worked and dropped their kids off at daycare.

It is only due to the heroic actions of the Capitol Police and a watchful bystander that these devices were discovered and disarmed.

Make no mistake, Mr. Cole's political goals appear to have been no different than those of the Proud Boys, the Oath Keepers, and hundreds of cop beaters and rioters who stormed the Capitol—to foment violence on that day, to terrorize the police, but most of all, to stop the steal and overturn the election that was certified in the United States of America with Joe Biden defeating Donald Trump by more than seven million votes, 306–232 in the electoral college.

There are only two real differences between the pipe bomber and the rioters.

First, unlike so many of the rioters, Mr. Cole was thankfully unsuccessful in his efforts to injure law enforcement and innocent people on that day.

Second, unlike the other rioters, it has not yet been determined whether Mr. Cole actually got a pardon from Donald Trump. Trump granted a, quote, “full, complete, and unconditional pardon to all individuals convicted of offenses related to events that occurred at or near the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021.”

Mr. Cole, if convicted, would he be covered by this unprecedented corrupt pardon offered by Donald Trump, who incited the insurrection against the Union? Well, Mr. Cole’s lawyer definitely seems to think so.

President Trump and his DOJ have already attempted to legitimize violence against the police on that day. Is it their position that the pardon extends to Mr. Cole as someone who was involved in the events that occurred near the Capitol, or is it a position that it’s OK to beat police officers with Confederate battle flags, Donald Trump flags, American flags, tase them, haze them, vilify them, demonize them, taunt them, trample them, kick them, and punch them, but they draw the line at planting an explosive device? I would be very interested to know the answer to that.

It’s been obvious for quite some time the pipe bomber was motivated by the same lies and violent rhetoric as everybody else who followed Donald Trump’s orders on that day. To avoid that reality, Republicans have deployed conspiracy theory after conspiracy theory about the pipe bomber.

Donald Trump falsely claimed the FBI knew who it was all along.

Dan Bongino, the former podcaster who turned former FBI Deputy Director, who recently quit for mysterious reasons, told us that this was a setup. He said it was an inside job.

Just a few months ago, the *Blaze* wrote a ludicrous article pinning the pipe bombs on an innocent Capitol Police Officer on the basis of how she walked, which unsurprisingly was quickly exposed for the pure concoction it was.

That did not stop multiple Republican Members of Congress—including, I’m afraid to say, you, Mr. Chair, at least I’m told, although I haven’t seen what you said directly—but certainly multiple Members of Congress promoted the article and its authors, and the false and dangerous idea that it was a former Capitol Police Officer who planted those bombs, an idea that continues to fester in the deepest and darkest corners of the extremist internet.

Mr. Chair, I think that the Capitol Police officer deserves an apology from any Member of Congress who participated in that particular lie and conspiracy theory.

These conspiracy theories have finally been debunked, but they’ve not been put to rest. We’re here as part of the “Select Subcommittee to Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021.”

Since the identity and motivation of the pipe bomber had been long one of the last question marks remaining, I am interested to know what are the remaining questions, because we’ve got a bunch of answers, but I certainly have some questions remaining.

One question I've got is: Why is it that those who pushed the big lie and tried to steal the election and participated in the riots at the Capitol, from Ed Martin to Heather Honey to Jared Wise and Jeffrey Clark, why are they now holding positions of power and influence in this administration?

We should also be holding a hearing on how Donald Trump pardoned the Proud Boys, the Oath Keepers, and other felons for violently assaulting hundreds of police officers against the wishes of more than 80 percent of the American people who reject those pardons.

What have been the public safety implications of those pardons? How about a hearing on the 33 pardoned rioters who have since gone on to commit other felony crimes, including possession of child pornography, rape, conspiracy to commit murder of FBI agents, kidnapping, sexual assault, aggravated robbery, reckless homicide, and so many more? How about a hearing on that?

How about a hearing on why the Speaker refuses to put up a plaque that by law was supposed to have been posted in 2023 in honor of the police officers who defended us?

How about a hearing on why, unlike Ashli Babbitt's family, which got a handsome \$5 million payout, even after two government investigations determined that the police had acted reasonably and appropriately in her case, how about a hearing on why the 140 officers who were injured on that day and the five officers who died in the days that followed, including officer Brian Sicknick and his family, why have they received nothing, not one penny, not one dollar, and Ashli Babbitt's family got \$5 million, even though there was no finding of any culpability on the part of the government? How about a hearing on that?

How about a hearing on whether we've done justice to the police officers who defended us on that day? How about a hearing on that, Mr. Chair?

Well, nothing that can be said around the edges of this nightmare is ever going to take away or erase the indelible truth of what happened. The President, not being able to handle his loss by more than seven million votes in the Presidential election, used every means at his disposal to try to overturn the election, to concoct fraudulent electoral slates, to try to get the Department of Justice to just say the election was corrupt and leave the rest to me and my Republican friends in Congress to try to force the Vice President of the United States, Mike Pence, to assert powers he didn't have to reject the electoral college votes and then to unleash a mob of thousands of people to attack Congress.

That's the reality. Nobody's laid a glove on a single sentence in the report of the January 6th Select Committee. Not one.

I defy anyone to challenge that statement. I would love to see someone show how anything we have found has been contradicted. Nothing. Not Presidential firings and demotions of devoted civil servants, like all the DOJ lawyers and FBI agents who've been sacked and demoted, not the Presidential pardons. Not all the tweets about how this was a day of love. Nothing will ever White-wash the indelible facts of that day.

Mr. Chair, I thank you for your indulgence, and I yield back to you.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman yields.

Without objection, all other Members' opening statements will be made part of the hearing record if they are submitted to the Committee clerk by 5:00 p.m. today.

I'd now like to introduce today's witnesses that are here to testify on the FBI's investigation into the pipe bomb.

Mr. Chris Piehota is a former FBI Senior Executive Official, serving over 25 years in the Bureau in various senior positions, including as an Executive Assistant Director and a special agent in charge.

Accordingly, he is well-equipped to provide insight into the FBI's protocol for handling cases like the investigation into the pipe bombs.

Mr. Piehota currently delivers strategic guidance and advice regarding national security matters, cyber operations, security practices, risk mitigation, and more.

Mr. Thomas Speciale is a former Senior Advisor to the Director of National Intelligence at the United States National Counterintelligence and Security Center.

Mr. Speciale has also served as Senior Collection Strategist on Domestic Terrorism at the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

He is a career intelligence officer, having served across the U.S. intelligence community in and out of uniform for over 20 years, and has a great understanding of how intelligence is used from an operational standpoint and can help provide insight into the intelligence failures which occurred on the 6th.

Mr. John Nantz is a former FBI Special Agent. In total, Mr. Nantz has served in the law enforcement community for 26 years. He was assigned to the Miami Field Office and subsequently to the Washington Field Office where he finished as a Supervisory Special Agent.

Prior to his FBI career, Mr. Nantz was a Deputy Sheriff. Mr. Nantz's combined law enforcement experiences make him well-suited to provide insight into the FBI's pipe bomb investigation.

Mr. Mike Romano is currently a Counsel at Lichten & Liss-Rioridan. Prior to his position, Mr. Romano previously served as a prosecutor at the Department of Justice for over 17 years.

We'll now begin by swearing in the witnesses.

Would you please stand and raise your right hand? Do you swear, under penalty of perjury, that the testimony you are about to give is true and correct and to the best of your knowledge, information, and belief, so help you God? You may be seated.

Let the record reflect that the witnesses have answered in the affirmative.

We thank you all for being here.

Please know that your written testimony will be entered into the record in its entirety. Accordingly, we ask that you do summarize and complete your summary of your testimony in five minutes.

Please remember to turn on your microphones using the button in front of you so that members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light on the timer in front of you will turn green. After four minutes it will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your

four minutes has expired, and we ask that you please wrap up at that moment.

Mr. Piehota, we'll start with you, and you may begin.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER M. PIEHOTA

Mr. PIEHOTA. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Loudermilk, Ranking Member Raskin, and the Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its handling of the Capitol Hill pipe bomb investigation. It's an honor to visit with the Committee today.

As said, my name is Chris Piehota. I am a retired FBI agent with nearly 25 years of experience. At the time of my retirement, I served as an Executive Assistant Director, one of the FBI's most senior executive roles. Prior to this role, I served as an Assistant Director, and before that as a Special Agent in Charge.

During my FBI career, I was taught about and personally developed familiarity with investigative, operational, administrative, and leadership requirements that can and should be met during properly executed and managed FBI operations.

We are here today to discuss the possible circumstances surrounding a case that cuts to the heart of public trust in Federal law enforcement; specifically, the FBI, specifically the placement of two viable pipe bombs outside of Democratic and Republican National Committee headquarters, circa January 5, 2021.

The December 4, 2025, arrest of Brian J. Cole, Jr., was a noteworthy investigative achievement for the FBI and its law enforcement partners.

Unfortunately, this arrest alone is not the central issue before this Committee. A primary issue for discussion today is how this case remained unsolved for nearly five years, despite indications that the FBI had decisive information in its possession.

There are three primary areas of consideration when looking at the past and present FBI challenges: Culture, leadership, and operational practices.

We must assess the following factors to determine the FBI's general fitness and performance in how it conducted the Capitol Hill pipe bomb case.

Culture. How did the FBI demand the fabled fidelity, bravery, and integrity in all its related operations?

In the high stakes environment present, it was plausible that investigators inadvertently eliminated or disregarded possible leads due to a lack of time and resources or flawed prioritizations, a fidelity shortfall; they became overly conservative in their approaches for fear of mistakes, a bravery shortfall; or pursued too many leads in a surface-level fashion to show urgency and expected progress, an integrity shortfall.

In the end, culture determined how the organization behaved and performed when times were good or bad.

Leadership environment. Leadership remains the lifeblood of any FBI investigation, the kind of fearless, principled leadership that demands excellence and makes no concessions when the safety and security of the American people are at stake.

How did the FBI leadership set expectations and maintain standards, preferred practices, and behaviors during this case? What

drove FBI leadership to set priorities, allocate resources, and motivate people in this matter?

One thing I learned over the course of my career was, ultimately, we lead or we fail.

Operational practices. Information volume can crush an investigative team if not adequately resourced and prioritized.

How did the FBI manage investigative workloads that could have resulted in terabytes of specialized data and information and required a small standing army to process investigative findings in a timely, usable manner.

Regarding other operational impacts, the presence of additional factors, such as case ownership churn, the reassignment of case agents, insufficient investigative skill or experience, investigative or analytic stovepipes, and overwhelmed administrative systems could have converged to cause unforeseen and unrecognized investigative gaps.

If the pipe bomb investigation was not actively led and managed, it is no surprise that the investigation eventually stalled.

In closing, this discussion brings us to an important takeaway. The Cole arrest itself appears to revalidate and remind us of the power, effectiveness, and necessity of a skilled, objective, apolitical, well-led FBI. However, the Cole arrest was not born of a new strategy, it was the result of a salvage operation.

Salvage operations and cold case approaches will not protect America and its people. The Cole arrest indicates that we still have work to do in rebuilding an FBI that can effectively meet and defeat 21st century threats and challenges while concurrently protecting the American people and upholding the Constitution.

I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Piehota follows:]

Statement of Christopher M. Piehota
Executive Assistant Director (Retired)
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Before the Select Subcommittee to
Investigate Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021

January 14, 2026

Good Afternoon, Chairman Loudermilk, Ranking Member Swallwell, and members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its handling of the “Capitol Hill Pipe Bomb Investigation.” It is an honor to visit with the committee today.

My name is Chris Piehota, and I am a retired FBI Supervisory Special Agent with nearly 25 years of experience. At the time of my retirement, I served as an Executive Assistant Director, one of FBI’s most senior career executive roles. Prior to this role, I served as an FBI Assistant Director and before that as a Special Agent in Charge of an FBI Field Office. During my FBI career, I was taught about and personally developed familiarity with investigative, operational, administrative, and leadership requirements that can and should be met during properly executed and managed FBI operations.

Capitol Hill Pipe Bomb Investigation

We are here today to discuss the possible circumstances surrounding a case that cuts to the heart of public trust in federal law enforcement, specifically the FBI and specifically the placement of the two viable pipe bombs outside the Democratic and Republican National Committee Headquarters circa January 5, 2021.

Arrest of Brian J. Cole, Jr.

The December 4, 2025, arrest of Brian J. Cole, Jr. was a noteworthy investigative achievement for the FBI and its law enforcement partners. Unfortunately, this arrest alone is not the central issue before this Committee. A primary issue for discussion today is how this case remained unsolved for nearly five years, despite indications that the FBI had decisive information in its possession.

Potential FBI Challenges Contributing to Investigative Stagnation

There are three primary areas of consideration when looking at past and present FBI challenges: Culture, Leadership Environment, and Operational Practices. We must assess the following factors to determine the FBI's general fitness and performance in how it conducted the Capitol Hill Pipe Bomb case.

Culture: How did the FBI demand the fabled fidelity, bravery, and integrity in all of its related operations? In the high-stakes environment present, it was plausible that investigators inadvertently eliminated or disregarded possible leads due to lack of time and resources or flawed prioritization (a fidelity shortfall); became overly conservative in their approaches for fear of mistakes (a bravery shortfall); or pursued too many leads in a surface-level fashion to show urgency and expected progress (an integrity shortfall). In the end, culture determined how the organization behaved and performed when times were good or bad.

Leadership Environment: Leadership remains the lifeblood of any FBI investigation – the kind of fearless, principled leadership that demands excellence and makes no concessions when the safety and security of the American people are at stake. How did FBI leadership set expectations and maintain standards, preferred practices, and behaviors during this case? What drove FBI leadership to set

priorities, allocate resources, and motivate people, in this matter? One thing I learned over the course of my career was, ultimately, we lead or we fail.

