OPEN HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF JOHN O. BRENNAN TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

* * *

Thursday, February 7, 2013

United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:30 p.m., in Room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, the Honorable Dianne Feinstein, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senators Feinstein, Chambliss, Rockefeller, Burr, Wyden, Risch, Mikulski, Coats, Udall, Rubio, Warner, Collins, Heinrich, King, & Levin

Ρ	R (0	С	Ε	Ε	D		Ν	G	S
---	-----	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---

* * *

-
2
~

1

CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: We will begin this hearing. And let me say right up front that the process is that people are respectful; that they don't cheer, they don't hiss, they don't show signs; that this is to listen. If that's a problem for anybody, I ask you to leave the room *now*, because what we will do is remove you from the room -- let there be no doubt.

So, if I may, I would like to begin. The Committee meets today in open session to consider the nomination of John Brennan to be the 21st Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the first director to have risen through the Agency's ranks since Bob Gates.

Mr. Brennan, congratulations on your nomination. I see Senator Warner has come in; Senator, I will make opening comments, the Vice Chairman will make opening comments, and then we will turn to you for your introduction, if that's agreeable.

Mr. Brennan, congratulations on your nomination. As you can see, it's going to be lively. I'd like to welcome your family, as well, and hope you'll introduce them so the Committee can give them its thanks.

This is the first opportunity, also, to welcome our new Members --Senator Heinrich, who is on my right; Senator King, who is due any moment; Senator Collins, who is on my left; and Senator Coburn, who is not here at the moment, but will be, who is returning to the Committee. And we have a
new Ex-Officio Member, Senator Inhofe. So, welcome to all of you.

The Director of the CIA is among the most critical national security positions in the United States Government, both because of the role the CIA plays in collecting and analyzing intelligence relevant to every national security challenge we face, and because of the added importance of having steady leadership at an organization that conducts most of its business outside of the public arena.

Intelligence is critical to the successful drawdown in Afghanistan; to the 9 brutal war going on within Syria's borders, across North Africa, where the 10 attacks in Benghazi and the hostage situation in Algeria threaten to spread 11 into the next front against al-Qa'ida and its affiliated groups; for 12 counterterrorism operations around the world; in the efforts by the United 13 States and others to prevent the gain and spread of weapons of mass 14 destruction in Iran, North Korea, and other states; and in addressing 15 emerging threats in space, cyberspace, and elsewhere around the globe. 16 To confront these challenges, and to lead the CIA through a difficult 17 budgetary period after a decade of major budget increases, President Obama 18 nominated John Brennan, his closest advisor on intelligence and 19 counterterrorism matters for the past four years. 20

21 Mr. Brennan is, without a doubt, qualified for this position. He served

at the CIA for 25 years in analytic, operational, and managerial capacities.

2 He has seen the Agency from just about every angle -- as a line analyst, as

³ Chief of Station, as Chief of Staff to the Director, and as the Deputy

4 Executive Director -- among many others.

People who have worked closely with him regularly cite his work ethic,
his integrity, and his determination. In nominating John Brennan, President
Obama spoke of his "commitment to the values that define us as Americans."
DNI Clapper, in a letter of support, noted his "impeccable integrity" and that
"his dedication to country is second to none."

10 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: So, with that, with unanimous consent, I would 11 like to insert into the record the letters the Committee has received in regard 12 to Mr. Brennan's nomination.

13 (Whereupon, letters received by the Committee regarding the 14 nomination of Mr. Brennan, were submitted for the record. Copies of 15 the letters follow.)

- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19

20

21

CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: John Brennan, by all accounts, will be a strong 1 leader, guided firmly by the law and his strong ethical code. He has assured 2 the Committee, in his response to pre-hearing questions, that he will be 3 independent from political influence; he will seek only to provide the 4 President, the Congress, and other leaders with his best analysis and advice. 5 His responses to the Committee's questions are available on the 6 Committee's website, at www.intelligence.senate.gov. Of course, the 7 Committee must conduct its due diligence on such an important nominee, 8 so Members are going to have guestions in a range of topics, including his 9 plans for directing the Agency, major national security challenges we face, 10 and positions and actions he has taken in his current and past jobs. 11

Also of interest will be Mr. Brennan's views on the use of targeted lethal force in counterterrorism operations. Mr. Brennan has been one of the few administration officials able to speak publicly about such issues; Members will certainly want to understand his views on this, to include the importance of Congress receiving all of the relevant legal analyses from the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice.

While the disclosure earlier this week of a 16-page unclassified White Paper on the government's legal analysis of the use of targeted force against a United States citizen, who was a senior operational leader of al-Qa'ida -there is finally more information available to the public. I have been calling, and others have been calling -- the Vice Chairman
and I -- for increased transparency on the use of targeted force for over a
year, including the circumstances in which such force is directed against U.S.
citizens and noncitizens alike. I have also been attempting to speak publicly
about the very low number of civilian casualties that result from such strikes;
I have been limited in my ability to do so.

But for the past several years, this Committee has done significant oversight of the government's conduct of targeted strikes and the figures we have obtained from the Executive Branch -- which we have done our utmost to verify -- confirm that the number of civilian casualties that have resulted from such strikes each year has typically been in the single digits.

When I ask to give out the actual numbers, I'm told, "You can't." And I say, "Why not?" "Because it's classified" ... "It's a covert program" ... "For the public, it doesn't exist." Well, I think that rationale, Mr. Brennan, is long gone, and I'm going to talk to you, in my questions, a little bit about that because I think it's very important that we share this data with people.

This Committee will continue to perform significant oversight of targeted strikes. We received, this morning, an Office of Legal Counsel opinion on the topic. Actually, we received a short one and a long one. And while I was there, I was delighted to see Senator Wyden reading, Senator King in the room, and Senator Udall came in the room. And I'm hopeful that every Member will avail of themselves of this opportunity to review those
OLC opinions.

I also intend to review proposals for legislation to ensure that drone
 strikes are carried out in a manner consistent with our values, and the
 proposal to create an analogue of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court
 to review the conduct of such strikes.

Finally, I will want to know how the nominee intends to lead an agency
that's had four directors since DCI Tenet resigned in July of '04, now in a
budget downturn, and what he sees as the major challenges before the CIA.
For the information of Members, we will have rounds of questions of
eight minutes each, and Members will be recognized by seniority, alternating
between the sides.

Members have requested the opportunity to ask Mr. Brennan questions that will require classified answers, as well, so we have the ability to move to a classified session following this hearing, if it is timely and we're able to do so. So my suggestion is that we play that ear by ear, Mr. Vice Chairman, and see if it's possible to do so. If it isn't, we will have our closed session on Tuesday at our next hearing.

Finally, before turning to the Vice Chairman, I'd like to conclude my remarks the same way I did at the confirmation for General Petraeus. Again this time, the transition between CIA directors has been managed by Acting Director Michael Morell. I'd like to thank Mr. Morell for keeping the Agency on firm footing and for his agreement to remain as Deputy Director after the confirmation process. He continues to be a top notch CIA officer, a friend of the Committee, and I'm sure he will be an excellent deputy, Mr. Brennan.

5 Mr. Vice Chairman, please proceed.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.
 And Mr. Brennan, I join the Chair in congratulating you on your
 nomination and welcoming you to the Committee today. And I don't have to
 remind you -- because you are a career individual -- of the importance of
 your nomination to head the Central Intelligence Agency. I also want to
 welcome your family and thank them for their support of you during your
 years of commitment to our government.

Also, I want to just say, as the Chairman did, how much we appreciate Mike Morell. And I'm very pleased to see in your prepared statement that you mention Mike and his contribution to the Central Intelligence Agency, and that you intend to keep Mike in place. He is a very valued public servant, and a guy who has stepped into a very difficult situation now *twice* and has led with great commitment and has provided the kind of leadership the Agency has needed.

Mr. Brennan, if confirmed as the next Director, it will be your responsibility to lead the CIA as our nation continues to face significant national security challenges. While we've heard a lot in recent months about
al-Qa'ida being decimated and on the run, it is by no means destroyed, and
the threat of terrorism from its affiliates, especially in Yemen and North
Africa, remains very real.

Just in the past few months, terrorist attacks in Algeria and Benghazi have claimed American lives, so it is clear that our vigilance must not waver. At the same time, our attention focused beyond these threats posed by al-Qa'ida and other terrorist organizations, from Iran to North Korea to Venezuela. From nuclear proliferation, to cyber intrusions, to counterintelligence, the challenges are constant and immense, and the CIA is at the point of the spear.

As your predecessors faced similar challenges, they recognized the importance of working hand in hand with Congress, especially the Congressional intelligence committees. I appreciated your commitment to me to be open and transparent with this Committee, if you are in fact confirmed as the next Director.

I expect this commitment to actually be born out and practiced,
 regardless of political pressures, and not just become words spoken during
 the confirmation process. Far too often, the Committee is facing
 unnecessary and, frankly, legally-questionable obstacles, in receiving needed
 oversight information from the Intelligence Community.

As we hear from you this afternoon, I also believe it is important for you to set the record straight on a few matters relating to detention policy and the CIA's detention and interrogation program. We know that the 2009 Executive Order removed the CIA from the detention business. But the current framework is simply not working to get real-time access to intelligence from terrorist detainees.

I reviewed elements of the 9/11 Commission report in preparation for 7 this hearing, and I am concerned that the administration is making the same 8 mistakes that were made before 9/11, when the CIA missed vital information 9 on KSM, the mastermind of the attacks, and decided to forego a capture 10 operation of Osama bin Laden. The Commission cited the administration's 11 focus on using the Article 3 court process as factors in both instances. 12 You and I also discussed the Committee's report on the CIA's detention 13 and interrogation program, which was approved in December by a slim 14 majority. You told me that you had completed your review of the report's 15 Executive Summary, and the Findings and Conclusions, and you'll have an 16

17 opportunity to express your observations and the concerns that you

18 expressed to me with the rest of the Committee today.

Mr. Brennan, I thank you once again for your dedication and your service to our country, and we look forward to your testimony and to your response to questions submitted by the Committee. 1 Thanks, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice Chairman. And
 now we will turn to the distinguished senator from Virginia, Senator Mark
 Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you, Chairman Feinstein, Vice Chairman
 Chambliss, and colleagues. It's my honor to introduce John Brennan as the
 President's nominee to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence
 Agency.

Like so many thousands of other professionals in the United States
 Intelligence Community, John now calls Virginia home. It has been my
 privilege, as a Member of this Committee for the last two years, to represent
 many of the thousands of men and women in our intelligence agencies who
 also call Virginia home.

I would also make mention of the fact, very briefly, since we don't get 14 this many opportunities in front of this kind of public audience, to recognize 15 an action that Senator Mikulski and I took last Congress that many of you 16 joined with us on that we will reintroduce this year -- a joint resolution to 17 mark U.S. Intelligence Professionals Day -- to bring respectful attention to 18 these guiet professionals who keep our nation safe every day. And I, again, 19 look forward to working with all of you to make sure that we do this 20 resolution again. 21

These same qualities -- dedication, selflessness, intelligence, and 1 patriotism -- are well represented in John Brennan, whom the men and 2 women of the CIA will find a dedicated leader in public service, should he be 3 confirmed. While I have not had the opportunity to work with Mr. Brennan as 4 much as some of the other Members, I've enjoyed our meeting together. 5 And as the Chairman has already indicated, John Brennan's long career of 6 public service and his record have prepared him to be Director of the CIA. 7 He served for 25 years at the Agency in the field and at Headquarters, 8 including as Deputy Executive Director in Saudi Arabia, and as briefer to two 9 presidents since 9/11. He's been on the front lines in the fight against al-10 Qa'ida, including standing up the National Counterterrorism Center. He has 11 enormous appreciation for the men and women of the CIA and the work they 12 do -- often in the shadows -- to keep our nation safe. 13 One thing that I was also impressed in our meeting was that Mr. 14 Brennan has been an advocate for greater transparency in our 15 counterterrorism policy and for adherence to the rule of law. As a Member 16 and a new Member of this oversight committee, I appreciate that. 17 As the President said, the imperative to secure the nation must not 18 come at the sacrifice of our laws or ideals. This needs never be an *either/or* 19 choice. We can protect the nation and stay true to our principles. As has 20 been raised by the Chair and the Vice Chair, I think it is also important -- and 21

12

these are questions that I'll be asking, as well -- to ensure that while we look
at the programs of the CIA, that these programs' effectiveness be measured
objectively and not simply by those who are charged with implementing
them.

5	So, the Chairman has already gone through other parts of your
6	background; I again want to congratulate you on this nomination, the service
7	you've provided to our nation so far, and, in the aftermath of this hearing,
8	hopefully the service that you'll provide on a going-forward basis.
9	With that, Madam Chairman, I'll come back to the dais and look forward
10	to my chance to ask the nominee questions, as well.
11	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you very much, Senator Warner. Mr.
12	Brennan, please stand, raise your right hand, and I'll administer the oath.
13	"I, John Brennan, do solemnly swear"
14	MR. BRENNAN: I, John Brennan, do solemnly swear
15	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: " that I will give this Committee the truth, the
16	full truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God."
17	MR. BRENNAN: that I will give this Committee the truth, the full
18	truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God.
19	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you very much. And we look forward to
20	hearing your testimony.
21	(The prepared Statement for the Record of Mr. Brennan follows.)

1	STATEMENT BY JOHN O. BRENNAN,
2	NOMINEE FOR DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
3	* * *
4	MR. BRENNAN: Chairman Feinstein, Vice Chairman Chambliss,
5	Members of the Committee, I am honored to appear before you today as the
6	President's nominee
7	(Disruption by a protestor in the audience.)
8	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Would you hold, please?
9	I will ask the Capitol Police officers to please remove this woman.
10	(Protest continues.)
11	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Please remove
12	(Protestor is removed from the Hearing Room.)
13	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: I'm going to say, once again, that we welcome
14	everyone here, that we expect no clapping, we expect no hissing, we expect
15	no demonstration in this room. This is a very serious hearing. I will stop the
16	hearing and I will ask the room to be cleared. So, know that.
17	Please continue, Mr. Brennan.
18	MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Chairman. I am honored to appear before
19	you today as the President's nominee to lead the Central Intelligence Agency.
20	I am deeply grateful to President Obama for the confidence he has placed in
21	me by sending my name forward to the Senate for consideration.

Senator Warner, thank you for your generous introduction, for your 1 service to our nation, and for your strong support for those who defend it. 2 This includes the extraordinary men and women of the CIA and the 3 Intelligence Community, so many of whom, like me, call Virginia home, and 4 call you our Senator. 5 I would not be here today without the love and support of my wife, 6 Kathy, who has been my life partner for 34 years, and who, like the spouses 7 of many other public servants and intelligence professionals -8 (Disruption by another protestor in the audience.) 9 **MR. BRENNAN:** -- has made numerous sacrifices over the years. 10 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Would you -- would you pause, Mr. Brennan? 11 If you would remove that individual, please, as quickly as you can. 12 Thank you. 13 (Protestor is removed from the Hearing Room.) 14 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Mr. Brennan, please proceed. 15 **MR. BRENNAN:** -- my wife, Kathy, who, like the spouses of many other 16 public servants and intelligence professionals, has made numerous sacrifices 17 over the years, bearing the brunt of family responsibilities because of my 18 chosen profession. 19 Similarly, I would like to pay tribute to my three children, who, like the 20 children of many CIA officers and other national security professionals, have 21

15

had to deal with the disappointments associated with an absentee parent far
more often than they should.

And I'm very pleased to be joined today by my wife, Kathy, and my
brother, Tom.

5	(Disruption by another protestor in the audience.)
6	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: All right, we will stop again.
7	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Please remove that woman.
8	(Protest continues.)
9	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: If you could please expedite the removal
10	(Protest continues.)
11	(Protestor is removed from the Hearing Room.)
12	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Please proceed, Mr. Brennan. The next time,
13	we're going to clear the chamber and bring people back in one by one. This
14	witness is entitled to be heard, ladies and gentlemen. So please give him
15	that opportunity.
16	MR. BRENNAN: Thank you. A heartfelt "thank you" also goes to my
17	family in New Jersey, especially my 91-year-old mother, Dorothy, and my 92-
18	year-old father, Owen, who emigrated from Ireland nearly 65 years ago -
19	(Disruption by another protestor in the audience.)
20	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: All right, I'm going to ask we're going to halt
21	the hearing. I'm going to ask that the room be cleared and that the

1	CODEPINK associates not be permitted to come back in. We've done this five
2	times now, and five times are enough. So, we will recess for a few minutes.
3	(Protest continues.)
4	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Ladies and gentlemen, if you would mind
5	leaving, we will then have you come back in, but it's the only way I think
6	we're going to stop this. We will recess for a few minutes.
7	(Whereupon, the Committee recessed briefly.)
8	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Okay, we will reconvene the hearing. If the
9	press would please take their places
10	Mr. Brennan, please proceed.
11	MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Chairman Feinstein.
12	I was talking about my parents: my 91-year-old mother, Dorothy, and
13	my 92-year-old father, Owen who emigrated to this country 65 years ago
14	and who, together, raised my sister, my brother, and I to cherish the
15	opportunity known as America.
16	As I appear before you today, I would additionally like to extend a
17	special salute to David Petraeus, a patriot who remains as do all former
18	directors one of the staunchest advocates of the Agency's mission and
19	workforce.
20	I want to express my admiration for my close friend and colleague,
21	Michael Morell, who has twice guided the CIA as Acting Director with a

steady hand, integrity, and exceptional skill. If confirmed, it would be a
distinct privilege for me to work side by side with Michael -- my friend, and
the epitome of an intelligent professional -- in the months and years ahead.
It also would be a tremendous privilege to serve with the Director of
National Intelligence, Jim Clapper, who has mentored literally *legions* of
intelligence professionals ever since his service in Vietnam.