Operational Practices: Information volume can crush an investigative team, if not adequately resourced and prioritized. How did the FBI manage investigative workloads that could have resulted in terabytes of specialized data and information and required a small standing army to process investigative findings in a timely, usable manner. Regarding other possible operational impacts, the presence of additional factors such as case ownership churn (re-assignment of case agents), insufficient investigative skill or experience, investigative and analytic “stovepipes,” and overwhelmed administrative systems could have converged to cause unforeseen and unrecognized investigative gaps. If the pipe bomb investigation was not actively led and managed, it is no surprise the investigation eventually stalled.

Conclusion

In closing, this discussion brings us to an important takeaway: the Cole arrest itself appears to revalidate and remind us of the power, effectiveness, and necessity of a skilled, objective, apolitical, well-led FBI. However, the Cole arrest was not borne of a new strategy; it was the result of a salvage operation.

Salvage operations and “cold case” approaches will not protect America and its people. The Cole arrest indicates we still have work to do in rebuilding an FBI that can effectively meet and defeat 21st-century threats and challenges, while concurrently protecting the American people and upholding the Constitution.

I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Piehota. Mr. Speciale, you may begin.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS ANTHONY SPECIALE, II

Mr. SPECIALE. Thank you, Mr. Chair and the Members of the Committee. Thank you for this invitation to speak to you and the American people.

I do not sit here today to speak for anybody other than myself and my family. This is not about me. It's about every American.

While I have served in the military since 1987 and in the intelligence community since 2009, I've had a unique vantage point in this country on the issue before us.

In the months leading up to January 6th, I served as the Senior Intelligence Collection Strategist for Domestic Terrorism at the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC). As an intelligence collector and an analyst, I am trained to pursue hard facts, rather than political ideology or what is convenient.

Everything I present here today is available on my website, along with a more detailed statement regarding these issues.

In late October 2020, I warned the FBI Domestic Terrorism Task Force leadership that we should be thinking about potential "black swan events," due to the fragility that I saw in our country, the distrust of the government, political polarization, and an extremely volatile social environment. My warnings were ignored, and I was labeled a domestic extremist by my FBI joint duty assignment supervisor because I was a supporter of President Trump.

At the NCTC, I was fighting back against the FBI's desire to get a Federal domestic terrorism criminal statute for deterrence purposes, and to treat constitutionally protected activities as a factor, not a constraint. That's KGB- and Gestapo-like thinking.

At the NCTC, I offered two highly classified documents, a collection of emphasis messages and a collection posture statement on domestic extremism, which I am happy to discuss.

These, if declassified by Director Gabbard, would greatly illuminate January 6th thinking on the part of the FBI and others leading up to January 6th.

On January 5th, in my private capacity, I stopped potential violence on the Capitol and warned rally attendees not to fall for a trap set by instigators and agitators to fight the police. On January 6th, I warned attendees that I was afraid that there would be blood in the streets—and Ashli Babbitt and Rosanne Boyland were both dead within hours of my warnings.

When I returned to the NCTC, I was terminated because my FBI supervisor believed I was a domestic extremist simply for attending the rally on January 6th.

In July 2021, I published a White Paper where I identified the actual causes of January 6th—a distrust of the government, false narratives of gun violence, and a lack of government transparency leading to conspiracy theories, many of which have now been proven to be true.

I have provided copies for the Congressional Record three times. This is the third time.

For 2½ years, the FBI, Army Counterintelligence, and Army CID investigated me for extremist activity without any criminal predicate. I have never even been questioned, much less charged.

All across the country, many citizens faced raids and arrests for protected activities. For deterrence purposes, I have FOIA'd the DOJ and the FBI for the 89 documents in my eGuardian file, but they have ignored my FOIAs.

The purpose of this hearing regarding the pipe bomb and my core assessment regarding the FBI's failures regarding January 6th, because the FBI was singularly focused after January 6th to prevent Donald J. Trump from becoming the President again and to cripple, intimidate, and silence his allies and supporters.

They never truly pursued the pipe bomber because they were focused on covering up lies, criminal misconduct, and election interference—and they were hunting Trump supporters.

In early 2022, I was a voluntary witness to the January 6th Investigative Committee where I offered them classified documents, which they were—a classified briefing which they refused, and I provided multiple documents, which they destroyed, including my report.

Regarding what happened on January 6th, a protective orders have been placed on the body cam footage of many of the officers on the Capitol that day. This must be lifted. The DOJ has been marked these as highly restricted. That's not a national security classification.

Also, we need to look into the FinCEN violations. There are people at the DOJ that I can direct you to that can speak specifically about these abuses.

I go into great detail about these classification abuses in my report, as a matter of fact. It is against government regulation, quote, "to classify or otherwise conceal information that is in violation of the law, or to prevent embarrassment to a person, organization, or agency." The FBI has been abusing this for decades.

The President issued an Executive Order, reports have been made to the President, referrals have been made to DOJ. The result of all this weaponization has been catastrophic to the public trust in our government, but specifically the FBI.

Without accountability and significant reforms, many Americans will lose complete faith in you and us. We do not want that.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman's time has expired. If you could wrap up, we'd appreciate it.

Mr. SPECIALE. Yes, sir. I've made a number of suggestions regarding reforms to the White House.

The hardest moment in my life was not in a combat zone, it was in my own home, sitting with my wife and my son. At one point, I had to sit down and tell them what to do if the FBI smashed open our door at 4 a.m. in the morning, waving rifles around and pointing at them. Imagine having to tell your 10-year-old son that his friends would do that.

I remember him asking me: "Why would your friends do that?" I didn't have an answer.

I have done my part. We have done our part. We have placed our careers, our lives, and our livelihood on the line in service to this country, in service to all Americans, red, blue, Brown, and White.

We will continue to serve the Nation in accordance with our oath. It is not an oath to our donors or a man or a party, it is an oath to the American people, it is an oath to the Constitution.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Speciale.

Mr. SPECIALE. Thank you for this opportunity. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Speciale follows:]

Thomas Anthony Speciale II
Select Committee Prepared Remarks
January 14, 2026

Thank you all for the invitation to speak to you and the American people regarding these issues. I do not speak for the War Department or any other entity except for myself and my family.

My core assessment regarding the FBI's failures regarding January 6th are: the FBI's singular focus after January 6, 2021, was to prevent Donald J. Trump from becoming president again and to cripple, intimidate and silence his allies and supporters. They never truly pursued the pipe bomber.

Everything I present here today is publicly available on my website (thomasspeciale.com) along with a more thorough dive into these issues.

In the month leading up to January 6th, 2021, I served as the Senior Intelligence Collection Strategist for Domestic Terrorism at NCTC. In that role—the only one of its kind, I warned the FBI DT Task Force leadership, that we should be thinking about potential “Black Swan events,” due to fragility I saw in the country: distrust in government, political polarization, and an extremely volatile social environment. My warnings were ignored, and I was labeled a domestic extremist by my FBI-assigned supervisor because I had run for political office in Virginia and had supported President Trump.

At NCTC I was fighting back against the FBI's desire to get a federal domestic terrorism statute, quote for “deterrence purposes,” and to treat constitutionally protected activities as a “factor not than a constraint.” Whatever that means?

While there I authored two highly classified documents: a Collection Emphasis Message and a Collection Posture Statement which I am happy to discuss. These, once declassified by Director Gabbard would greatly illuminate pre-January 6 thinking on the part of the FBI and others.

On January 5, 2021, in my private capacity, I stopped potential violence and warned rally attendees not to fall for traps set by instigators and agitators to fight with the police. On January 6th, I warned attendees that I was afraid there would be blood in the street.

Ashli Babbitt was shot and killed at 2:44 p.m. and Rosanne Boyland was pronounced dead at a local hospital at 6:09 p.m.

It is important to note that there were no credible threats to the Capitol in the days leading up to January 6th. None. The FBI had dozens of tasked confidential human sources on the ground and many more un-tasked CHS, including ¹ CHS within leadership circles of groups like the Oath Keepers and Proud Boys; none reported credible threats to the Capitol beforehand.

These activities are eerily similar to the findings of the Church Committee. Where the FBI's egregious mismanagement and manipulation of the KKK at the time, included widespread infiltration to the point where the FBI was actually responsible for a significant portion of its membership growth, and a failure to prevent violence despite having prior knowledge. Sound familiar?

The day I returned to work at NCTC, I was terminated because my FBI supervisor believed I was a "domestic extremist" simply for attending the rally on January 6th.

After my departure, in July 2021, I published a white paper where I identified three causes for the events of January 6th: a distrust of the government due to the criminal misconduct of senior leadership in the FBI; false narrative of gun violence and a lack of government transparency leading to "conspiracy theories" (many of which have now been proven true).

In early 2022, I was a voluntary witness to the J6 Investigative Committee where I offered them a classified briefing which they refused and provided multiple documents which they destroyed. Including my report.

From January 2021 to July 2023, the FBI, Army Counterintelligence and Army CID opened investigations into me for "extremist activity" without any criminal predicate. I was never even questioned much less charged.

Across the country, many citizens faced raids and arrests for activities largely protected by the First Amendment. These actions, I believe, without any reservation whatsoever were perpetrated for "deterrence" purposes.

Why did it take 5 years to find the supposed pipe bomber? The answer should be obvious to every American.

Because the FBI was focused on covering up lies, criminal misconduct and election interference by government officials and their allies pure and simple—the Russia-collusion hoax, the 51-intelligence officers misinformation memo, free speech being silenced on Facebook and Twitter, the manipulation of intelligence by Senior intelligence leadership to help a political candidate. That is a fact.

The result of all this weaponization has been catastrophic for public trust in the our government, but specifically the FBI. Without accountability and significant reforms, many Americans will lose complete faith in you. You do not want that.

Without accountability, our Republic will perish. Every Americans need to understand-they did this to ALL of us – Republicans, Democrats, Independents, non-voters, everyone.

I have spent the last five years getting ready for this testimony.

I have done my part, we have done our part. We have placed our careers, our lives and our livelihood on the line in service to our country. In service to ALL Americans. And we will continue to do so in accordance with our oath. Because oaths matter.

Thank you again for this opportunity. I look forward to your questions.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Speciale. Mr. Nantz, you may begin.

STATEMENT OF JOHN NANTZ

Mr. NANTZ. Chair Loudermilk, Ranking Member Raskin, and the Members of the Subcommittee, I would like to thank you for the invitation to speak with you today. It's an honor to share my perspectives derived from 26 years in law enforcement, 20 of those as an FBI agent.

The Biden-era FBI and DOJ presided over some of the most controversial investigations and prosecutions in modern history. From the January 6th investigations to the Mar-a-Lago raid, Merrick Garland's DOJ, in concert with former FBI Director Christopher Wray, has successfully tarnished our most respected institutions of justice and national security with the odious stigmas of politicization and weaponization.

American citizens have been rightly outraged at the inexcusable malfeasance of a relatively few senior executives. A bifurcated FBI held highly politicized investigations in the compartmentalized precincts of the Hoover Building, while the vast investigative experience and far more rigorous oversight of field agents and division-level management was in large part circumvented, providing insulated political hacks with the unchecked latitude to pursue political opponents.

For instance, as documented by DOJ Inspector General findings, the Crossfire Hurricane investigation was predicated on a thin tissue of preposterous fictions spun by operatives of the Clinton campaign and given the imprimatur of compromised members of the intelligence community.

What we witnessed during Biden-era weaponization was appalling. I watched the events of January 6th unfold at a Washington Field Office offsite. I was initially struck by the peaceful and civilized conduct demonstrated by the vast majority of protestors, which quickly devolved into disgust as radical elements, wearing the uniform of antifa anarchists, began a campaign of agitation and vandalism which drew a minority of the more gullible into criminal acts.

The Biden Administration and a complicit mainstream media wasted no time in labeling it as an insurrection, an event to rival September 11th, or the Confederate insurrection of the Civil War. However, the only casualty of January 6th was an Air Force veteran and Trump supporter, Ashli Babbitt.

The objective was obvious: To stigmatize Republican protests and bludgeon President Trump and his supporters with bigoted labels such as White supremacists, White nationalist extremists, or racially or ethnically motivated violent extremists, or RMVE.

This political narrative bears directly on the issue of why Chris Wray's FBI failed to identify the pipe bomb subject. The answer, in my opinion, isn't a sensational one. Therefore, it has eluded most of the podcasting class. It was simply a function of good leadership or the lack thereof.

The Biden's FBI was directed to conduct the most sweeping investigation in the FBI's history, absurdly, of mostly Federal trespassers. The political narrative driven by Biden to his Attorney

General Merrick Garland was myopically focused on the unicorn of violent White extremism.

In simple terms, finding the pipe bomb subject was not a priority for Wray's FBI. The incentive structure was shifted, and FBI resources were squandered on chasing political chimeras. The obsession with persecuting Trump supporters left no institutional impetus to get to the bottom of the pipe bomber mystery.

Elections matter, and the Trump victory has paid out some unexpected dividends. The appointment and confirmation of FBI Director Kash Patel and the appointment of former Deputy Director Dan Bongino has everything to do with finally discovering who planted those viable pipe bombs at the DNC and RNC headquarters.

In short, Deputy Director Bongino recommitted FBI investigative resources and assigned a group of task force officers assembled from local and State jurisdictions.

Combined with a new type of FBI CAST analysis, this group of FBI agents and TFOs worked seamlessly to bring about the identification and arrest of Brian Cole, Jr. The current disposition of this case comes down to a simple matter of priorities, an election of great consequence.

Critics of Director Patel and the investigation into the pipe bomb subject have based their allegations on the conjecture of internet cranks, utilizing hobbyist analysis of cell phone tower data, among other things.

Conversely, the CAST and TFO professionals formulated new and specifically tailored algorithms to demystify cell tower data that had been opaque to investigators up to that point.

In essence, we're being asked to believe that the stalwarts of the conservative movement—Attorney General Pam Bondi, FBI Director Patel, the former Deputy Director Bongino, and the esteemed U.S. Attorney for D.C. Jeanine Pirro—have all concluded to railroad an innocent man.

The bottom line is this: President Trump's FBI got their man by dint of good leadership. This bodes very good things for the American people and their FBI.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Nantz follows:]

Testimony of John Nantz, Contributing Writer, Townhall Media

Chairman Loudermilk, Ranking Member Swalwell and Members of the Subcommittee, I would like to thank you for the invitation to speak with you today. It's an honor to share my perspectives, derived from twenty-six years in law enforcement, twenty of those as an FBI agent.

The Biden-era FBI and DOJ presided over some of the most controversial investigations and prosecutions in modern history. From the January 6th investigations, to the Mar-a-Lago raid, Merrick Garland's DOJ, in concert with former FBI Director Christopher Wray, has successfully tarnished our most respected institutions of justice and national security with the odious stigmas of politicization and weaponization.

American citizens have been rightly outraged at the inexcusable malfeasance of a relatively few senior executives. A bifurcated FBI held highly politicized investigations in the compartmentalized precincts of the Hoover Building. While the vast investigative experience and far more rigorous oversight of field agents and division level management was in large part circumvented, providing insulated political hacks with the unchecked latitude to pursue political opponents. For instance, as documented by DOJ Inspector General findings, the Crossfire Hurricane investigation was predicated on a thin tissue of preposterous fictions spun by operatives of the Clinton campaign, and given the imprimatur of compromised members of the intelligence community.

What we witnessed during Biden-era weaponization was appalling. I watched the events of January 6th unfold at a Washington Field Office offsite. I was initially struck by the peaceful and civilized conduct demonstrated by the vast majority of protesters, which quickly devolved into disgust as radical elements, wearing the uniform of Antifa anarchists, began a campaign of agitation and vandalism which drew a minority of the more gullible into criminal acts. The Biden administration and a complicit mainstream media wasted no time in labeling it as an "insurrection," an event to rival September 11th, or the Confederate insurrection of the Civil War. However, the only casualty of January 6th was an Air Force veteran and Trump supporter, Ashli Babbitt. The objective was obvious, to stigmatize Republican protest and bludgeon President Trump and his supporters with bigoted labels such as "White supremacists," "White Nationalist Extremists," or "Racially or Ethnically Motivated Violent Extremists," or RMVE.

This political narrative bears directly on the issue of why Chris Wray's FBI failed to identify the Pipe Bomb subject. The answer, in my opinion, isn't a sensational one; therefore, it has eluded most of the podcasting class. It was simply a function of good leadership, or the lack thereof.

Biden's FBI was directed to conduct the most sweeping investigation in its history...absurdly, of mostly federal trespassers. And the political narrative driven by Biden through his Attorney General Merrick Garland was myopically focused on the unicorn of Violent White Extremism. In simple terms, finding the Pipe Bomb subject was not a priority for Wray's FBI. The incentive structure was shifted and FBI resources were squandered on chasing political chimeras. The obsession with persecuting Trump supporters left no institutional impetus to get to the bottom of the Pipe Bomber mystery.

Elections matter and the Trump victory has paid out some unexpected dividends. The appointment and confirmation of FBI Director Kash Patel, and the appointment of former Deputy Director Dan Bongino has everything to do with finally discovering who planted those viable pipe bombs at the DNC and RNC headquarters. In short, DD Bongino recommitted FBI investigative resources, and assigned a group of Task Force Officers assembled from local and state jurisdictions. Combined with a new type of FBI CAST analysis, this group of FBI Agents and TFOs worked seamlessly to bring about the identification and arrest of Brian Cole, Jr. The current disposition of this case comes down to a simple matter of priorities — and an election of great consequence.

Critics of Director Patel and the investigation into the Pipe Bomb subject have based their allegations on the conjecture of internet cranks utilizing hobbyist analysis of cell phone tower data, among other things. Conversely, the CAST professionals formulated new and specifically tailored algorithms to demystify cell tower data that had been opaque to investigators up to that point. In essence, we're being asked to believe that stalwarts of the conservative movement, Attorney General Pam Bondi, FBI Director Patel, former DD Bongino, and the esteemed U.S. Attorney for D.C. Jeanine Pirro, have all colluded to railroad an innocent man.

The bottom line is this: President Trump's FBI got their man by dint of good leadership. This bodes very good things for the American people and their FBI.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Nantz. Mr. Romano, you may begin.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. ROMANO

Mr. ROMANO. Good afternoon, Chair Loudermilk, Ranking Member Raskin, and the Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its handling of the Capitol Hill pipe bomb case. It's an honor to speak with you all today.

My name is Michael Romano. I was an attorney at the Department of Justice for almost 18 years, and immediately before my resignation I was a Deputy Chief of the Capitol Siege Section here in Washington, DC.

It was a great privilege to serve the United States by prosecuting crimes arising out of the violent riot that happened at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

I commend the department's work in identifying and arresting Brian Cole for planting pipe bombs outside the Republican and Democratic National Committee headquarters on the evening of January 5, 2021.

This was a difficult case to solve, given the needle-in-a-haystack nature of the evidence. Solving it was important, both because of the harm that the pipe bombs could have caused and because of the suspect's apparent motivation—political violence.

Of course, the political violence at the Capitol did not end on January 5th when the pipe bombs were planted, nor on January 6th when they were discovered. That same day, a riot broke out as the President's supporters descended on the Capitol Grounds, broke down barriers, overwhelmed police, and stormed the building.

This too was political violence. Rioters openly broke the law. In fact, they bragged about it, in some cases filming themselves and sharing their conduct on social media. Their willingness to self-identify made them much easier to apprehend than the pipe bomber was.

Today, I speak as a career prosecutor who oversaw hundreds of prosecutions of Capitol rioters. Every day for four years I reviewed evidence of crimes committed at the Capitol. My experience helps me better understand the political violence that day, the damage it caused to our country, and the way that misdemeanor defendants enabled the violence by joining the mob.

The evidence showed that the rioters understood their conduct in political terms. I saw some of them circulate in advance a picture of the United States Capitol with the following text superimposed over it, quote: "Occupy Congress. If they don't hear us, they will fear us. The great betrayal is over. Election fraud is treason. January 6, 2021." Rioters sending that message planned to storm the Capitol in advance.

One rioter I prosecuted, Cody Mattice, recorded himself as he marched to the Capitol, saying, quote, "We're going to fuck shit up. It's about to be nuts." He was not peacefully marching to the Capitol.

Mattice recorded his co-defendant, James Mault, asking officers to stand down because, quote, "We had your guys' back when you

were under attack,” and promising that, quote, “Your jobs will be here after we kick the shit out of Members of Congress.” He was not instigated by the police.

The evidence showed me that the mob shared their sentiments. Its purpose was to prevent the certification of the electoral college vote by violence or threats of violence. After rioters smashed their way into the building, they demanded of Officer Goodman, quote, “Where are they counting the fucking votes?”

At the main door to the House, I saw rioters overwhelm police, occupying the space outside the door. Then, I saw rioters, including misdemeanor trespass defendants, urge other members of the mob to “use the helmet” and “use the crowbar” to break down that door and get inside so they could target Member of Congress like you.

Throughout the day, I witnessed rioters tell police officers they had a right to rebel. Some compared their behavior to the Revolutionary War. One defendant, Kevin Seefried, carried the Confederate battle flag into the Capitol.

Capitol Police officers and others bravely stood in the way and suffered violence for it. Now the rioters who attacked them have been pardoned. On the five-year anniversary of that riot, the White House hosted propaganda on its official website, falsely claiming that the Capitol Police instigated the crowd and escalated tensions, falsely claiming that the Capitol Police invited people into the building, and falsely claiming that our work represented a political weaponization of the department against patriotic Americans. None of that is true.

The pardons are a permission for future political violence, and the rioters understand them that way, as you can see in footage of violent rioters who came to Washington, DC, last week on the anniversary of the riot and taunted police officers.

It is good that the pipe bomber suspect was arrested. It is good he will face justice. Just as planting those bombs was an act of political violence, we cannot forget the political violence committed by hundreds and abetted by thousands on that day.

I’m here and I am happy to answer any questions the Committee has remaining about what happened on January 6th and to speak to the importance of my team’s work. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Romano follows:]

Statement of Michael J. Romano
Former Deputy Chief, Capitol Siege Section
U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia

Before the Select Subcommittee to
Investigate Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021

January 14, 2026

Good afternoon, Chairman Loudermilk, Ranking Member Swalwell, and members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its handling of the Capitol Hill pipe bomb case. It is an honor to speak with you today.

My name is Michael Romano. I was an attorney at the Department of Justice for almost eighteen years; immediately before my resignation, I was a Deputy Chief of the Capitol Siege Section here in Washington, D.C. It was a great privilege to serve the United States by prosecuting crimes arising out of the violent riot at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

I commend the Department's work in identifying and arresting Brian Cole for planting pipe bombs outside the Republican and Democratic National Committee Headquarters on the evening of January 5, 2021. This was a difficult case to solve, given the needle-in-a-haystack nature of the evidence. Among other things, it required sustained effort, over years, to gather and analyze tens of thousands of apparently innocent financial transactions. But solving it was important, both because of the harm that the pipe bombs could have caused and because of the suspect's apparent motivation—political violence.

Of course, the political violence at the Capitol did not end on January 5, when the pipe bombs were planted, or on January 6, when they were discovered. That same day, a riot broke out as the President's supporters descended on the Capitol grounds, broke down barriers, overwhelmed police, and stormed the building. This, too, was political violence. Rioters openly broke the law. In fact, they bragged about it—in some cases, filming themselves and sharing their conduct on social media. Their willingness to self-identify made them much easier to apprehend than the pipe bomber was.

Today, I speak as a career prosecutor who oversaw hundreds of prosecutions of Capitol rioters. Every day for four years, I reviewed evidence of crimes

committed throughout the Capitol and its grounds on January 6. My experience helps me better to understand the political violence of that day, the damage that violence caused to our law enforcement and our country, and the way that misdemeanor defendants enabled that violence by joining the mob.

The rioters understood their conduct in political terms. I saw this repeatedly in the evidence we gathered. I saw rioters circulate in advance, via Facebook, a picture of the U.S. Capitol with text superimposed over it: “Occupy Congress. If they won’t hear us, they will fear us. The great betrayal is over. Election Fraud is Treason. January 6, 2021.” Rioters sending these messages planned to storm the Capitol; their conduct wasn’t spontaneous. One rioter I prosecuted, Cody Mattice, recorded himself as he marched to Capitol Hill, saying “We’re going to go fuck some shit up. It’s about to be nuts.” On reaching the Capitol, he said (of the building) “We’re getting up front, and we’re taking this shit.” He was not peacefully marching to the Capitol. Mattice recorded his co-defendant, James Mault, asking officers to stand down because “We had your guys’ back when you were under attack,” and promising that “your jobs will be here ... after we kick the shit out of” Members of Congress. He was not instigated by the police. The evidence showed me that the mob shared their sentiments.

The mob had a purpose: to prevent the certification of the electoral college vote through violence, or threats of violence. After smashing their way into the building, rioters demanded of Officer Goodman: “Where are they counting the fucking votes?” At the door to the House, I saw rioters overwhelm police, then heard rioters—including misdemeanor defendants—scream at other members of the mob to “use the helmet!” and “use the crowbar!” to break through and get into the House Chamber. At the door to the Senate, rioters like Brady Knowlton and Patrick Montgomery asked officers to “step out of the way,” telling them “This is a moment in history. Right now is a moment in history. We don’t want to push through here.” Throughout the day, I witnessed rioters tell police officers they had a right to rebel. Some compared their behavior to the Revolutionary War. One defendant, Kevin Seefried, carried the confederate battle flag into the Capitol.

Capitol Police officers and others bravely stood in the way and suffered violence for it. They were battered with poles, tackled, punched, kicked, and stomped on, hit with chairs, crushed in doors, blasted with pepper and bear spray, and shocked with stun guns. Rioters brought firearms and Molotov cocktails to Washington, D.C. One rioter, Daniel Ball, lobbed an explosive into a tight crowd of officers. Officers were wounded, physically and psychologically.

Now these rioters have been pardoned. And on the five-year anniversary of January 6, the White House hosted propaganda on its official website. It claimed—falsely—that Capitol Police instigated the crowd and escalated tensions, which isn't true. It claimed that Capitol police invited people into the building, which isn't true. It claims that our work represented a political weaponization of the Department against patriotic Americans, which isn't true. Rioters were convicted in overwhelming numbers because the evidence against them was overwhelming.

The pardons were permission for political violence, in the future, in support of this President and his administration. And from what I have seen, the rioters understand the pardons in these terms. Indeed, last week—on the five-year anniversary of January 6—I saw that formerly-convicted felons traveled to Washington, D.C., and recorded themselves taunting the same police officers they attacked five years ago. They know that if they do violence again, in support of the President, the President will have their back. They know because he *did* have, and *has* had, their back.

It is good that the pipe bomber was arrested; it is good that he will face justice. But just as planting those bombs was an act of political violence, we cannot forget the violence committed by hundreds and enabled by the thousands of people who joined the mob. The brave police officers who defended the Capitol did not deserve to be assaulted. They do not deserve, now, to be blamed for the violence on January 6, with false claims that they escalated tensions, nor to be verbally abused by those same people. You, Members of Congress, did not deserve to be put in fear for your lives. The United States did not deserve the damage to its institutions brought about by the riot, nor by the pardons, nor by the White House's willingness to spread falsehoods about what happened on January 6.