As the President's principal intelligence advisor and the head of the
 Intelligence Community, Jim is a person of longstanding and deep
 experience and integrity. He and I share identical views on the role of
 intelligence and the importance of giving current and future generations of
 intelligence professionals the support they need and that they so richly
 deserve.

It would be the greatest honor of my professional life to lead the
women and men of the Central Intelligence Agency -- the Agency where I
started my career nearly 33 years ago and where I served for a quartercentury. A 24-year-old fresh out of graduate school, I arrived at Langley in
August 1980 as a GS-9 career trainee, determined to do my part for national
security as one of this nation's intelligence officers.

When I joined the CIA in August 1980, world events were unsettled. Our Embassy in Tehran had been overrun the year before, and 52 Americans were still being held hostage by a radical new government in Iran. The

Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was less than a year old, and the next decade 1 would witness the slow but steady crumbling of the Soviet Union. Nuclear 2 proliferation and the spread of weapons of mass destruction were a constant 3 concern. And U.S. officials were hard at work around the globe, trying to 4 prevent regional tensions and animosities from turning into full-scale wars. 5 And, ominously, the United States was about to face an upsurge in 6 terrorist attacks that would claim hundreds of American lives in Lebanon, 7 including a 49-year-old CIA officer named Bob Ames, who was killed during a 8 brief visit to our Embassy in Beirut, and who, at the time, was my boss at 9 CIA. 10

During my 25-year career at CIA, I watched up close, and even 11 participated, in history being made in far off corners of the world, as CIA 12 fulfilled its critical intelligence roles -- collecting intelligence, uncovering 13 secrets, identifying threats, partnering with foreign intelligence and security 14 services, analyzing opague and complicated developments abroad, carrying 15 out covert action, and attempting to forecast events yet to happen -- all in an 16 effort to protect our people and to strengthen America's national security. 17 And throughout my career, I had the great fortune to experience first-18 hand, as well as witness, what it means to be a CIA officer: such as an 19 analyst, who has the daunting task and tremendous responsibility to take 20 incomplete and frequently contradictory information and advise the senior-21

most policy-makers of our government about foreign political, military, and
 economic developments.

Or an operations officer, whose job it is to find and obtain those elusive secrets that provide advanced warning of strategic surprise, political turbulence, terrorist plots, impending violence, cyber attacks, and persistent threats such as nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons proliferation.

Or a technical expert, who seeks new and creative ways to find nuggets
 of intelligence in tremendous volumes of data, provides secure, and even
 stealthy, intelligence collection and communication systems, and counters
 the latest technological threats to our nation.

Or a support officer or manager with the responsibility to ensure that the core missions of the Agency -- collecting intelligence, providing all source analysis, and, when directed by the President, conducting covert action -- are carried out with the requisite skill, speed, agility, and proficiency.

From the Middle East to the Central Caucasus; from Sub-Saharan Africa to Central and South America; from the vast expanses of Asia to the great cities of Europe, and all countries and regions in between, CIA officers were there -- sometimes in force, and sometimes virtually standing alone. And for those 25 years, it was a great honor for me to be a CIA officer, as I knew that the Agency's contributions to this country's security were as invaluable as 1 they were innumerable.

Following my retirement from the CIA in 2005, I had the good fortune
to experience other professional opportunities. For three years, I served as
President and Chief Executive Officer of a private-sector company, where I
learned, first-hand, some very important lessons about fiduciary
responsibility and sound business practices. And for the past four years I've
had the privilege to serve as the President's principal policy advisor on
Homeland Security and Counterterrorism.

In that role, I have had the opportunity to work daily with some of the finest Americans I have ever met from the intelligence, military, homeland security, law enforcement, and diplomatic communities, who have dedicated their lives to the safety and security of their fellow Americans. It is because of the work of those Americans -- serving domestically, and especially, those serving in dangerous places abroad -- that we are able to experience the freedom and security that are the hallmarks of our nation.

I believe my CIA background and my other professional experiences
 have prepared me well for the challenge of leading the world's premier
 intelligence agency at this moment in history, which is as dynamic and
 consequential as any in recent decades, and will continue to be in the years
 ahead. Simply stated, the need for accurate intelligence and prescient
 analysis from CIA has never been greater than it is in 2013 or than it will be

1 in the coming years.

Historic political, economic, and social transformations continue to
sweep through the Middle East and North Africa, with major implications for
our interests, Israel's security, our Arab partners, and the prospects for
peace and stability throughout the region. We remain at war with al-Qa'ida
and its associated forces, which, despite the substantial progress we have
made against them, still seek to carry out deadly strikes against our
homeland and our citizens, and against our friends and allies.

U.S. computer networks and databases are under daily cyber attack by
nation states, international criminal organizations, sub-national groups, and
individual hackers. And the regimes in Tehran and Pyongyang remain bent
on pursuing nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missile delivery
systems, rather than fulfilling their international obligations or even meeting
the basic needs of their people.

Yes, the CIA's mission is as important to our nation's security today as at any time in our nation's history. In carrying out their mission, the men and women of the CIA are frequently asked to undertake challenging, perilous, and, yes, controversial actions, on behalf of the American people. The CIA is not immune from scrutiny of these efforts, and I welcome a discussion of CIA's past and present activities.

If I am confirmed, one of my highest priorities would be the

Committee's lengthy report on the CIA's former rendition, detention, and 1 interrogation program that involved now-banned interrogation techniques. I 2 have read the Findings and Executive Summary of the 6,000-page report, 3 which raises a number of very serious issues. Given the gravity and 4 importance of this subject. I would look forward to further dialogue with 5 Members of the Committee on the report and its Findings, if I am confirmed. 6 In addition, some of our government's current counterterrorism policies 7 and operations have sparked widespread debate -- domestically, 8 internationally, and in this room. I have publicly acknowledged that our 9 fight against al-Qa'ida and associated forces have sometimes involved the 10 use of lethal force outside the hot battlefield of Afghanistan. 11 Accordingly, it is understandable that there is great interest in the legal 12 basis, as well as the thresholds, criteria, processes, procedures, approvals, 13

As the elected representatives of the American people and as Members of this Committee, you have the obligation to oversee the activities of the CIA and the other elements of the Intelligence Community to ensure that they are being carried out effectively, lawfully, successfully, and without

and reviews of such actions. I have strongly promoted such public

that our system of government and our commitment to transparency

discussions with the Congress and with the American people, as I believe

14

15

16

17

demands nothing less.

regard to partisanship. If confirmed, I would endeavor to keep this
Committee fully and currently informed, not only because it is required by
law, but because you can neither perform your oversight function nor
support the mission of the CIA if you are kept in the dark.

And I know that irrespective of the fullness of that dialogue, there will 5 be occasions when we disagree, just as you disagree among *yourselves* at 6 times, on aspects of past, current, and future activities of the CIA. Such 7 disagreement is healthy, and is a necessary part of our democratic process. 8 But such disagreements should never prevent us from carrying out our 9 national security and intelligence responsibilities, as a failure to do so could 10 have devastating consequences for the safety and security of all Americans. 11 During my courtesy calls with many of you, I also heard repeated 12 references to a "trust deficit" that has, at times, existed between this 13 Committee and the CIA. If I am confirmed, a trust deficit between the 14 Committee and the CIA would be wholly unacceptable to me, and I would 15 make it my goal on Day One of my tenure, and every day thereafter, to 16 strengthen the trust between us. 17

I have a reputation for speaking my mind, and, at times, doing so in a
 rather direct manner, which some attribute to my New Jersey roots. I like to
 think that my candor and bluntness will reassure you that you will get
 straight answers from me -- maybe not always the ones you like, but you will

get answers, and they will reflect my honest views. That's the commitment I
made to you.

I would like to finish by saying a few words about the importance of
taking care of the women and men who serve in the CIA. Because of the
secrecy that intelligence work requires, few Americans will ever know the
extraordinary sacrifices that these professionals and their families make
every day. Many of them risk their lives and, at times, have *given* their lives
to keep us safe.

If confirmed, I would make it my mission, in partnership with the 9 Congress, to ensure that the men and women have the training, tradecraft, 10 linguistic skills, technical tools, guidance, supervision, and leadership they 11 need to do their jobs. They also need assurance that we will do all we can to 12 protect our nation's secrets and prevent leaks of classified information. 13 These leaks damage our national security -- sometimes gravely -- putting 14 these CIA employees at risk and making their missions much more difficult. 15 The men and women of the CIA are a national treasure, and I will 16 consider it one of my most important responsibilities to take care of them, 17 just as others took care of me when I first arrived at Langley as a young 18 trainee in 1980. 19

20 Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Members of the Committee, as you well 21 know, when you arrive at CIA Headquarters in Langley and enter the main lobby, you immediately see the marble Memorial Wall. On it are stars -- each
one representing a Member of the CIA family who gave his or her life in the
service of this nation. Today, there are 103 stars on that wall.

To me, and to everyone in the CIA, they are not simply stars, nor are
they only visible remembrances of dearly departed colleagues and friends.
The stars represent heroic and unsung patriots; Americans who lived their
lives loving this country and who died protecting it.

That Memorial Wall means something very special to me and to every other American who has proudly served at the Agency. I want all CIA employees always to be proud of the organization to which they belong, and to be proud of its activities.

And if given the honor to serve as the 21st Director of the CIA, I would take it as a sacred obligation to do everything in my ability to make sure the Central Intelligence Agency is the absolute best intelligence service it can be, and one that makes all Americans proud.

16 Thank you very much, and I look forward to taking your questions.

17 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much, Mr. Brennan.

I have five short questions that we traditionally ask; if you would just answer them yes or no.

Do you agree to appear before the Committee here or in other venues when invited? 1 **MR. BRENNAN:** Yes.

CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Do you agree to send officials from the CIA 2 and designated staff when invited? 3 MR. BRENNAN: Yes. 4 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Do you agree to provide documents or any 5 other materials requested by the Committee in order for it to carry out its 6 oversight and legislative responsibilities? 7 **MR. BRENNAN:** Yes; all documents that come under my authority as 8 Director of CIA, I absolutely would. 9 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** We'll talk to you more about that in a minute. 10 MR. BRENNAN: Yes, Senator. 11 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Will you ensure that the CIA and its officials 12 provide such material to the Committee when requested? 13 MR. BRENNAN: Yes. 14 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Do you agree to inform and fully brief, to the 15 fullest extent possible, all Members of this Committee, of intelligence 16 activities and covert actions, rather than only the Chairman and Vice 17 Chairman? 18 MR. BRENNAN: Yes, I will endeavor to do that. 19 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you. Now, let me -- we are now going 20 to go into eight-minute rounds. And we'll do it by seniority, and alternate 21

1 from side to side.

I wanted to talk about, just for a moment, the provision of documents -Senator Wyden and others have had much to do about this. But our job is to
provide oversight to try to see that the CIA and Intelligence communities
operate legally. In order to do that, it is really necessary to understand what
the official legal interpretation is, so the Office of Legal Counsel opinions
become very important.

8 We began during the Bush administration, with Mr. Bradbury, to ask for 9 OLC opinions. Up until last night, when the President called the Vice 10 Chairman, Senator Wyden, and myself, and said that they were providing the 11 OLC opinions, we had not been able to get them. It makes our job -- to 12 interpret what is legal or not legal -- much more difficult if we do not have 13 those opinions.

The staff has asked for eight additional opinions. What I want to know is will you become our advocate with the administration, so that we can obtain those opinions?

MR. BRENNAN: The National Security Act, as amended, requires that the heads of intelligence agencies provide the Committee with the appropriate legal documentation to support covert actions. I would certainly be an advocate of making sure that this Committee has the documentation it needs in order to perform its oversight functions. I have been an advocate 1 of that position; I will continue to be.

CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: I take that as a yes, and I'm counting on you to
 provide eight OLC opinions.

Second question on this: when the opinion came over, our staff were
banned from seeing it -- this morning. We have lawyers. We have very good
staff. This is upsetting to a number of Members. We depend on our staff,
because you can't take material home, you can't take notes with you. So the
staff becomes very important.

⁹ Do you happen to know the reason why our staff are not permitted, ¹⁰ when *we* are permitted, to see an OLC?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator -- Chairman, I understand fully your interest in
 having your staff have access to this documentation; fully understandable.
 The reason for providing information just to Committee Members at times is
 to ensure that it is kept in a limited basis.

It is rather exceptional, as I think you know, that the Office of Legal
 Counsel opinions, or advice, would be shared directly with you. And this, I
 think, was determined because of the rather exceptional nature of the issue
 and in a genuine effort to try to meet the Committee's requirements. I
 understand your interest in having the staff access to it - CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: If you would relay the request, officially --

21 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely.

1 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** -- we'd appreciate it very much.

2 **MR. BRENNAN:** Absolutely; I will.

CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Second thing: when I spoke with you in my office, we talked about our report on detention and interrogation -- the 6,000-page report you mentioned. I asked you if you would please read it; you said you would -- you said you would, for *sure*, read the 300-page summary. Have you done so?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, Chairman, I have read the first volume, which is
300 pages.

10 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Then, let me ask you this question: were the 11 EITs key to the takedown of Osama bin Laden?

MR. BRENNAN: Chairman, the report right now still remains classified.
 And the report has been provided to the Agency and Executive Branch for
 comments.

There clearly were a number of things, *many* things, that I read in that report that were very concerning and disturbing to me, and ones that I would want to look into immediately, if I were to be confirmed as CIA Director.

It talked about mismanagement of the program, misrepresentations of
 the information, providing inaccurate information. And it was rather
 damning in a lot of its language, as far as the nature of these activities that
 were carried out.

I am eager to see the Agency's response to that report. I read those
 300 pages; I look forward, if confirmed, to reading the entire 6,000-page
 volume, because it is of such gravity and importance.

But, Chairman, I do not yet -- and nor has the CIA finished its review of
this information. The Committee's report was done, obviously, over an
extended period of time; a tremendous amount of work that's gone into it.
Based on the review of the documentary information that was available -- the
documents, there were not interviews conducted with CIA officers.

I very much look forward to hearing from the CIA on that and then
 coming back to this Committee and giving you my full and honest views.

11 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Well, thank you. You will have that

12 opportunity, I assure you.

I'd like to ask you about the status of the administration's efforts to 13 institutionalize rules and procedures for the conduct of drone strikes; in 14 particular, how you see your role as CIA Director in that approval process. 15 MR. BRENNAN: Chairman, as this Committee knows -- and I'm sure 16 wants to continue to protect certain covert action activities -- but let me talk, 17 generally, about the counterterrorism program and the role of CIA, and this 18 effort to try to institutionalize and to ensure we have as rigorous a process 19 as possible, that we feel that we're taking the appropriate actions at the 20 appropriate time. 21

The President has insisted that any actions we take will be legally
grounded, will be thoroughly anchored in intelligence, will have the
appropriate review process, approval process, before any action is
contemplated, including those actions that might involve the use of lethal
force.

The different parts of the government that are involved in this process 6 are involved in the interagency, and my role as the President's 7 counterterrorism advisor was to help to orchestrate this effort over the past 8 four years to ensure, again, that any actions we take fully comport with our 9 law and meet the standards that I think this Committee and the American 10 people expect of us, as far as taking actions we need to protect the 11 American people, but at the same time ensuring that we do everything 12 possible before we need to resort to lethal force. 13

14 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you.

15 Mr. Vice Chairman?

¹⁶ VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Thanks very much, Madam Chair.

17 Mr. Brennan, the 9/11 Commission report describes a canceled 1998

18 CIA operation to capture Osama bin Laden using tribal groups in

19 Afghanistan.

The former head of CIA's bin Laden Unit told staff that you convinced Director Tenet to cancel that operation. He says that following a meeting you had in Riyadh with Director Tenet, the bin Laden Unit Chief, and others,
that you cabled National Security Advisor Sandy Berger, saying the operation
should be canceled in favor of a different approach, described by the 9/11
Commission as "an all-out secret effort to persuade the Taliban to expel bin
Laden."

Now, as we know, bin Laden was not expelled. Three months later, the
bin Laden wrath was unleashed with the attack on our embassies. Did you
advise Director Tenet and National Security Advisor Berger against this
operation; and if so, why?

MR. BRENNAN: I had conversation with George Tenet at the time. But I must point out, Senator, that every single CIA manager -- George Tenet, his deputy, the head of the Director of Operations at the time, and other individuals -- the Chief of the Counterterrorism Center -- argued against that operation, as well, because it was not well grounded in intelligence and its chances of success were minimal. And it was likely that other individuals were going to be killed.

And so, when I was involved in those discussions, I provided the Director and others my professional advice about whether or not I thought that that operation should go forward. I also was engaged in discussions with the Saudi government at the time and encouraged certain actions to be taken so that we could put pressure on the Taliban, as well as on bin Laden. VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: So, I'm taking it that your answer to my
 question is you did advise against -- in favor of the cancellation of that
 operation?