This committee is tasked with investigating remaining questions around January 6. I am here, and I am willing to answer any questions you may have—and to speak to the importance of my team's work.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Romano. We'll now begin with questions. Reminding the Members that this hearing is about the investigation into the pipe bombs of January 6th.

We'll begin proceeding under the five-minute rule. I would like to note for everyone here that we may have a second round of questioning, depending on time and pending votes. We'll address this at the end of the first round.

I now recognize the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Nehls.

Mr. NEHLS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you to all our witnesses for being here.

Let me start by explaining to the American people why we are here and why this new Committee is necessary.

The previous Select Subcommittee, assembled by Speaker Pelosi, was a sham from the start. It was a total sham. For the first time in the history of Congress, the Speaker rejected the Minority leader's selections for who would serve on a Select Committee. Pelosi installed two of her puppets, Adam Kinzinger and Liz Cheney. They both hated Donald Trump and the MAGA movement.

The stated the purpose of that Committee was to examine the security failures and events that led to the breach of the Capitol and to provide recommendations to ensure that it never happens again.

That is not what the previous January 6th Committee did. Instead, it set out to destroy Donald Trump and the MAGA movement by convincing the American people that Donald Trump coordinated a violent White supremacist insurrection to overthrow the U.S. Government. They did this to justify the prosecution of his supporters and former administration officials and to ensure that he could never become President again. Today, we can say they failed.

They put on a pretty good show. The first thing they did was hire someone to produce all their televised hearings who they knew would have a knack for making the President look bad, former President of *ABC News* James Goldston. Then, they set out to have a highly prescribed hearing, designated to play on the emotions of Americans.

For example, the hearing with Capitol Police officers Dunn, Gonell, Fanone, Hodges, four Trump haters who gave highly scripted and preplanned testimonies.

All told, the sham Committee work cost the American people \$18 million. That's right, \$18 million. In the end, they released this 845-page report that failed to achieve the stated purpose of the Committee. Instead, it sought to blame the entire event on Donald Trump, whose name was mentioned 4,207 times.

The word "insurrection," which not a single person was actually charged with, is mentioned 78 times. The Proud Boys are mentioned 218 times. While antifa, who intelligence confirmed planned to be present, is only mentioned 20 times, the words "White supremacy" and "White nationalist" are mentioned 23 times and MAGA is mentioned 17 times.

Meanwhile, Ashli Babbitt, the only person who died by firearm, is mentioned just five times.

Oh, and remember how we found out from the December 2024 IG report that the FBI had 26 confidential human sources, or

CHSs, in the crowd that day. The CHSs are mentioned a total of zero times in this report.

I know it's been a long time, but remember Ray Epps? Let me introduce you again to Ray Epps.

Play the video.

[Video shown.]

Mr. NEHLS. The night of January 5th, he is filmed yelling at the crowd that they are going to go into the Capitol, and again on the day in question. He is filmed at the front of the crowd at the barricades, just before the initial breach. He whispered something into the ear of the guy next to him, and that guy initiated the breach.

Then, later at 2:43 p.m., a red flare goes off; 2:45 p.m., red smoke pops; and at 2:46, Ray Epps is in video being extracted from the crowd of an eight-man team even though he was allegedly alone that day.

Play that clip.

[Video shown.]

Mr. NEHLS. Now, despite Epps' actions on that day and despite him being number 16 on the January 6th most wanted page for months, his name is mentioned zero times in that 840-page document. Zero.

The previous Committee's report highlights that it believes some 2,000 protestors entered the U.S. Capitol Building on that date. It's on page 77. By conservative standards, that's less than two percent of the total estimated number of protestors present in the Capitol complex, 120,000, on January 6th.

Why didn't the other 98 percent of protestors rush to the Capitol if that's what Trump supposedly wanted? Why did they not listen to Donald Trump's orders and commands? Why did the vast majority never enter the Capitol Building?

The first breach occurred 20 minutes before Trump's speech ended. Why would Trump supporters leave a Trump speech and breach the Capitol before the grounds even ended?

I yield back the balance of my time. I yield back.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman yields. Obviously, the Chair has given some latitude to our side on time. I will extend the same courtesy to the Members of the Minority.

I now recognize the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I thank you for your evenhandedness there, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that roundup of the worst conspiracy theories of the January 6th canon, and I hope that this Committee will help us to debunk all of them. All of them have been well debunked and repudiated online.

In any event, the gentleman does not advance any counter story to what the January 6th Committee found after more than a year of talking to more than a thousand witnesses and looking at more than a million pages worth of documents and getting overwhelmingly testimony from Republicans, people in Donald Trump's world.

If you go and you read the interviews and you look at the videos—and it's all online—you can see these were Donald Trump's people who told the story.

I don't mind any of those flights of fancy, but none of them, again, have laid a glove to what was found by the bipartisan January 6th Select Committee.

Now, Mr. Romano, you ended up by talking about pardons. I want to ask you, first, well, generally, what you thought about the validity and legitimacy of those pardons, pardons generally being reserved for people who show contrition and remorse and who have been reformed and rehabilitated and no longer are a danger to society.

Second, I wonder if you would opine as to whether or not Donald Trump's pardon extends to Mr. Cole, if he is indeed convicted, as his lawyer is asserting.

Mr. ROMANO. Certainly. Thank you for the question.

Mr. RASKIN. Turn your mike on.

Mr. ROMANO. Thank you. I thought the pardons of the January 6th defendants were tremendously ill-advised. These were people who had been convicted after trial or after guilty plea.

Many of them, as we saw, remained proud of their conduct throughout the pendency of their case, remained proud of their conduct at sentencing. They certainly, as a group of people, broadly, did not show remorse. We can see that in the way that they have celebrated the pardons and tried to lie about what happened on January 6th.

As for Mr. Cole, it's unfortunately an open question whether the pardon applies to him. I don't know that there's a clear yes or no, and I think that's a problem.

Certainly, a pardon that was not rushed through on day one in the way that this could have been more targeted and could have not raised the sort of issues that are raised by this question.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, the Department of Justice under Pam Bondi has actually advanced a very robust understanding of the scope of the pardon. Has the DOJ not? Isn't she taking the position it's even applied to other criminal offenses unrelated to January 6th if there was evidence that was assembled from the defendants after their January 6th arrest?

Mr. ROMANO. That's true. For instance, when a home is searched and evidence of another crime is developed during the execution of that search warrant, the Department of Justice has taken that position.

Mr. RASKIN. One might expect that she could take a similarly robust interpretation of the pardon with respect to Mr. Cole.

Look, we should really have a hearing on this Subcommittee about the people who were pardoned who have gone on to commit other serious offenses against public safety and against the people of the United States.

I wonder, is there any case in your mind that you prosecuted or you oversaw which stands out in your mind as a particularly troubling one from the standpoint of public safety?

Mr. ROMANO. Absolutely. The one that stands out in my mind is the case of Daniel Ball, who fought with officers at the Lower West Terrace Tunnel, the site of some of the worst violence that day, and then threw an explosive into the tunnel. He threw an explosive injuring officers, causing some to lose hearing.

There's no world in which a person who uses an explosive device against police in close quarters should be pardoned.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, to be clear, did President Trump investigate his file and determine that he had shown repentance and remorse, that he would no longer be a danger to the public?

Mr. ROMANO. I don't see how he could have given it when the pardons came out.

Mr. RASKIN. It came out on the first day, and it was en masse. It was everybody. The most serious criminals who leveled the most egregious violence against police officers, and those people who were just mere trespassers who just went in and maybe damaged some property or something else like that, all of them were swept in together, all of them treated exactly the same way.

Well, what do you think, in general, the meaning of those pardons is going to be for American public safety and government going forward?

Mr. ROMANO. The pardons are damaging to public safety, the pardons are damaging to confidence in the rule of law and in the ability of the Justice Department to fight crime. That some of the rioters have received the message that violence done on behalf of the President or in support of his administration is permitted and encouraged.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. Well, finally, Mr. Chair, I would just commend to everybody the testimony of Pamela Hemphill, who was a convicted insurrectionist and yet was pardoned. She rejected her pardon because she said she didn't want President Trump's filthy pardon; that she was found guilty because she had actually committed an offense, and she wasn't going to participate in the sham of the pardons. Her testimony is something that would pay everybody well to check out. I would like to submit it for the record.

I yield back to you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Without objection. The gentleman yields back. I now recognize the gentlelady from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Romano, did you prosecute anyone related to January 6th for engaging in an insurrection?

Mr. ROMANO. No, Congresswoman.

Ms. HAGEMAN. I didn't think so. Mr. Raskin's statement that someone was a convicted insurrectionist is actually inaccurate. Isn't that correct?

Mr. ROMANO. I wouldn't say it's inaccurate. Well, a convicted insurrectionist—

Ms. HAGEMAN. He wasn't a convicted insurrectionist, was he?

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. HAGEMAN. No, I will not. Mr. Romano—

Mr. RASKIN. Do you accept seditious conspiracy is insurrection?

Mr. LOUDERMILK. It's the gentlelady's time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. I will reclaim my time. Mr. Romano, did you prosecute anyone for engaging in an insurrection related to January 6th?

Mr. ROMANO. For the crime of insurrection?

Ms. HAGEMAN. You did not, did you?

Mr. ROMANO. No.

Ms. HAGEMAN. This Select Subcommittee is committed to undertaking the investigation that the first Select Committee never conducted: How did the security failure on January 6th happen, and

how do we ensure it does not happen again. Since the pipe bomb split the USCP posture and thereby facilitated the breach of the Capitol, we must begin with this issue.

My first question is: Why did a new team under Director Patel in just two months do what the FBI failed to do over four years with the exact same evidence? The answer appears to be a failure from the very start of the FBI's response.

As a Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that oversees the DOJ and FBI, it necessitates that we begin right here.

According to what we have been led to believe, the pipe bombs were placed outside the RNC and DNC on the evening of January 5th.

They allegedly sat there undetected for 17 hours before the device behind the RNC was discovered at approximately 12:38 p.m., with the device at the DNC immediately discovered thereafter at 1:05 p.m.

The pipe bomb outside the RNC was discovered by Karlin Younger, who lived near the RNC and discovered the pipe bomb in the unmarked alley between the Capitol Hill Club and RNC while doing her laundry. She alerted the RNC security who had then alerted the authorities.

Oddly enough, no one from the FBI contacted Ms. Younger. Two days later, on January 8th, Ms. Younger had to proactively contact the FBI through an online tip to identify herself as the person who discovered the pipe bomb and to offer her assistance with the case because she had not yet been contacted by the FBI.

Mr. Nantz, would you agree that it would be standard operating procedure and good investigative practice to interview all the eyewitnesses?

Mr. NANTZ. Yes, absolutely. That would be standard practice, to make sure that you cast a broad enough net so that you're interviewing any witness that could possibly provide information with regard to the progress of the investigation.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Well, can you think of any reason as to why the FBI did not seek to immediately speak to the person who actually found the bomb?

Mr. NANTZ. Well, no. That's a problem. That's a question that needs to be answered. Does it go to lack of resources? That's still very, very early. I find that to be extremely problematic.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Well, in her online tip, Ms. Younger stated, quote, "I can confirm that the device must have been placed between 12:00 p.m. and 12:40 p.m. Eastern Standard time on January 6th," because it was not there when she first passed the area around 12 p.m.

When was the bomb actually placed and by whom?

The FBI finally interviewed Ms. Younger three days later, on January 11th, and it confirmed her testimony that the device outside the RNC was not there before 12 p.m. on January 6th.

Ms. HAGEMAN. This leads us to three significant data points.

First, the bombs had kitchen timers for 60 minutes.

Second, the witness who first discovered the bomb noted it was not there before noon, about 60 minutes before the meeting of Congress.

Third, if, in fact, the bombs were placed the night of the 5th, they sat there for 17 hours in a highly trafficked area, undisguised, without detection, until the most crucial time for security that day, which was when Congress was voting to certify the election.

Mr. Nantz, what should the FBI have done with this contradicting evidence?

Mr. NANTZ. Well, the Bureau should have run that all to ground. Every resource should've been made available to make sure that those questions got answered. That simply did not happen. That had to do with a less-than-ideal leadership posture.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Well, that's the understatement of the century, Mr. Nantz, but I appreciate your remarks on that.

Both devices were largely undisguised, invisible along heavily trafficked areas, yet they allegedly lay undiscovered for 17 hours, a point Ms. Younger disputes. Again, which, oddly enough, they were not detected by the Secret Service bomb sweeps at the DNC before the arrival of then-Vice-President-elect Harris that very morning.

Does the fact that these devices were not detected for 17 hours raise any questions for you?

Mr. NANTZ. Well, of course. I think it does for everybody, you know?

Though the January 6th investigation was just beginning and I suppose you could make an argument that resources were stretched thin, the gravity of the placement of where these pipe bombs were placed suggests that should've received at least the same or equivalent amount of resources that the broader J6 investigation—

Ms. HAGEMAN. Well, then, I appreciate not only did it not receive the attention, the January 6th Committee entirely ignored the placement of those bombs, which tells you that they had an agenda that they pursued that had nothing to do with what actually happened on January 6th.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Chair, I have a UC.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Crockett, is now recognized.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much. This is from *The New York Times*. It's dated January 13, 2021, "Trump Impeached for Inciting Insurrection: President Trump became the first president to be impeached twice, after the House approved a single charge citing his role in whipping up a mob that stormed the Capitol. He faces a Senate trial that could disqualify him from future office."

There were 10 members of his party that joined the Democrats in impeaching him for insurrection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Without objection.

Ms. CROCKETT. May I proceed?

Mr. LOUDERMILK. You've been recognized.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

I don't know where I want to start. I am so frustrated with this country, and I don't think that I'm the only one. To know that we have former law enforcement here, as someone who worked with

law enforcement consistently as a practicing lawyer, I'm quite concerned. I'm alarmed by some of the things that you said.