MR. BRENNAN: Based on what I had known at the time, I didn't think
that it was a worthwhile operation and it didn't have a chance of success.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: The 9/11 Commission reported that no
 capture plan before 9/11 ever again attained the same level of detail and
 preparation; do you have any second thoughts about your recommendation
 to the Director to cancel that operation?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I have no second thoughts whatsoever about my advice, which was to look carefully at this operation because the chances of success were minimal. I was not in the chain of command at that time. I was serving abroad as Chief of Station.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: As Deputy Executive Director, you
 received the daily updates from the time of Abu Zubaydah's capture
 throughout his interrogation, including the analysis of the lawfulness of the
 techniques, putting you in a position to express any concerns you had about
 the program before any of the most controversial techniques, including
 waterboarding, were ever used.

Now, we found a minimum of 50 memos in the documents within the 6,000 pages, on which you were copied. What steps did you take to stop the CIA from moving to these techniques you now say you found objectionable
at the time?

MR. BRENNAN: I did not take steps to stop the CIA's use of those techniques. I was not in the chain of command of that program. I served as Deputy Executive Director at the time. I had responsibility for overseeing the management of the Agency and all of its various functions. And I was aware of the program; I was cc'd on some of those documents, but I had no oversight of it. I wasn't involved in its creation.

I had expressed my personal objections and views to some Agency
colleagues about certain of those IETs, such as waterboarding, nudity, and
others, where I professed my personal objections to it, but I did not try to
stop it, because it was, you know, something that was being done in a
different part of the Agency under the authority of others, and it was
something that was directed by the administration at the time.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Now, you say you expressed your
 objection to other colleagues; did you ever express any concern to Director
 Tenet, to John McLaughlin, Executive Director Krongard, or any other of the
 CIA leaders?

MR. BRENNAN: I had a number of conversations with my Agency
 colleagues on a broad range of issues during that period of time -- not just
 on this program, but other ones. We would have personal conversations on

1 that.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Well, my reason, particularly, for
naming those individuals, Mr. Brennan, is that they were the ones directly
above you. Mr. McLaughlin has been quoted in the press as saying he never
heard from you; he doesn't doubt that you did this, but he says he never
heard from you. And we just have not seen anybody who has come forward
and said they ever heard any objections from you with respect to these
programs.

9 Moving on -- Mr. Krongard, your boss at the CIA, told the Wall Street 10 Journal that you had a role in setting the parameters of the program, and I 11 quote, "Helping to seek Justice Department approval for the techniques." He 12 went on to say that "John would have been part and parcel of that process." 13 How does that comport with your response to the Committee that you 14 played no role in the program's -- and I quote again, your answer -- "its 15 creation, execution, or oversight"?

MR. BRENNAN: I respectfully disagree with my former colleague, Buzzy
 Krongard. I was not involved in establishing the parameters of that
 program. I think in that same Wall Street Journal article, he goes on to say,
 in fact, that I was not involved in a lot of elements of that program.
 But I was not involved in the establishment of that program. Again, I
 had awareness that the Agency was being asked to do this; I had awareness

that the Agency was going forward on it. I had some visibility into some of
the activities there, but I was not part of any type of management structure
or aware of most of the details.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: That being the case, why would you be
 the recipient of a minimum of 50 e-mails, Mr. Brennan, on the progress of
 the interrogation of Abu Zubaydah, including the techniques used in that
 interrogation?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, that was probably a standard e-mail 8 distribution. I was on thousands upon thousands of e-mail distributions, as 9 Deputy Executive Director. I think I was just cc'd on them; I wasn't an action 10 officer on it. I know of no action I took at the Agency that in any way 11 authorized or reprogrammed funds, or anything along those lines. 12 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Executive Director Krongard is said to 13 have been an advocate of using SERE techniques. Did he discuss with you a 14 proposal to move to SERE techniques with Abu Zubaydah; and if so, did you 15

¹⁶ raise any objection?

MR. BRENNAN: I don't recall a conversation with Mr. Krongard about
 that particular issue.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: When you reviewed the intelligence that the CIA was getting on Abu Zubaydah *after* the use of EITs, did you think the information was valuable? MR. BRENNAN: The reports that I was getting subsequent to that, and in the years after that, it was clearly my impression that there was valuable information that was coming out.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: In a November 2007 interview, you said
 that information from the interrogation techniques, quote, "saved lives." But
 you also say that CIA should be out of the detention business.

The main benefit that I saw in CIA's program was the ability to hold and question individuals about whom there was significant intelligence that they were terrorists, but not necessarily evidence that could be used in a court of law.

Your view seems to be that even if we could save American lives by detaining more terrorists, using only traditional techniques, it would be better to kill them with a drone or let them go free rather than detain them. Can you explain the logic in that argument?

MR. BRENNAN: I respectfully disagree, Senator. I never believe it's
better to kill a terrorist than to detain him. We *want* to detain as many
terrorists as possible so we can elicit the intelligence from them in the
inappropriate manner so that we can disrupt follow-on terrorist attacks. So,
I'm a strong proponent of doing everything possible short of killing
terrorists, bringing them to justice, and getting that intelligence from them.
I clearly had the impression, as you said, when I was quoted in 2007,

that there was valuable intelligence that came out from those interrogation
sessions. That's why I did say that they save lives. I must tell you, Senator,
that reading this report from the Committee raises serious questions about
the information that I was given at the time, and the impression I had at the
time.

Now I have to determine, based on that information, as well as what
CIA says, what the truth is. And at this point, Senator, I do not know what
the truth is.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: How many high value targets have been
 10 captured during your service with the administration?

MR. BRENNAN: There have been a number of individuals who have been captured, arrested, detained, interrogated, debriefed, and put away by our partners overseas, which is -- we have given them the capacity now, we have provided them the intelligence. And, unlike in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 when a lot of these countries were both unwilling and unable to do it, we have given them that opportunity. And so, that's where we're working with our partners.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: How many high-value targets have been
 arrested and detained, and interrogated by the United States, during *your* four years with the administration?

21 MR. BRENNAN: I'll be happy to get that information to you, in terms of

those high-value targets that have been captured with U.S. intelligence
support.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: I submit to you the answer to that is 3 one. And it's Warsame, who was put on a ship for 60 days and interrogated. 4 Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice Chairman. 6 I want to point out that I'm going to try and enforce the eight minutes. 7 If you hear a tapping, it is not personal. 8 Senator Rockefeller? 9 **SENATOR ROCKEFELLER:** Thank you, Madam Chair. 10 Welcome, Mr. Brennan. And if confirmed, you're going to lead an 11 extraordinary agency with extraordinary people who perform extraordinary 12 services, most of them totally unknown by the American people. Most 13 people don't think about that -- what it is to do a life of public service and 14 never have anything known. Those of us who sit up here do a life of public 15 service and want everything that we do to be known. It's how we get 16 elected. It's a very different ethic in the Central Intelligence Agency and all 17 intelligence agencies, and I respect it very much. 18 I want to go to the EITC -- sorry; that's *Earned Income Tax Credit* -- to 19 the enhanced interrogation techniques. Well, I'm for both. Well, I'm not for 20 the second, but for the first. 21

You talk about the 6,000 pages. What I want to say, and when the second round comes, I will, I'm going to pour out my frustration on dealing with the Central Intelligence Agency, and dealing with various administrations, about trying to get information.

Why was it that they felt that we were so unworthy of being trusted?
Why was it they were willing to talk to Pat Roberts and me, or Saxby
Chambliss and Dianne Feinstein, but not anybody else, until we literally
bludgeoned them -- Kit Bond and I -- into agreeing to include everybody?
Like, Carl Levin's not trustworthy? You know? I mean, it's amazing.

And I pursue Dianne Feinstein's point about staff. When you go and you have, under the previous administration, a briefing with the President or the Vice President, or the head of the CIA, or others, you're not allowed to -- I can remember driving with Pat Roberts, when he was Chairman and I was Vice Chairman, and we weren't allowed to talk to each other driving up or driving back. You weren't allowed to do that.

Staff were a part of *nothing*. You have to understand that you're surrounded by people who work with you and fill you in -- people who are experts. We are, too. But they've got to be part of this. They've got to be part of -- when the OLC comes, it should come to them, also. I strongly support the Chairwoman's view on that.

Now, in the enhanced interrogation techniques matter, a handful of

former senior CIA officials who were personally invested -- and *are*personally invested -- in defending the CIA's detention and interrogation
program, largely because their professional reputations depend on it,
depend on it.

(Inaudible) to speak for the CIA and its workforce on this issue, and I 5 think it does all a great disservice. In my office, you and I discussed the 6 Committee's landmark report on this program. You do understand that this 7 took six years to write -- not just 6,000 pages, but six years to write, 8 perhaps longer -- 23,000, 30,000 footnotes. Why did we do this? We did 9 this because we heard *nothing* from the Intelligence Agency. We had no way 10 of being briefed. They would not tell us what was going on. So we had to 11 do our own investigation, and we're pretty good at it. 12

And when you read those first 350 pages, you told me that you were 13 shocked at some of what you read. You did not know that. And that, to me, 14 is shocking -- but not to condemn anybody; simply says that has to be fixed, 15 and changed forever. There never can be that kind of situation again, where 16 we have to tell you what's going wrong in your Agency, and thus 17 demoralizing some of the people in your Agency who want to be relieved of 18 the burden and the taint of bad techniques in interrogation. They suffer 19 from that. 20

And yet, nobody would talk with us about that. We had to get that

information on our own. It's a magnificent piece of work, and I think it's a
piece of history; it'll go down in history because it will define the separation
of powers as between the intelligence committees of the House and Senate,
and the Agency and others that relate to it.

I'm also very aware that this is all crucial to the President's authority. 5 Not just on the more modern question of the day about drones. But, you 6 know, that determination is made by one person and one person alone. And 7 if there is a breakdown in protocol, if there is a breakdown in line of 8 command in reacting, therefore, into something which is not good, where 9 there's too much collateral damage, I think, for the most part, I would agree 10 with the Chairwoman -- I believe she said this -- that the work of the drone 11 had been fairly safe. However, any collateral damage is unacceptable. And 12 that has to be the purpose of the Agency. 13

And therefore, this detention and interrogation program, I've got to 14 say, it was -- the people who ran it were ignorant of the topic; executed by 15 personnel without relevant experience, managed incompetently by senior 16 officials who did not pay attention to crucial details, and corrupted by 17 personnel with pecuniary conflicts of interest. It was sold to the 18 policymakers and lawyers of the White House, the Department of Justice, and 19 Congress with grossly-inflated claims of professionalism and effectiveness; 20 so-called "lives saved." 21

It was a low point in our history. And this document, this book, should
change that forever. I would hope very much that you would, if you are
confirmed, which I hope you will be, that you will make parts of this at your
discretion, required reading for your senior personnel so they can go
through the same experience that you went through. Are you willing to do
that?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, Senator. I am looking forward to taking
 advantage of whatever lessons come out of this chapter in our history and
 this Committee's report.

10 SENATOR ROCKEFELLER: How do you cross-reference --

-- and tell me when I'm out of time.

12 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Eight seconds. No -- a *minute* and eight
 13 seconds.

14 **SENATOR ROCKEFELLER:** A minute and eight seconds, yes.

15 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Right -- a long time.

16 **SENATOR ROCKEFELLER:** The cross-referencing of the EIT disaster

and the future of the drone, and the decisions that -- only the President, of

18 course, can authorize that -- but the decision sometimes is passed down,

and it has to be passed down in a very accurate manner. And there have to

20 be a protocol, which is exact -- more exact, even, than the interrogation

techniques, because I think that's probably been put to bed just a bit; it's

1 beginning to get straightened out.

But the drones are going to grow. There's going to be more and more of that warfare -- not just by us, but by other countries, including, perhaps, by people from within our own country. So the protocol of that, insofar as it would refer to a particular agency, is going to have to be exact, and directed, and of particular excellence and exactitude. How will that happen?

7 MR. BRENNAN: Senator, you make an excellent point, and that's what 8 I'm most interested in -- is finding out what went wrong. If this report is, as 9 stated, accurate, what went wrong in the system where there were systemic 10 failures; where there was mismanagement or inaccurate information that was 11 put forward?

Because there are covert activities that are taking place, you know, today, under the direction and management of the CIA. And I would have the obligation to make sure I could say to this Committee that all of those covert action programs are being run effectively, they're being well managed, they're being overseen, and that the measures of effectiveness, the results of those programs, are an accurate and fair representation of what actually is happening.

This report raises serious questions about whether or not there are serious systemic issues that are at play here. I would need to get my arms around that, and that would be one of my highest priorities, if I were to go

45

1 to the Agency.

2 **SENATOR ROCKEFELLER:** I thank you. Thank you, Chair.

3 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you, Senator Rockefeller.

4 Senator Burr?

5 **SENATOR BURR:** Thank you, Chair.

6 Mr. Brennan, welcome. Thank you for your long history of public

7 service; and more importantly, to your family -- thank you for your

8 willingness to put up with his hobby.

Most, if not all, of the intelligence that our Committee receives is the finished analysis that's derived from source reports and other raw intelligence materials that we don't see -- and I might say, we don't *need* to see -- all of.

In order to ensure that we can perform our oversight duties of the
 Intelligence Committee, would you agree that the Committee should be able
 to review all analytical product, if requested?

MR. BRENNAN: On the face of that question, yes. My answer would be yes. However, I would have to take a look at the issues it involved in terms of, you know, what are we talking about, in terms of access to that analytic product -- whether it's all staff, all Committee Members, whatever. l just can't make a commitment to that. But your intention, and what I

I just can't make a commitment to that. But your intention, and what I
 think your objective is, I fully support, in terms of making sure this

1 Committee has the breadth of analytic expertise available from the Agency.

SENATOR BURR: As we go forward, there may be times that the
 Committee will need the raw intelligence to judge the accuracy of analytical
 product that we're provided. If confirmed, will you provide the raw
 intelligence on those occasions when the Committee requests it?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I would give every request from this
 Committee for access to that information full consideration. That's my
 commitment to you.

SENATOR BURR: Do you agree that it's a function of this Committee's
 oversight that occasionally we would need to look at it?

MR. BRENNAN: I would agree that it is probably a function of your oversight that you would have interest in doing that, and it would be my obligation, I think, as Director of CIA, to try to be as accommodating as possible to that interest, while at the same time trying to respect whatever considerations need to be taken into account as we do that.

SENATOR BURR: Mr. Brennan, as you know, the Committee is
 conducting a thorough inquiry into the attacks in Benghazi, Libya. In the
 course of this investigation, the CIA has repeatedly delayed, and in some
 cases, flatly refused, to provide documents to this Committee. If confirmed,
 will you assure this Committee that this refusal will never happen again?
 MR. BRENNAN: I can commit to you, Senator, that I would do

1 everything in my ability and my authority to be able to reach an

accommodation with this Committee that requests documents, because an
impasse between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch on issues
of such importance is not in the interest of the United States Government.
And so, it would be my objective to see if we could meet those interests.

At the same time, our founding fathers did, sort of, separate the branches of government -- Judicial, Legislative, and Executive. And so, I want to be mindful of that separation, but at the same time, meet your legitimate interests.

10 **SENATOR BURR:** They also gave us the "power of the purse."

11 **MR. BRENNAN:** They certainly did, Senator; I'm fully aware of that.

SENATOR BURR: I would suggest that that's the only tool, and it's one we hate to use.

14 **MR. BRENNAN:** Yes.

SENATOR BURR: Do you think that there's any situation where it's legal to disclose to the media, or to the public, details of covert action programs?

MR. BRENNAN: I do not think it is ever appropriate to improperly disclose classified information to anybody who does not have legitimate access to it and has the clearances for it.

21 **SENATOR BURR:** Let me clarify. I didn't ask for classified information.

1 I specifically said "covert action programs."

MR. BRENNAN: By definition, covert action programs are classified,
 Senator.

4 **SENATOR BURR:** I realize that.

MR. BRENNAN: Right. So, I do not believe it is appropriate to
 improperly disclose any of those details related to covert action programs.

SENATOR BURR: Let me point out that in the Committee pre-hearing
 questions, you didn't really answer a question that dealt with specific
 instances where you were authorized to disclose classified information to a
 reporter. So, could you provide for the Committee any times that you were
 given the authority to release classified information?

MR. BRENNAN: I have never provided classified information to reporters. I engaged in discussions with reporters about classified issues that they might have had access to because of unfortunate leaks of classified information, and I frequently work with reporters, if not editors, of newspapers, to keep out of the public domain some of this country's most important secrets.

And so I engage with them on those issues. But after working in the intelligence profession for 30 years and being at the CIA for 25 years, I know the importance of keeping those secrets *secret*.

21 SENATOR BURR: Have any of your conversations with those reporters

or media consultants about intelligence matters been recorded, or were
there transcriptions of it?

MR. BRENNAN: I believe there have been. I've been on news network
 shows, and I have been, you know, engaged in conversations on the
 telephone and other things that I presume -- and I know -- that they have
 been recorded on occasion.

SENATOR BURR: Have you specifically asked for them not to be
 recorded?

9 MR. BRENNAN: Whenever I talk to reporters, I do so at the request of 10 the White House Press Office, and there are ground rules that are established 11 there. And I'm not the one to establish those ground rules about whether or 12 not they would be recorded or not.

SENATOR BURR: You said in your responses to pre-hearing questions
 that in exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to acknowledge
 classified information to a member of the media.

Did you tell media commentators that the United States had, and I quote, "inside control" or "inside information" on the AQAP bomb plot in May of last year?

MR. BRENNAN: I think what you're referring to, Senator, is when I had a teleconference with some individuals, former government officials from previous administrations, who were going to be out on talk shows on the 1 night that an IED was intercepted.

And so, I discussed with them that some of the aspects of that -because I was going on the news network shows the following day -- I wanted to make sure they understood the nature of the threat, and what it s was, and what it wasn't.