Specifically, Mr. Speciale—am I saying it correctly? OK. Mr. Speciale, you said—and I may quote you incorrectly, so correct me—you were warning your family about the possibility of the FBI busting into your home. Is that correct? Close enough?

Mr. SPECIALE. Yes, because they were raiding American citizens all over the United States for trespass.

Ms. CROCKETT. You'd agree with me that's—I mean—

Mr. SPECIALE. No, I don't agree that you should use FBI tactical teams to raid people who are trespassing.

Ms. CROCKETT. That's not what I was saying. Sorry, I was moving a little slow, because I wanted to make sure I quoted this correctly. Are you aware that the FBI recently executed a search warrant at a *Washington Post* reporter's home?

Mr. SPECIALE. No, I'm not aware of that.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. You'd agree with me that doing something like that with the FBI sounds like what you were afraid of happening. To be clear, that never happened to you, correct?

Mr. SPECIALE. No, it didn't, but I was aware of the FBI investigation for 2½ years.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. OK. Hold on. It is my time. You did not—so they never busted into your home. You were concerned, and you felt like that would be wrong.

What I'm trying to understand is that there's a lot of complaints about the Wray FBI, and I won't opine on that, but I will make it clear—Mr. Romano, help me out if I'm wrong, but was Mr. Wray appointed by Donald J. Trump himself?

Mr. ROMANO. Mr. Wray? No.

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Christopher Wray, who was the FBI Director.

Mr. ROMANO. Oh, yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. He was appointed by Donald Trump. Right now, it is interesting, because we're sitting here and we're talking about domestic terrorism, and every day there are Americans concerned about ICE and what ICE is doing.

Let me ask you a different question that you may be familiar with. As it relates to the training that the average FBI officer gets before they are admitted as officers, is it longer than 47 days, yes or no?

Mr. SPECIALE. I don't think that I'm the person that you should be asking that question. I think that the retired FBI agent should be—

Ms. CROCKETT. Anybody want to answer that who's been in law enforcement?

Mr. PIEHOTA. Yes, ma'am. The FBI Academy ranges anywhere from—it changes in length and duration. It can go from 12–16, up and up to 18–20 weeks at a time.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. Thank you so much. So, here it is. We have people—I know that there have been conversations about political opponents. I believe it may have been you, Mr. Piehota, that you talked about political opponents being prosecuted.

Let me ask you, Mr. Romano, though. Are you aware that this DOJ has gone after Jerome Powell, or going after Jerome Powell?

Mr. ROMANO. I'm aware of reporting to that effect, yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Are you aware of this DOJ going after Tish James?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Are you aware of this DOJ going after James Comey?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes, after the President tweeted that they should.

Ms. CROCKETT. Are you also aware that James Comey is not currently being prosecuted, his case was dismissed?

Mr. ROMANO. I am.

Ms. CROCKETT. Are you also aware that Tish James's case was dismissed?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Are you also aware that a number of times that they tried to indict Tish James they were unsuccessful?

Mr. ROMANO. I am.

Ms. CROCKETT. Now, as a career prosecutor, how many times did you have to try to get people indicted before you could finally secure an indictment?

Mr. ROMANO. I never had the grand jury reject an indictment that I presented—

Ms. CROCKETT. Oh, OK. All right. Well, it seems like maybe they still need you there, because they are struggling.

In addition to that, I want to talk—because the conspiracy theories are driving me insane. Maybe it is because I'm used to the law just being the law and practicing and getting into a courtroom, and maybe it's because I've been there. I am so confused about how they're like, "Oh, these poor little people, they did nothing wrong, and that's why the President let them all out of prison."

Let's talk about the process, OK? Because you can say that an investigation has been flawed—and Lord knows, as a criminal defense attorney, it was my job to make sure that I dug into every single flaw. Because I can tell you, in almost every single prosecution that I've had to go up against, the only thing I was looking at is how much did you mess up, so that I could represent my client well, right? It didn't mean that I would get them off.

I'm trying to figure out, did these people, over a thousand people, get convicted of something that they did in a criminal way on January 6th, yes or no?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. Then you come back—and they were convicted by, what, a jury, some of them?

Mr. ROMANO. Mostly juries, some judges.

Ms. CROCKETT. Some people actually did what we call a plea bargain, correct?

Mr. ROMANO. Correct.

Ms. CROCKETT. Meaning that they walked in and they said, "I am guilty," correct?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. The final point that I'll make, because I know I'm running out of time, is, there was some stuff about White supremacists and the concerns about people being alleged to be White supremacists. Some of the people that got convicted were neo-Nazis. Have they been clarified as White supremacists or not?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Some of the people were Proud Boys. Have they been declared as White supremacists or not?

Mr. ROMANO. I believe so.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. Then, the Confederate flag, has that sometimes been associated with White supremacist groups?

Mr. ROMANO. I would certainly say it was during the Civil War and since.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. Then, there's this sign, I'm not going to do it, but it looks like the "OK" sign with the hand gesture.

Mr. ROMANO. Uh-huh.

Ms. CROCKETT. Has that been associated with White supremacy?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. OK. As one of the prosecutors that prosecuted some of these cases, did you not have defendants that you felt like may have been White supremacists based on the investigations?

Mr. ROMANO. Yes. In some cases, we had evidence explicitly of it.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank so very much. I'll yield.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentlelady's time has expired. I'll now recognize the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Griffith, for five minutes.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Romano, let's first clear up the "OK" sign. The "OK" sign is more predominantly just used to say "OK," is it not, than for White supremacy?

Mr. ROMANO. Sometimes it is. Historically, yes.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Historically—

Mr. ROMANO. Sometimes it's used to—

Mr. GRIFFITH. Used today, a majority of the time, worldwide, it's not a White supremacist sign. Wouldn't that be true?

Mr. ROMANO. I don't know if I could speak to the majority of cases now.

Mr. GRIFFITH. All right. Let's move on. I've got so many things to ask.

I've been concerned with this whole pipe bomb situation for some time, and I want to ask you some questions, because, as a prosecutor, I, too—as Ms. Crockett just pointed out, was a criminal defense attorney—I, too, was a criminal defense attorney.

Absent a confession, would you agree with me that, with the evidence that we know, that the pipe bombs were allegedly planted—allegedly—by Mr. Cole on the night of January 5th, but we have the witness at the RNC who says they weren't there then and we have the situation where the folks came through with the explosive-sniffing dogs before the pipe bombs were supposed to be there, but before they were found and didn't hit on the pipe bombs. Wouldn't you agree that, as a prosecutor, absent the confession by Mr. Cole, you have a hard time getting a conviction? Wouldn't you agree with that?

Mr. ROMANO. Maybe yes, maybe no. It depends on the rest of the evidence, which I understand includes evidence of financial transactions that he engaged in license-plate-reader hits, that sort of thing.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Yes, intending to do something and actually succeeding in doing it are two different things. If you've got dogs and people saying the bombs weren't there when they were supposed to

have already been planted by him and he's confessed to planting them the night before, I win that one. Now, we can disagree about that and talk about it later.

Let me ask you some additional questions, if I might.

Were you ever advised, as you were doing your investigations, of any FBI agents on January 6, 2021, being inside the Capitol and observing the January 6th rioters?

Mr. ROMANO. I'm not sure what you mean. There—I wasn't aware of, nor did I see any evidence of, FBI agents within the crowd or planted there, if that's what you're getting at.

Mr. GRIFFITH. All right. How about FBI-paid informants?

Mr. ROMANO. I understand there were people who had been signed up as informants by the FBI who went there, not at the direction of their FBI handlers, but individually. There were a small handful of such individuals.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Did you interview those individuals?

Mr. ROMANO. No.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Did your office—did anybody in your office interview those individuals?

Mr. ROMANO. They may have. I'm not certain as I sit here today.

Mr. GRIFFITH. You're not certain. You didn't call any of those individuals as witnesses in any of the cases?

Mr. ROMANO. I did not. I, again, couldn't say that it didn't happen in any case, but I did not.

Mr. GRIFFITH. All right. Did anyone—while you were the prosecutor and working on this, did anyone bring you information regarding Congressman Barry Loudermilk?

Mr. ROMANO. No.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Did anybody bring you any information about any wrongdoing ever done by Congressman Barry Loudermilk?

Mr. ROMANO. No, I certainly didn't receive any evidence of wrongdoing by the Chair.

Mr. GRIFFITH. If there was a thorough investigation and at one point mentioned that there might've been a problem and then that final report didn't have any report saying that there was no problem, that might be an issue of contention, wouldn't you agree? Wouldn't you agree with the premise that there could be an issue of contention there?

Mr. ROMANO. I'd have to know more about the circumstances.

Mr. GRIFFITH. All right. I appreciate that. That being said, let me go to Mr. Piehota.

We've heard all kinds of allegations, but how do you explain that the Patel FBI was able to identify a pipe bomb suspect once they put their attention to it within about six weeks, but the Wray FBI failed to identify a single suspect or make one arrest in four years? What does that tell you about the way the investigation was handled?

Why did it take so long for the Wray folks to even look at doing a pipe bomb investigation? Can you give me some insight on that?

Mr. PIEHOTA. Certainly. What you saw with the incoming leadership team from Director Patel was a renewed focus, renewed energy, resourcing, and new perspective on what they were looking for.

Under the Wray FBI, this case was allowed to languish. It started to lose energy. Over time, there was a split of resources, there was a split of attention. What happened—

Mr. GRIFFITH. Well, it looked like that happened within the first couple of months. Would that be standard at the FBI in the case of a pipe bomb being left outside the Republican National Committee headquarters and the Democrat National Committee headquarters? Does that make sense?

Mr. PIEHOTA. No, it's highly unusual. They did have the larger events that happened on January 6th that they diverted attention, energy, and resources to. The headquarters' senior leadership and the Washington Field's senior leadership diverted their attention.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Wouldn't you have been concerned—because I certainly would be, as a Member of the Republican Party, for the Republicans and for my friends on the other side of the aisle at the Democrat headquarters—if somebody planted a bomb and they have no idea who it is, that there might be a repeat offense and that we really ought to dig into that because both Republican lawmakers and Democrat lawmakers were at risk?

Mr. PIEHOTA. Absolutely. It was a public safety issue. They failed to do that, and it was a lack of focus.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I think it is more than a lack of focus. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman yields. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Moskowitz. Sorry.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that.

First, let me say a thank you to the FBI and the Department of Justice and law enforcement for catching the pipe bomber.

The other side of the aisle came with videos showing the riot on January 6th. Keep showing those videos. We can sit here and let's watch a couple hours of that footage. I don't know why you think that helps you. It just reminds the American people what they saw with their eyes: Thousands of people storming into a building and beating police officers.

If we wanted, at the next hearing, Mr. Chair, a documentary standpoint, maybe we should watch all the film from that day. I think that would be good.

Also, it's a weird question to ask, why wasn't the riot worse? Why didn't even more people go in? Why wasn't it even worse? We had a couple thousand; why wasn't it 10,000? Why did some people decide not to break the law? That's a weird sort of thing to ask.

Oh, then we've got Ray Epps. Love this. Ray Epps, OK?

Ray Epps told us to do it. He told us to break the law and break windows and doors and beat police officers and hang Mike Pence and try to break onto the floor of the House of Representatives and wipe feces on the walls. We only did it because Ray Epps told us.

How pathetic. Who are these lemmings that broke into the Capitol because Ray Epps told them to do it?

By the way, if you go to Ray Epps's Wikipedia page, Ray Epps says he's an American wedding planner and Oath Keeper chapter president. Number-one wedding planner to the Oath Keepers. I will say, weddings are a place that you give an oath. That's totally fair.

By the way, the head of the Oath Keepers is here with us in the audience. Stewart Rhodes is here today.

[Applause.]

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. It's not every day, of course, you get to meet someone who was convicted of seditious conspiracy against the United States. Hasn't happened in 30 years. Of course, sitting in the front row in the reserved section, which is controlled by my colleagues across the aisle.

Not sure why he's here. I don't know if he's here to tell us about the Oath Keepers' secret handshake or what treehouse they meet in or whether girls are allowed in. I've always wondered that about the Oath Keepers, but, yes, he's here.

I don't know, do you have any questions, my colleagues across the aisle, for the head of the Oath Keepers that's sitting in the reserved section of this hearing?

He wasn't pardoned. He's still convicted of seditious conspiracy—something you guys say didn't happen, right? If there wasn't an insurrection, I don't know how you get convicted of seditious conspiracy.

Then, we've got Mr. Speciale, who says the reason we didn't catch the pipe bomber is because we were so focused on trying to catch Trump people, Trump supporters.

Well, Mr. Speciale, breaking news: As it turns out, the pipe bomber is a Trump supporter. You're right. They were focused on trying to catch people. Turns out, it's just that person, the person you're talking about.

I went to your website, because you mentioned it, Mr. Speciale. You put on your website that January 6th should not be forgotten, like the Holocaust and 9/11.

It's interesting that you chose those two events—two events that also have terrible conspiracies about them, right? Like the Holocaust didn't happen or it wasn't as bad, or that 9/11 was done by the Jews or an inside job, right? It's interesting that you lump in this one with those. I find that fascinating.

Did the Holocaust happen, Mr. Speciale?

Mr. SPECIALE. That's an asinine question. Of course it did.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. Did 9/11 happen?

Mr. SPECIALE. Of course it did.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Was 9/11 done by the American Government?

Mr. SPECIALE. I don't believe so, no.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Was it done by the Israelis?

Mr. SPECIALE. No, I don't think so.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. Six million people died in the Holocaust, right?

Mr. SPECIALE. Yes, I think that's the number.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. You—

Mr. SPECIALE. I think it's actually worse than that—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. It was, yes.