And so, what I said at the time -- because I said I couldn't talk about any operational details, and this was shortly after the anniversary of the bin Laden takedown -- I said there was never a threat to the American public as we had said so publicly, because we had inside control of the plot, and the device was never a threat to the American public.

SENATOR BURR: Did you think that that comment actually exposed sources or methods?

MR. BRENNAN: No, Senator, I did not. And there is an ongoing
 investigation, I must say, right now about the unfortunate leak of
 information that was very, very damaging. And I voluntarily cooperated with
 the Department of Justice on that and have been interviewed on it.

SENATOR BURR: Well, let me just say, as one that was overseas shortly
 after that, I certainly had, on numerous occasions, U.S. officials who
 expressed to me the challenges they've gone through to try to make
 apologies to our partners. And I personally sat down in London to have that
 apology conversation, and it was very disruptive.

Very quickly -- did you provide any classified or otherwise sensitive
 information to reporters or media consultants regarding the details of the
 Abbottabad raid?

4 **MR. BRENNAN:** No, I did not, Senator.

SENATOR BURR: Then, do you know *who* disclosed information that
 prompted the Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, to advise the White House
 to tell people to shut up?

MR. BRENNAN: You would have to ask Senator Gates what he was
referring to at that time, because I don't know.

SENATOR BURR: In conclusion, let me just go back to the initial questions that the Chair referred to. And in that, I think you might have taken her request on documents to be the documents that we've got outstanding right now; I think she was referring to the future.

But let me just say I hope that you take the opportunity, if you haven't already, to take back to the administration that it is absolutely essential that the documents this Committee has requested on Benghazi be supplied before the confirmation moves forward. I realize -- I'm not saying that you were part of it, but it is absolutely essential that we get those documents before we begin a new administration at the CIA. And I hope you will deliver that message. I thank you.

21 MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Senator.

1 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much, Senator.

2 Senator Wyden?

SENATOR WYDEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. And Mr. Brennan, thank
 you for our discussions and for the joint meeting that you had with several
 of us on the Committee last week.

As we discussed then, I believe the issues before us really have nothing
 to do with political party, and have everything to do with the checks and
 balances that make our system of government so special.

Taking the fight to al-Qa'ida is something every Member of this
Committee feels strongly about. It's the idea of giving any president
unfettered power to kill an American without checks and balances that's so
troubling. Every American has the right to know when their government
believes it's allowed to kill them.

And ensuring that the Congress has the documents and information it needs to conduct robust oversight is central to our democracy. In fact, the Committee was actually created, in large part, in response to lax oversight of programs that involved targeted killings.

So it was encouraging last night when the President called and
 indicated that, effective immediately, he would release the documents
 necessary for Senators to understand the full legal analysis of the President's
 authority to conduct the targeted killing of an American. What the President

said is a good first step towards ensuring the openness and accountability
that's important, and you heard that reaffirmed in the Chair's strong words
right now.

Since last night, however, I have become concerned that the
Department of Justice is not following through with the President's
commitment just yet. Eleven United States Senators asked to see any and all
legal opinions, but when I went to read the opinions this morning, it is not
clear that that is what was provided.

9 And moreover on this point, with respect to lawyers, I think the concern 10 is that there's a double standard. As the National Security Advisor -- you 11 volunteered, to your credit, you weren't a lawyer -- you ask your lawyers and 12 your experts to help you. And we're trying to figure out how to wade 13 through all these documents, and one of the reasons why I'm concerned that 14 it's not yet clear that what the President committed to has actually been 15 provided.

And finally on this point, the Committee has been just *stonewalled* on several other requests, particularly with respect to secret law. And I'm going to leave this point simply by saying I hope you'll go back to the White House and convey to them the message that the Justice Department is not yet following through on the President's commitment. Will you convey that message?

1 **MR. BRENNAN:** Yes, I will, Senator.

2 **SENATOR WYDEN:** Very good.

Let me now move to the public side of oversight -- making sure that the public's right to know is respected. One part of oversight is Congressional oversight, and our doing our work here. The other is making sure that the American people are brought into these debates; just like James Madison said -- this is what you need to preserve a republic.

8 And I want to start with the drone issue. In a speech last year, the 9 President instructed you to be more open with the public about the use of 10 drones to conduct targeted killings of al-Qa'ida members.

So, my question is what should be done next, to ensure public conversation about drones, so that the American people are brought into this debate and have a full understanding of what rules the government is going to observe when it conducts targeted killings?

MR. BRENNAN: Well, I think this hearing is one of the things that can
 be done, because I think this type of discourse between the Executive and
 the Legislative Branch is critically important.

I believe that there need to be continued speeches that are going to be
 given by the Executive Branch to explain our counterterrorism programs. I
 think there is a misimpression on the part of some of American people who
 believe that we take strikes to punish terrorists for past transgressions --

nothing could be further from the truth. We only take such actions as a last
resort to save lives when there's no other alternative to taking an action
that's going to mitigate that threat.

So we will need to make sure that there is an understanding. And the
people that were standing up here today, I think they really have a
misunderstanding of what we do as a government, and the care that we
take, and the agony that we go through to make sure that we do not have
any collateral injuries or deaths.

And as the Chairman said earlier, the need to be able to go out and say that publicly and openly, I think, is critically important, because people are reacting to a lot of falsehoods that are out there. And I do see it as part of my obligation, and I think it's the obligation of this Committee, to make sure the truth is known to the American public and to the world.

SENATOR WYDEN: Mr. Brennan, I'm also convinced there are parts of
 drone policy that can be declassified consistent with national security. And I
 hope that you will work with me on that if you are confirmed.

Let me ask you several other questions with respect to the President's authority to kill Americans. I've asked you how much evidence the President needs to decide that a particular American can be lawfully killed, and whether the administration believes that the President can use this authority inside the United States. In my judgment, both the Congress and the public needs to understand the answers to these kinds of fundamental questions.
What do you think needs to be done to ensure that Members of the
public understand more about when the government thinks it's allowed to
kill them, particularly with respect to those two issues -- the question of
evidence, and the authority to use this power within the United States?

MR. BRENNAN: I have been a strong proponent of trying to be as open 6 as possible with these programs as far as our explaining what we're doing. 7 What we need to do is optimize transparency on these issues, but at the 8 same time, optimize secrecy and the protection of our national security. I 9 don't think that it's one or the other; it's trying to optimize *both* of them. 10 And so, what we need to do is make sure we explain to the American 11 people: what *are* the thresholds for action; what *are* the procedures, the 12 practices, the processes, the approvals, the reviews. 13

The Office of Legal Counsel advice establishes the legal boundaries within which we can operate. It doesn't mean that we operate at those outer boundaries. And, in fact, I think the American people would be quite pleased to know that we've been very disciplined and very judicious, and we only use these authorities and these capabilities as a last resort.

SENATOR WYDEN: One other point with respect to public oversight: if the Executive Branch makes a mistake and kills the wrong person or a group of the wrong people, how should the government acknowledge that? MR. BRENNAN: I believe we need to acknowledge it. I believe we need
 to it knowledge it to our foreign partners. We need to acknowledge it
 publicly.

There are certain circumstances where there are considerations to be taken into account, but as far as I'm concerned, if there is this type of action that takes place, in the interest of transparency, I believe the United States Government should acknowledge it.

8 **SENATOR WYDEN:** And acknowledge it publicly?

9 **MR. BRENNAN:** That would be ideal, and that would be the objective of 10 the program.

SENATOR WYDEN: One last question if I might: in my letter to you three weeks ago, I noted that I've been asking for over a year to receive the names of any and all countries where the Intelligence Community has used its lethal authorities.

15 If confirmed, would you provide the full list of countries to the

16 Members of this Committee and our staff?

MR. BRENNAN: I know that this is an outstanding request on your part.
 During our courtesy call, we discussed it. If I were to be confirmed as
 Director of CIA, I would get back to you, and it would be my intention to do
 everything possible to meet this Committee's legitimate interests and
 requests.

SENATOR WYDEN: Well, I'm going to wrap up just with one sentence
 on this point, Chair Feinstein.

It's a matter of public record, Mr. Brennan, that the raid that killed
Osama bin Laden was carried out under the authority of CIA Director Leon
Panetta. So that tells you right there that the Intelligence Community's lethal
authorities have been used in at least one country.

I want to hear you say that if these authorities have been used in any *other* countries, that you'll provide this Committee with the full list. Now,
will you give us that assurance?

10 MR. BRENNAN: You're talking about a historical list; are you not,

11 Senator Wyden -- as far as anytime, anywhere, that the CIA was involved in

12 such a lethal provision?

13 **SENATOR WYDEN:** Yes.

MR. BRENNAN: I would have to go back and take a look at that
 request. Certainly, anything that -- if I were to go to CIA, and the CIA was
 involved in any type of lethal activity, I would damn well make sure that this
 Committee had that information; absolutely.