Mr. SPECIALE. —when you think about all the consequences of all the other—all the soldiers and all the—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Tens of millions of people died in World War II.

Mr. SPECIALE. Yes, yes, yes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes, 70 million, actually, I think is the number of total people that died in World War II. This was a conspiracy.

Mr. SPECIALE. Yes. That's the frustrating part for me, is that we've got Congressman Raskin up there smiling while he's watch-

ing videos of one of the biggest tragedies that our country has ever faced, and he's over there giggling about how—and you're saying we should watch it over and over again.

We should watch it over and over again. We absolutely should. Because I think, that day, were it not for Donald Trump saying, "Thank you, everybody; go home," it could've been worse. Instead—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Oh, yes, yes, no, no.

Mr. SPECIALE. —he said, "Go home."

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Hold on. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. SPECIALE. So, no, listen—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Reclaiming my time. I love that. After the President told everyone to break the law, mid-law-breaking—

Mr. SPECIALE. He didn't tell everybody to break the law.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Hold on. Mid-law-breaking, he was like, "OK, pull back, pull back."

Mr. SPECIALE. He didn't tell everybody, "Break the law." He said, "Go there peacefully." The media distorted what he said.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Was that peaceful?

Mr. SPECIALE. They edited the clips.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Hold on. Was it peaceful?

Mr. SPECIALE. Then the January 6th Committee distorted it for all the American people.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Hold on, Mr. Speciale. Was it peaceful?

Mr. SPECIALE. The truth of the matter is—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Hold on. Was it peaceful?

Mr. SPECIALE. —Donald Trump said—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Hold on. Was it peaceful?

Mr. SPECIALE. —"Go home; you've made your point," and they did.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Was it peaceful?

Mr. SPECIALE. No, it wasn't peaceful.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK, OK. Hanging Mike Pence, not peaceful.

Mr. SPECIALE. That's asinine. Of course not.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. OK. It wasn't peaceful.

Mr. SPECIALE. I can explain better—if you'd give me time, I would happily explain to you—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No, no No, no, it wasn't peaceful because Ray Epps told people—

Mr. SPECIALE. No, it wasn't peaceful because the body of the—I've made this analysis—I've made this analysis over and over again, and it's very important, and it's lost on many people.

The crowd of people that were there in attendance that day were, a vast majority of them, veterans and law enforcement—retired veterans and law enforcement. They were standing around. Most of them, 99 percent, were peaceful.

Then the Capitol Police, I believe, panicked. I believe that they lost command and control in the Capitol Police and they started CS-gassing the crowd.

Well, veterans are trained to do one thing and one thing only, and that is fight tyranny and fight injustice.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Break into the Capitol, apparently.

Mr. SPECIALE. That is what we're trained to do. When the Capitol Police began CS-gassing the crowd, the veterans and the law enforcement stepped forward to protect the crowd.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes.

Mr. SPECIALE. That right there is called a black swan. It is what I warned of in October 2020 to the FBI domestic terrorism task force. That's how these things happen all around the world. They happen in Iran, they happen in Syria, they happen in Saudi Arabia, and they happen in Libya. That's how it's done. I was warning of that.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman's time—

Mr. SPECIALE. In this particular crowd—sorry.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman's time has expired. You can submit the remainder of your comments for the record. I now recognize the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Speciale, you can take great honor to know that Mr. Moskowitz would've treated you with much more kindness had you been an illegal appearing before this Committee.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. That's a lie, but OK.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Romano, have you been deposed by this Committee, sir?

Mr. ROMANO. No, not by this Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS. Would you be willing to participate in a deposition by this Committee?

Mr. ROMANO. Absolutely.

Mr. HIGGINS. That's gonna happen.

Mr. Chair, the COVID-era government oppression was very real and impacted American citizens. Our freedom to travel the land was greatly restricted—our freedom to congregate, our freedom to worship, and our freedom to speak. The government oppression that America suffered in the COVID era leading up to the November election cycle of 2020 was unprecedented.

The Biden FBI did penetrate legitimate First Amendment communications in groups of American patriots who had the audacity to object to government oppression. The Biden FBI, trained to manipulate and agitate, did foment rage within these groups of American patriots.

The November 2020 election cycle was compromised. The Biden FBI did have undercover agents and confidential informants embedded within the rally crowds on J4, J5, and J6. The Biden FBI did conspire to entrap MAGA Americans prior to J6 and then successfully entrapped several hundred Americans on J6.

The Biden FBI and DOJ did unrighteously persecute, arrest, and imprison entrapped Americans.

The FBI Director Wray did lie to Congress repeatedly about all this abhorrent government oppression against the American people. President Trump did rightfully pardon the Americans who fell prey to the Biden FBI and DOJ.

Within months of his inauguration, the Trump FBI did identify and arrest the J6 pipe-bomber suspect, using only the evidence that had been in the possession of the Biden FBI since 2021.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to present for the record a letter dated January 11, 2021, to the Administrator of TSA, signed by Bennie Thompson, then-Chair of Homeland Security Committee, and John Katko, the Ranking Member of Homeland Security Committee, a renowned moderate, New York, leaning-liberal Repub-

lican now gone from Congress, identifying Trump supporters as insurrectionists and suggesting efforts by the TSA to disrupt the travel of White supremacists and other domestic terrorists, to quickly deny air carrier services to individuals identified as members of those groups, and to encourage efforts to identify and add to watchlists the perpetrators and members of American organizations that had the audacity to challenge the narrative that was presented under the COVID era and the oppression that the American people suffered.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Without objection.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Nantz, drawing from your expertise, longstanding, with the FBI, can you find any reason, good sir, that the FBI would not have solved the pipe-bomber crime based on the evidence in their possession, including cellular analytics that—we were advised by whistleblowers that under 200 possible cell numbers were identified and presented to the FBI and the illegitimate J6 original Liz Cheney Committee. Why did the FBI not solve that crime, good sir?

Mr. NANTZ. Well, the rapidity of the Patel Administration, or directorship, in solving this case demonstrates exactly why the Wray FBI failed to do so. As has been stated before, this was a matter of leadership. This was also a matter of messaging.

People need to understand the relationship between DOJ and the FBI, that the FBI investigates criminal activity, or should be, and DOJ conducts prosecutions—

Mr. HIGGINS. How could the FBI be that inept, I just ask you? To me, I believe it was purposeful. I believe they identified their suspects in the under 200 numbers, and none of them fit the profile of the so-called alleged White supremacist MAGA activists, so they stepped away from that investigation. I believe that there's no way they could be that inept.

Mr. Chair, my time has expired, but my passion on this subject has not.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman has yielded back.

The Chair notes that there is a lot of passion regarding this topic. It is something that's passionate on both sides of the aisle here. Our objective, or my objective, in this Committee is to get to the truth, without political bias, of what happened.

The question remains: How did the previous FBI go five years without even a lead, using the exact same data, no exception?

Recently, I've talked to the FBI agents that are currently at the FBI, were at the FBI before. They confirmed to me that there was no new evidence brought forward. New eyes were brought into this process. A Red Team was brought in, which also included non-FBI agents that come from teams that are out—task forces. They took a look at the same evidence.

The question being—there's a lot of good information that's been brought up, and a lot of questions—is there political bias involved in the decision? Is it just a lower priority? We know that a lot of the resources were shifted over to prosecuting those who trespassed at the Capitol.

What I'd like to do for a moment is actually look at the data that was there during the Biden-era FBI, the same data that was looked at by the Patel-era FBI.

One of the things—Mr. Piehota, let me start with you. You're familiar with the CAST team; is that correct?

Mr. PIEHOTA. Yes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Can you briefly describe what the CAST team is in the FBI?

Mr. PIEHOTA. They're a communication analysis team. They do cellular phone communication reviews, analysis of records, and dispositions. They can tell you who was where and when. They look at the communications network and how it was leveraged during certain situations.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. We also have from an FBI report that the members of CAST were frustrated that they were put on the back burner when it came to the pipe-bomb investigation. Would that be something that would normally be done within the FBI?

Mr. PIEHOTA. In my experience, no. You take those specialized resources as they come.

Unfortunately, what they might've run into were turf battles, personality issues, and things that tend to hinder investigations, where that's where that engaged leadership would come in and bulldoze right through those challenges and make sure that internal FBI resources were properly and completely engaged, which did not happen, it appears, across this investigation.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. OK. There's no doubt there was violence on January 6th. None of us have denied that. I do appreciate our Capitol Police, who defend us here and have been here to protect us and the other that people are here.

Now, one of the concerns I had with the Select Committee on January 6th is: They had an entire team that was supposedly dedicated to investigating how did the breach happen here at the Capitol. Now, there's really nothing in their 700-page report regarding security failures. However, Republicans investigating this, all the way back to Representative Banks, who's now Senator Banks, as well as my previous investigation, uncovered what appears to be a massive intelligence failure.

One of those that we're actually getting more information right now are these CHSs, confidential human sources, which we know that there were several embedded, which that's important, for the FBI to have these informants embedded in extremist groups.

We have multiple reports of that, some even indicating that it very well could have been much worse, as I've been reading over these reports, by some reports coming in that it was going to be armed, it was going to be a takeover of the government. Fortunately, that didn't happen.

It is beyond the question that the FBI, through these reports, knew that there was going to be violence at the Capitol. However, we have been unable to find any evidence that this information was transferred from the FBI formally to anyone else, including the U.S. Capitol Police and the U.S. Capitol Police intelligence division. We're still looking at that.

Is that normal operating procedures? Is this turf battle so tight within the FBI that they would not report actionable intelligence that there very, very likely is going to be violence at the Capitol?

Mr. PIEHOTA. What you found here was a communication failure. They downplayed the information. They probably saw that it

wasn't actionable or it came from sources of questionable reliability. They downgraded the veracity of the information, chose not to disseminate some of it to the partners, and let them make their own decisions.

In my opinion, it was a bad judgment call inside the Bureau not to have that pre-event call, share that information with them, let the partners make their own decisions, and combine it with information that they may have developed separately. I would say it was an intelligence shortfall.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. It is clear the intelligence was there, because even the Metropolitan D.C., their own emergency management department ordered hospitals to double their blood supply just based on their intelligence of what was coming in.

That we would not be able to use these agencies that work together to make sure that we weren't caught flatfooted, as we were on January 6th.

One other question I have about the CAST. Now, we do know that there was a data request made from all the carriers, and it was a huge request of cell phones that were in/around the Capitol January 5th–6th. That's the data of which the current FBI was able to narrow down, with a combination of the videos so they'd know where the suspect was, they were able to track him down, and then they were also able to go out and find the purchases. This is what pulled things together.

It's confusing me how that could not have been done by the previous administration. I believe it could have; there was just a lack of will.

There's another—something else that was brought up by one of my colleagues here was the gallows that were erected. It appears from my previous investigation that the FBI put no resources into identifying who erected the gallows.

It's always bothered me that the gallows were allowed to stay up all day long. They weren't even taken down until late that evening. They were erected at 6:00 in the morning when hardly anyone was around.

Based on this CAST team and this digital data that was there, shouldn't the FBI be able to just go look at that same data and identify whose phones were pinging right at that area where the gallows were erected at 6:00 in the morning? Seems like that should be an easy—

Mr. PIEHOTA. The same investigative model would apply.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. OK. Maybe this is something the current FBI could tackle. I've exceeded my time. We'll begin our second round. The Chair recognizes Mr. Nehls.

Mr. NEHLS. Hey. Thank you, sir. I was running out of time, but I finished talking about that first breach. This entire document is about Donald Trump. It's about blaming Donald Trump. "Donald Trump commanded—he ordered his followers to go to the Capitol to storm the Capitol."

I find it interesting, because the first breach occurred 20 minutes before Trump's speech ended. Why would Trump supporters leave a Trump speech and breach the Capitol Grounds before the speech ever ended? I've been to rallies, this and that. When the boss is up there speaking, nobody leaves early. Nobody leaves early.

I'll tell you why: Because there was never a call to violence. There was never a call to violence or a call to storm the Capitol.

That was something the militia groups were craving and created on their own. The Oath Keepers, Proud Boys, antifa, Three Percenters—bad actors that day. Gotta say it: Bad actors. They were acting alone and not listening to Trump. Stewart Rhodes stated that, “if Trump didn’t do what they wanted, they would have to do it themselves.”

The January 6th resulted from a gross failure of intelligence, not the actions of Donald Trump.

Capitol Police Assistant Chief Yogananda Pittman was in charge of the intelligence division of the U.S. Capitol Police in days leading up to January 6th and produced a report, the “January 3rd Special Event Assessment,” and stated, quote, “Congress itself is the target on January 6th,” and, quote, “Protesters may be inclined to become violent,” and, quote, “There have been some worrisome calls from protestors to come to these events armed.” Another quote: “The sense of desperation and disappointment may lead to more of an incentive to become violent.”

Even worse, Pittman testified to the Senate that she had shared the appropriate intelligence with the Assistant and Deputy Chiefs of the Capitol Police, which is unconditionally false. It was never sent or shared.

Why can I say that? I can say it with certainty because if you look at Harry Dunn, Officer Harry Dunn’s testimony in the previous Committee, he states that, “he believed that January 6th would just be like any other day. He had no independent reason to believe that there would be violence.” In his own words on July 27, 2021, testimony, Harry Dunn stated, “he thought there was going to be peaceful protests and received no threat warning from the chain of command.”

The question is, who lied? Harry Dunn, you’re lying, or Yogananda Pittman, who’s got a nice job. Pelosi gave her a nice capital—a nice job there in California.

Now, we know why the Capitol Police was so ill-prepared. We know why. Assistant Chief Yogananda Pittman never shared the intel.

Now, let’s talk about the deployment of the National Guard. For the Capitol Police to request outside assistance, the three members of the Capitol Police Board must declare an emergency. This wasn’t done—wasn’t done until very late. Isn’t it interesting that there is not a single word in the report from any of the three voting members on the board? How could there not be?

Finally, the subject of this hearing, the pipe bomb, only mentioned—guess what—five times in this appendix. It’s in the appendix at the end of the report, even though the pipe bombs were by far the most serious thing that occurred that day, as they could’ve killed, maimed many people—the VP, the Vice President-elect of the United States. The previous committee nor the FBI cared. They didn’t care about it at all.

Understand the effect of the discovery of the pipe bombs in the timeline.

The first pipe bomb was reported to law enforcement at 12:42 p.m., which drew half of the police—half of the police away from

the Capitol Building. The officers began arriving two minutes later at 12:44 p.m. Then, the bike-rack perimeter is breached minutes later at 12:53 p.m.

Now, that security at the Capitol has been softened—it's smart. This was organized. This was an operation, folks. Then, at 12:59 p.m., six minutes later, Congress convened to certify the election. It's very interesting that the pipe bomb is reported just minutes before the joint session convenes.

Here's the key the American people need to understand: The FBI, Patel's FBI, didn't get any new information, no new information to find the pipe bomber. They had all the evidence to identify him and had been in possession of Christopher Wray's FBI for the entire Biden Administration.

It is extremely bizarre, folks. It's bizarre, because the January 6th investigation was the largest and most extensive in the history of the FBI. This is the article. The Wray FBI aggressively pursued and charged nearly 1,600 individuals in all 50 States, including elderly individuals who committed no acts of violence.

They identified and tracked these people down at breakneck speed using every tool at their disposal, left no stone unturned, when we had an FBI whistleblower disclose to us that they were even pulling agents off porn cases, child porn cases, so they could catch trespassing grandmas. For the pipe bomber, there was comparatively no effort to find this person.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record of today's hearing this CNN article titled, "Biggest Investigation in FBI History Still Has Merrick Garland in the Hot Seat."

I'd also like to enter into the record—this is good to help my colleague from Texas on the other side that talked about impeachments, impeachments, impeachments—November 6, 2024, the *Los Angeles Times*, "Trump is elected 47th president, soundly defeating Harris to retake the White House." This is a beautiful one here.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Without objection.

Mr. NEHLS. Everybody read it. I yield back.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Raskin, is recognized.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. It looks like a new conspiracy theory is born.

Originally, the pipe bomber was supposed to be an anti-Trump person, which was why the name wasn't revealed. Then, that's out the window when it turns out it's a pro-Trump election denier.

Well, then they were saying, "No, it's an inside job. It was by a former Capitol Police officer." That's out the window. That's not who the person was.

Now, the claim is, "Well, they got the person—yay for the FBI, hurray for Kash Patel—they got the person, but it took too long for them to do it." That's what the conspiracy theory has come to, and this is just pathetic.

Look, let's start with this. They tried to blame January 6th on antifa on January 6th. Donald Trump did it himself in a conversation with Kevin McCarthy. McCarthy called him up from his office, desperate, saying, "We're being overrun. We're besieged here. You've gotta call off your people, Donald Trump." Trump said, "Oh, it's not my people; it's antifa."

McCarthy said, “No.” Effectively, he said, “No.” I’m paraphrasing here. He said, “They’re in my office. They’re your people, Mr. President.” Then, Trump said, “Well, maybe they just care a little bit more about a fair election than you do, Kevin.” Again, paraphrasing, but that’s the sum and substance of the conversation.

Immediately, they wanted to try to pin it on antifa. That was the whole methodology. That’s what Matt Gaetz did when he came to the floor, even after we were driven out of our chambers by MAGA, the Proud Boys, the Oath Keepers, and other extremists who had been called to storm the Capitol. Because you’ve got to go and “fight like hell,” Donald Trump said, “and if you don’t fight like hell, you’re not going to have a country anymore.” They went to “stop the steal.” That was the slogan. They did exactly what they set out to do. Then, they tried to blame it on antifa. What a fraud it was.

Was there any evidence, Mr. Romano, that antifa was actually behind it? Did Donald Trump just pardon nearly 1,600 antifa fighters? Is that what he did?

Mr. ROMANO. No, there was no evidence of that. In the hundreds of cases that I supervised, I saw no evidence that any person we charged was antifa or was motivated or driven by antifa.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, if it wasn’t antifa, surely it was undercover FBI agents who made all those people go out there and smash police officers in the face and storm the Capitol and try to overthrow the 2020 Presidential election, right?

What about the theory that this was really FBI sources, undercover sources, who did it?

Mr. ROMANO. I’ve seen no evidence of that. As I said before, there were informants who were present in the crowd, not at the direction of their FBI handlers. There were no undercover FBI agents directing the crowd. That is false information based on a statistic taken out of context.

Mr. RASKIN. All right. Essentially, what are our colleagues inviting us to believe today?

Well, let’s see. Ms. Hageman wants us to believe there was no insurrection, despite the fact that the House of Representatives voted that Donald Trump incited an insurrection. She wants us to believe it didn’t happen, despite the fact that you can find calls replete throughout the crowd and throughout the extremist groups calling for an overthrow of the government, calling for the assassination of Mike Pence and Nancy Pelosi, calling for the killing of Members of Congress. No, that didn’t happen.

They want us to believe that Trump, Giuliani, and Sidney Powell and their associates didn’t lie by claiming the elections were stolen. In other words, they want us to believe the original lie that set America off on this path of chaos and division.

They want us to believe that Donald Trump actually won the 2020 Presidential election, which he lost by more than seven million votes, 306–232 in the electoral college, with more than 60 Federal and State court decisions, including by eight judges nominated to the bench by Donald Trump, rejecting and repudiating every claim of electoral fraud and corruption that Trump and his forces put forward in court, and they want to go back to it.

They want us to believe that January 6th was provoked by the FBI. Even Director Patel said that was false. Even Patel rejects that one.

They want us to believe that the Capitol Police are responsible for hundreds of rioters attacking them. Sergeant Gonell, who fought in Afghanistan and said that he saw no violence abroad that remotely compared to the medieval mayhem and violence unleashed on the police officers that day, that he was at fault for it? Sergeant Gonell, who had to resign from the force because of injuries to his rotator cuff, his shoulder, and his left foot, because he couldn't any longer meet the physical demands of the job, that this is something that he wanted? These officers who've suffered brain contusions, heart attacks, strokes; Brian Sicknick, who died the next day after injuries inflicted on him by the mob; that this was somehow their fault? It's obscene. It's absurd.

I certainly hope we can expect more out of this Subcommittee than that, Mr. Chair.

There are some lingering questions. Most of them could be answered by Donald Trump, who's never once testified under oath about what he did on January 6th other than sit on his hands and probably order hamburgers and french fries while he watched the whole scene on TV unfold. Did nothing to send out the National Guard, under his unilateral direct control in the District of Columbia.

If you don't believe me, look it up, Ms. Hageman. Look it up. The President controls the National Guard in the District of Columbia. I'll bet you a lunch with your former occupant of your office, your predecessor, Ms. Cheney, who is somebody who brought great honor to this institution.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Great—OK.

Mr. RASKIN. I'll tell you this: The truth is a resilient thing. We're not going to put up with a pack of lies in this Subcommittee and a bunch of conspiracy theories. We're not. We're not.

Have at it. Throw what you want against the wall. You'd better learn the first lesson they teach lawyers when you pass the bar: When you go to court, you'd better bring the evidence with you.

I yield back.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman's time has expired. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Griffith, is now recognized.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Let's talk about the evidence. If you learned that you're supposed to bring the evidence with you, I submit to my colleague he should've brought the evidence onto the National Guard. Because in our prior hearings held by Mr. Loudermilk, we discovered that not only did the President authorize the National Guard in advance of January 6th, but that offer was turned down, and then there was some obstruction on the National Guard getting here, because he gave the order for the National Guard to be brought, and the general in charge, according to four officers who were with the National Guard that day, with the commander of the Washington, DC, National Guard—four of them testified under oath that the general never transmitted that order for well over two hours after the President gave the order.

That's the evidence that's out there, and those are the facts on that.

Now, it was made in the prior hearing on this—somebody said, “Well, why didn’t the President just call directly?” We all know what would happen. I said so at the time. We all know what would happen if the President had done that. They would’ve said he’s not following the chain of command, because he’s supposed to give the orders to the general, and the general is supposed to give the order to the National Guard. There was a failure there as well.

Now, that’s not what we’re here about today. We’re here about the pipe bombing.

Let me say this to my colleague on the other side of the aisle: It took too long to capture the pipe bomber. It took too long. He threw that into his litany of conspiracies. He says it’s now a conspiracy that it took too long to find the pipe bomber. I’m telling you, my friend, it took too long. That’s not a conspiracy. That is the evidence and the facts. It took too long to find this individual, and there was sloppy work at the FBI.

Now, I’m concerned about our safety, because there’s sloppy work all around on this thing, and I don’t understand why. Because we saw in the previous investigation through the House Admin Subcommittee on Oversight, we saw a video where they bring in the detonation robot, or the robot to take apart or to make sure there’s not a problem with one of the pipe bombs, and they didn’t secure the area around it.

In the film, the Chair will agree; he saw it too—you see a pedestrian walking by. All the police are standing back. Here comes a pedestrian walking by where the pipe bomb is.

Mr. PIEHOTA, does that make any sense? Why are you allowing pedestrians in the neighborhood where you’re about to try to get a robot—you’ve sent a robot in to detonate, and you don’t have the area secured? Does that make any sense to you?

Mr. PIEHOTA. It makes no sense. The safety of the public would be your paramount objective first, to secure the area, clear the area of civilians, and make sure that there aren’t any unnecessary personnel close to the device.

Mr. GRIFFITH. It raises the issue—and I don’t have any conspiracy—or, I have no idea why, but it raises the question, why? Maybe it was just sloppy work.

Mr. PIEHOTA. I think you’re looking at adrenaline, bad training—ineptitude.

Mr. GRIFFITH. OK. All right. If you can do it quickly, because I’ve only got a minute and 50 seconds left because I got wound up about the National Guard, but Patel FBI created a Red Team. What’s a Red Team? What’s the process of setting it up? Who makes the decision to set it up?

Mr. PIEHOTA. OK. A Red Team, it’s a term of art. It’s a review team. He did a case review team.

He took people who had certain backgrounds and investigative experience that were consistent with what he was looking to accomplish, put them together, gave them resources, gave them priority, and gave them the charter to take all this information. He removed all obstacles, and he gave them the charter to find out what’s going on, look for any investigative gaps.

What the boss is interested in gets done. What the boss checks gets done well. That’s what you saw here.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Well, if he did that in 2025, do you think that, while the Wray team was focused on something else—and you mentioned that earlier—do you think that by 2024 or 2023 they would've been able to focus and do a Red Team in the Wray FBI if they thought that there was a reason to do so or they felt that it was important?

Because I'm concerned about the safety of people who go to the RNC and the DNC.

Mr. PIEHOTA. The senior leadership did not make it a priority. The resources weren't dedicated. It didn't happen.

Mr. GRIFFITH. The safety of Members of Congress going to their respective political party headquarters was not a priority for the FBI at that time.

Mr. PIEHOTA. Did not appear so.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I thank you very much. I yield back.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to enter the criminal indictment of Mr. Brian J. Cole as the defendant in the pipe-bomb case.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Without objection.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Nantz, the investigation on the pipe bomber, that commenced under the Trump Administration FBI. Seemed to be initiated just based on a focused effort of leadership within the FBI to direct investigative assets and procedures to put, quote "a new set of eyes" on the existing evidence. That's where they intended to begin.

They had no way of knowing that the evidence that they were already in possession of, that the FBI had been in possession of since 2021, would produce a relatively short list of potential suspects based upon cellular analytics of possible cell phone numbers that could have planted these bombs. They had no way of knowing that the evidence in their possession that they were going to put a fresh set of eyes on would produce a solid suspect and, ultimately, probable cause for an arrest.

Their intention was just to review the existing material so that they had a good investigative foundation to move forward with an aggressive investigation and to solve the pipe-bomber case.

Does that sound like the kind of solid leadership you would expect out of the FBI?

Mr. NANTZ. Yes, absolutely. That's what you would expect from what we used to call our country's leading law enforcement agency.

Mr. HIGGINS. Well, I concur. I think they're reclaiming that recognition—

Mr. NANTZ. Uh-huh.

Mr. HIGGINS. —and that solving the pipe-bomber case was quite significant.

The cellular analytical data—is it true that the FBI and our intel services have contractors that specialize in the collection of that data and the analytics of that data? It's not necessarily a direct CAT FBI employees, but that the FBI itself uses contractors to provide some of that data as additional assets to the FBI's own CAT. Is that correct?

Mr. NANTZ. Yes, to a limited degree, yes.

Mr. HIGGINS. To a limited degree. Would you say to a specialized degree?

Mr. NANTZ. Absolutely.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you.

Let me just clarify, Mr. Chair and for Americans watching: Whistleblowers came forward—a particular whistleblower came forward in 2022 that is a specialized contractor for cellular analytical data that had initiated his own review of cell data after J6 happened and the J6 pipe-bomb event was revealed to America and that investigation was ongoing, and this whistleblower identified telephone numbers and provided them to the FBI and, we're advised, to the original J6 select Liz Cheney Committee—Subcommittee—the Select Committee, and that data went nowhere.

I ask again, Mr. Nantz, Mr. Speciale, good sir, Mr. Piehota, how is it possible that the FBI could be that inept? Would you say that it's reasonable to suspect that there was a purposeful intent to ignore the evidence that they were in possession of? Or is it more likely that the FBI was that inept?

Mr. Nantz?

Mr. NANTZ. It's a matter of narrative. The controlling narrative at the time was that the threat to the American people was coming from the RMVE threat, the White supremacist threat. That was the constant—

Mr. HIGGINS. Well, how would they know without analyzing the data if it wasn't a MAGA Republican? How would they know?

Because that's how they identified alleged White supremacist domestic terrorists. If you were a MAGA guy, a MAGA American, you were in that category.

How you would know it was not a MAGA guy unless they had analyzed the data?

Mr. NANTZ. Well, it's possible that they knew that Cole, perhaps in late 2021, was a Black male individual from Woodbridge, Virginia, that did not fit that narrative.

Mr. HIGGINS. You agree that's possible.

Mr. NANTZ. It is possible, yes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chair, I find that to be a reasonable and disturbing suspicion.

To my friend and colleague, the Ranking Member, I would suggest, it's not a conspiracy theory if it turns out to be true. We shall see.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman yields. Mr. Raskin's recognized for a UC.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much. I've got several UC requests, Mr. Chair. First, "Defense Secretary Christopher Miller: Trump Gave No Order to Prepare Troops Before January 6th."

Second, *Associated Press* Fact Check: "Pelosi Did Not Block the National Guard from the Capitol on J6." That's July 23, 2021.

Third, this is the decision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *RNC v. Nancy Pelosi*, rejecting all the claims of procedural irregularities in the January 6th Committee that were voiced by the gentleman from Texas.

Fourth, *Yahoo.com*, "Trump Forgets He Was President During Capitol Riot, Blames 'THE BIDEN FBI' for Placing Agents in the Crowd in the Dead of Night on January 6th."

Finally, just two others: This is the staff report that we did on the Minority side, Mr. Chair. "One Year Later: Assessing the Public Safety Implications of President Trump's Mass Pardons of 1,600 January 6th Rioters and Insurrectionists."

Then, finally, from *Politico.com*, "Trump May Have Accidentally Pardoned the January 6 Pipe Bomber."

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Without objection. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. The Ranking Member indicated that the first lesson that you teach lawyers is you better bring the evidence with you.

Another lesson that we learn is that you should also know the elements of the crime and the relevant statute if you're going to claim that somebody committed a crime.

It's a pretty slimy tactic to use the word "insurrection" over and over and over and over and over again, and yet try to hide the fact that the gentleman who's sitting here before us today, who was responsible for prosecuting many of the people on January 6th, never once charged anybody with violating 18 U.S.C. 2383.

You never charged anybody with violating that statute. You never convicted anybody of violating that statute. Sitting here and using that word over and over again means absolutely nothing.

We are here today focusing on the pipe bomb because of what happened that day. It clearly played a pivotal role in facilitating the breach of the Capitol, and we need to get to the bottom of what happened there.

These devices were discovered outside the RNC and DNC within 20 minutes of the joint session, and the U.S. Capitol Police were forced to divide the forces while a crowd of protestors moved toward the Capitol.

The U.S. Capitol Police was not dealing with just the force division, but also with the fact that 500 bike racks had been removed the night before.

Who ordered the removal of the 500 bike racks and why? The staff of the Architect of the Capitol testified that the evening of January 5th, roughly around the time the pipe bombs were allegedly planted, the order came down to remove 500 bike racks from around the Capitol.

Mr. PIEHOTA, can bike racks help law enforcement with crowd control and deterrence?

Mr. PIEHOTA. Absolutely. They form a physical barrier between the crowd and a protected location, or they can be used to help funnel a crowd to or from a location.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Well, can they also serve as a visual cue for nonlaw enforcement personnel about what lines they are not allowed to cross? Could removing them spell legal jeopardy for protestors who cannot identify what is the line of trespass?

Mr. PIEHOTA. It creates ambiguity for the public. They don't know where those barriers are.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Did this actually result in legal jeopardy for many of the people who were on the Capitol Grounds on January 6th?

Mr. PIEHOTA. It ended up that way.

Ms. HAGEMAN. OK.

According to the Select January 6th Committee's final report, quote,

At 1:28 p.m., USCP requested the AOC deliver 400 additional bike racks to the East Front to serve as protective barriers, even though rioters were using bike racks as weapons. The pipe bomb discovery at the DNC prevented the AOC from delivering them.

Clearly, the Capitol Police viewed the bike racks as a necessary tool for that day, and their removal is absolutely baffling. This Subcommittee should focus on identifying who gave that order, why, when, and who was involved. We need to get to the bottom of this. The previous January 6th Committee didn't look into it. They're not the ones who actually investigated what happened here and why.

This statement is also clear that the impacts of the pipe bombs continue to be felt by the U.S. Capitol Police officers responding to the incident. Mr. Piehota, does this raise even more questions about why the Wray FBI did not take this pipe bomb investigation seriously?

Mr. PIEHOTA. The Wray FBI did not prioritize this investigation. Again, their resources and their attention were split into the other events of January 6th. Over time, what we saw was then, I would say, a weak or inept case management approach where this investigation eventually stalled.

Ms. HAGEMAN. OK. Mr. Speciale, do you have anything you would like to briefly add to the discussion today?

Mr. SPECIALE. That probably the biggest takeaway in all this is that there are 1,600 American citizens that were baited into a trespass trap to a great extent.

Yes, certainly, absolutely, some of them were violent, or investigations and prosecutors were warranted. I have an estimate that it was almost a billion dollars that was spent on prosecuting American citizens. It's a lot of money that we spent on trying to prosecute patriotic American citizens.

Then, you add on top of that the thousands of American citizens that, like myself, were also weaponized against for deterrence purposes, all the tactical resources. It was really a terror campaign.

I would refer you to the National Counterterrorism reports available on my website, and it's highlighted where they want an FBI domestic terrorism statute, quote, "for deterrence purposes." They want to be able to silence free speech. They did that with all this.

The cause, bottom line, is 51 intelligence officers' memo, Hunter Biden laptop. It's all these things where the American citizens that showed up that day were at their wits' end on having faith in their government. They were vulnerable, as I warned, they were vulnerable.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Well, then, Hunter Biden is a good name to bring forward with Mr. Romano here when we talk about the appropriateness of pardons.

Mr. Nantz, do you have anything to very briefly add?

Mr. NANTZ. One of the biggest things that the American people need to take away from this is the understanding of how dangerous narrative-led investigations can be. What we have going on here in large measure are narratives driven by the Biden White House

through the Garland DOJ. These are, of course, communications happening headquarters to headquarters.

Director Wray, as any leader, can present the commander's intent without explicitly doing so. If he's getting communications from his boss, who is the Attorney General, that the narrative needs to be, "We need to prioritize and stick with the J6 insurrection narrative, the pipe bomber narrative, or the pipe bomber investigation," in my opinion, was deprioritized because of that narrative coming from potentially the White House.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Well, I appreciate your testimony. Thank you for being here. Thank you for being willing to expose this.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for a UC.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is just the website from the District of Columbia National Guard stating the D.C. National Guard is the only National Guard unit which reports only to the President.

Then, I would like to submit for the record, also under UC, 18 U.S.C. 2384, defining conspiracy "to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States . . . or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States," as seditious conspiracy, which is synonymous with insurrection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Without objection. I now recognize myself for the final few moments of questioning.

Mr. Romano, you had mentioned to Mr. Griffith earlier—and correct me if I'm wrong—that you were not aware of FBI agents being inside the Capitol during the violence on January 6th.

Mr. ROMANO. What I said was that I wasn't aware of FBI agents being undercover in the crowd or inciting action of the crowd. I know that FBI agents went to the Capitol as part of the law enforcement response.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. OK. Yes. We just found that out recently, in the last few months, that over a hundred FBI agents were deployed as crowd control, which is something that they're really not supposed to do, according to after-action reports that we've read. That apparently was never made public during the trials.

Did you ever have an FBI agent, one of those agents there, testify on behalf of the defense or the prosecution?

Mr. ROMANO. I had FBI agents testify. Typically, they were case agents who were part of the investigative team who—

Mr. LOUDERMILK. These agents would have been witnesses.

Mr. ROMANO. Oh, no—

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Because they were in the crowd, but nobody knew they were in the crowd.

Mr. ROMANO. The witnesses who testified in my cases were typically Capitol Police and MPD officers.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. OK. What I'm getting at is, would they be someone who could be compelled to testify as a witness had it been known that they were there witnessing some of this?

Mr. ROMANO. If they were used for crowd control, I'd be skeptical—

Mr. LOUDERMILK. If they were inside the Capitol when things were going on, would they not be a witness either for defense or prosecution?

Mr. ROMANO. It's possible.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. If the FBI held that back that they were there, is that not withholding evidence that could be exculpatory?

Mr. ROMANO. I would struggle to think how it's exculpatory. Most things in the Capitol were recorded by cameras, which we produced.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. There are plenty of areas that are not covered by cameras. I've watched most of the footage.

Mr. ROMANO. Sure.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. OK. Thank you. Let me clear something regarding the D.C. National Guard before I move on to my final question.

The gentleman from Maryland is right, the President does have the power to deploy the D.C. National Guard, but there is something that is more powerful than the President, and that is Constitution of the United States and the separation of powers. He cannot just send the National Guard, unless the National Guard is requested by the Legislative Branch.

There were multiple requests made by the former Chief of Police for National Guard before the request to call them was given, and that was only after shots were fired in the Capitol.

That request was made to the Department of Defense in the one hour on January 6th. However, the D.C. National Guard was not deployed, the order was not given to them for more than 3½ hours after the request was made.

On January 3rd, according to General Milley's own testimony, which I have not only his testimony that he gave to the D.C. National Guard—or to the Department of Defense IG—but also in his daily log that we've had for some time.

On January 3rd, he reported that President Donald J. Trump told him to have the D.C. Guard ready to deploy to keep the people safe and what other resources he may need to keep the people safe on January 6th.

That was delegating to the Department of Defense. There was no question that that was done because there were plenty of discussions, which we have the evidence through depositions and transcribed interviews, between the officials who were there and the DOD IG. The discussion was whether or not we should go ahead and deploy them. They knew that they had the authority to deploy the D.C. National Guard.

There was a lot of concern over optics. One of the TIs—or one the DOD officials said: "We did not want it to appear that we were participating in an insurrection."

If you believe it was an insurrection, by holding the D.C. National Guard back, therefore, you participated, right, because they were there to help. They would have been a huge deterrent had they been there when Chief Sund originally requested them.

I just want to clear the record on that, and there is evidence to that.

Mr. Nantz, is it plausible, given the high-profile nature of this case, that the Biden DOJ influenced how the FBI prioritized the pipe bomber's apprehension?

Mr. NANTZ. Yes, that's the point that I've been making throughout this proceeding, is that there was a narrative that was being pushed by the Garland DOJ.

When you have a careerist like Director Wray, individuals like that aren't really motivated to push back on narratives that they disagree with.

In large part that's what happened. You had a narrative that was being presented by the Attorney General and was communicated to the FBI Director. Therefore, that led to the deprioritization of the pipe bomb case.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Well, thank you for that.

There is evidence pointing out that Brian Cole, Jr., was present in all three of the FBI's most obvious evidentiary buckets: Cell phone data, license plate reader data, and financial transactions.

Is it plausible that FBI investigators knew Cole's identity as early as February 2021?

Mr. NANTZ. It's not just plausible, I think it's likely.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. If you could remind us, what's your experience with the FBI?

Mr. NANTZ. Well, 20-year veteran with the FBI. I started out in the Miami Field Office working counterintelligence and moved on to dignitary protection, and then finally as a supervisory special agent over ground surveillance and aviation assets.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. There's been a lot of talk about conspiracy theories and narratives. Quite often they can interconnect, right? What to one person is a conspiracy theory, to another could be defined as a narrative.

I would submit that there is plenty of narrative that came out of the former Select Committee on January 6th that just is not factual, such as the D.C. National Guard. In fact, they reported they took what the DOD IG at the time told them, that the D.C. National Guard was not ready. However, they were sitting ready at the Armory as early as daybreak, because they had been—they mustered, and they were recalled, ready to deploy, because of Donald Trump's order.

The handwriting of a note that the Select Committee attributed to one of the witnesses, which a handwriting analysis clearly defined and identified, a nine-year-old can look at the handwriting of this note and identify that it was one of the counsels at the White House.

There are a number of statements, blatant statements made in the January Select Committee's report that just aren't—they just don't pass the evidentiary test because the evidence is opposite.

It still confounds my wisdom is why was no one on that side interested in the pipe bomb when it was a Democrat Vice President-elect who was within feet of the pipe bomb. There's basically no reference to that in the report.

Before we adjourn, I do want to submit a couple of things for the record.

An article, “Governor Pritzker’s Sanctuary Illinois Released More than 1,700 Criminal Aliens, Including Murderers, Pedophiles, and Kidnappers.”

An article, “Sanctuary New York Released Nearly 7,000 Criminal Illegal Aliens, Including Murderers, Terrorists, and Sexual Predators.”

That’s evidence—there’s been a lot of talk about pardons in here. There’s definitely evidence here that violent offenders are regularly being released back into the community by some of my colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle.

This is a press release from September 20, 2024, “Transcripts Show President Trump’s Directives to Pentagon Leadership to ‘Keep January 6 Safe’ Were Deliberately Ignored.”

Also, an article from August 28, 2024, “Pelosi admits blame for ‘stupidity’ in Jan. 6 security failures in new released video: ‘I take full responsibility.’”

Without objection.

This concludes today’s hearing. We thank the witnesses for appearing before the Select Committee.

Without objection, all Members will have five legislative days to submit additional questions in writing for the witnesses or additional materials for the record.

Without objection, this hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:41 p.m., the Select Subcommittee was adjourned.]

All materials submitted for the record by Members of the Select Subcommittee To Investigate the Remaining Questions Surrounding January 6, 2021, can be found at: <https://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=118824>.