18 **SENATOR WYDEN:** That's a good start.

19 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much, Senator Wyden.

20 Senator Risch?

SENATOR RISCH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

1 Mr. Brennan, thank you for your service over the years.

I want to follow up on a conversation you and I had in my office, and it
 touches on what Senator Burr asked you about a little bit, and that is the
 question of leaks.

I was glad to hear you acknowledge in your opening statement how
important it is that we avoid leaks of any kind, because they are dangerous,
they endanger the lives of Americans, and they can't be tolerated in the
business that we're in. And you agree with that, I gather?

9 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely, Senator.

SENATOR RISCH: Okay. Well, I want to talk to you about a person who I believe, and I think you acknowledge, is one of the most dangerous people on the planet, and that's Ibrahim al-Asiri. And the conversation that you had with Senator Burr was referring to the interview that you gave that talked about the plot that was uncovered that involved him. Do you recall that conversation with Senator Burr?

16 MR. BRENNAN: Yes, I do, Senator.

SENATOR RISCH: Okay. And I have in front of me the Reuters article that's dated May 18, 2012, describing your engagement with the media regarding Mr. Asiri and the plot; you're familiar with that article, I would assume?

21 MR. BRENNAN: I have read many articles, so I presume I read that one.

1	SENATOR RISCH: Well, this particular one is one that's similar, I think,
2	as far as the leak itself and how we got to where we are on this.
3	I want to quote from the article. It says, "At about 5:45 p.m., Eastern
4	Daylight Time, on Monday, May 7, just before the evening newscasts, John
5	Brennan, President Barack Obama's top White House advisor on
6	counterterrorism, held a small, private teleconference to brief former
7	counterterrorism advisors who have become frequent commentators on TV
8	news shows."
9	Is that an accurate statement?
10	MR. BRENNAN: That is an accurate statement, Senator. Yes.
11	SENATOR RISCH: And can you tell me who was involved in that
12	conversation; who was involved in that interview?
13	MR. BRENNAN: I believe that the people who were on that phone
14	included one of my predecessors, Fran Townsend; Roger Cressey; Juan
15	Zarate; Richard Clarke. I think these are individuals who have served in the
16	government and are counterterrorism professionals.
17	SENATOR RISCH: Any others you can think of?
18	MR. BRENNAN: I do not remember the others.
19	SENATOR RISCH: Do you have notes from that conversation?
20	MR. BRENNAN: There are notes, yes that people took at that, yes.
21	SENATOR RISCH: Have those been turned over to the Justice

1 Department?

MR. BRENNAN: The Justice Department -- as I said, I voluntarily and 2 eagerly engaged in that investigation, and they have --3 **SENATOR RISCH:** That wasn't the question. Were those notes turned 4 over? 5 MR. BRENNAN: Everything that was available on that has been turned 6 over to the Department of Justice; absolutely, Senator. 7 **SENATOR RISCH:** Did *you* turn those notes over? 8 **MR. BRENNAN:** My office turned over everything that was available 9 about that, yes. 10 SENATOR RISCH: Who took those notes? 11 **MR. BRENNAN:** Senator, I was not taking notes at the time. There were 12 people, also, from the White House, who were on that conversation, as we do 13 with all of these types of engagements. 14 **SENATOR RISCH:** And who were the people that were involved in that 15 conversation? 16 MR. BRENNAN: Aside from the reporters? There was somebody from 17 the White House Press Office and someone from the Counterterrorism 18 directorate. 19 **SENATOR RISCH:** You don't know the peoples' names? 20 **MR. BRENNAN:** I do. They were Nick Rasmussen and Caitlin Hayden. 21

SENATOR RISCH: Those are the two people from the White House that 1 were involved; is that --2 MR. BRENNAN: That's my recollection of who was involved in that 3 conference call, yes. 4 **SENATOR RISCH:** May 7th was the date that the incident occurred; is 5 that correct? 6 **MR. BRENNAN:** The date of the conversation with those reports? 7 **SENATOR RISCH:** Excuse me -- the date of the underlying event that 8 you were talking about involving Mr. Asiri. 9 **MR. BRENNAN:** Now you're talking about Mr. Asiri -- in terms of being 10 the person who was responsible for putting together the IED? 11 SENATOR RISCH: Correct. 12 **MR. BRENNAN:** I believe May 7th was about the right date, yes. 13 **SENATOR RISCH:** And can you tell me why you felt compelled to 14 release that information to these people on May 7, 2012? 15 **MR. BRENNAN:** Well, as I explained on the network news the following 16 morning, and as we said publicly, that device was not a threat to the 17 American public at the time of the bin Laden anniversary --18 SENATOR RISCH: I don't want to cut you off, but that's not the 19 question. 20 **MR. BRENNAN:** I thought it was, Senator. But go ahead. 21

63

SENATOR RISCH: No. The question was why did you feel compelled to
 hold this press conference and divulge that information at that time on that
 day?

MR. BRENNAN: It wasn't a press conference; it was a teleconference
with these individuals. And I know they were going out on TV that evening
and I wanted to make sure that these individuals with that background on
counterterrorism were able to explain appropriately to the American people
as we've been talking about -- the importance of making sure the American
people were aware of the threat environment and what we're doing on the
counterterrorism front.

SENATOR RISCH: And they were going to go on TV that evening to discuss this event?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, because it had already broken. The news reports had broken that afternoon, Senator, and so there was a flurry of activity and press reporting that was going on. These individuals reached out to us, as they normally do. So this was just a routine engagement with the press, as we normally do when these things are made public.

SENATOR RISCH: The next paragraph says, "According to five people
 familiar with the call, Brennan stressed that the plot was never a threat to the
 U.S. public or air safety because Washington had inside control over it."

ls that an accurate statement?

MR. BRENNAN: Inside control of the plot, yes, that's exactly right. 1 SENATOR RISCH: Okay. So, based on that, one would know that we 2 had something inside; is that a fair statement? 3 **MR. BRENNAN:** From that statement, it is known that that IED, at the 4 time, was not a threat to the traveling public, because we had said publicly 5 that there was no active plot at the time of the bin Laden anniversary. That's 6 correct. 7 **SENATOR RISCH:** Would you agree with me that that disclosure 8 resulted in the outing of an asset that shouldn't have been outed? 9 **MR. BRENNAN:** Absolutely not, Senator. I do not agree with you, 10 whatsoever. 11 **SENATOR RISCH:** Well, how can you say that? 12 **MR. BRENNAN:** What I'm saying is that we were explaining to the 13 American public why that IED was not, in fact, a threat at the time that it was 14 in the control of individuals. When we say "positive control," "inside control," 15

16 that means that we have, in fact, that operation, either environmentally or

any number of ways. It did not in any way reveal any type of classified

18 information.

And I told those individuals -- and there are transcripts that are available of that conversation -- "I cannot talk to you about the operational details of this, whatsoever." SENATOR RISCH: Having used the words that you used of "inside
 control," it isn't much of a leap to determine that somehow you had a handle
 on it.

MR. BRENNAN: It's not much of a leap to know that if in fact we said
this IED was, in fact, obtained, and it was not a threat at the time, that there
was some type of inside control. It is almost a truism.

SENATOR RISCH: Well, having said that, it seems to me that the leak
 that the Justice Department is looking for is right here in front of us. And
 you disagree with that?

MR. BRENNAN: I disagree with you vehemently, Senator. And I've 10 talked to the Department of Justice. As I said, I conducted interviews with 11 them. And, you know, I am a witness in that, as many other people are. And 12 as you know, there's witness and subject and target. I'm not a subject. I'm 13 not a target. I am a witness. Because I want to make sure whoever leaked 14 this information that got out to the press and that seriously did disrupt 15 some very sensitive operational equities on the part of some of our 16 international partners -- that never should have happened. 17 **SENATOR RISCH:** And you're in agreement with that -- that this was a 18

19 serious flaw in what *should* have happened; is that correct?

20 **MR. BRENNAN:** It's a serious flaw that it got out to the press before 21 that operation was, in fact, concluded; absolutely. And my discussion with 1 those individuals that night, it already was out in the press.

2	SENATOR RISCH: You would agree with me that on the day that we get
3	Mr. Asiri, it's going to be either a very, very good day, or, if he gets us first,
4	it's going to be a very, very bad day for the American people, and particularly
5	for anyone who was involved in a leak concerning him.
6	MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I live this every day and night.
7	SENATOR RISCH: I understand.
8	MR. BRENNAN: I go to bed at night worrying that I didn't do enough
9	that day to make sure I could protect the American people. So, when Mr.
10	Asiri is brought to justice, one way or another, it will be because of the work
11	that's been done over the past number of years by some very brave
12	Americans in CIA and other places.
13	So, believe me, I am focused as a laser on the issue of the IED threat,
14	AQAP, and Mr. al-Asiri.
15	SENATOR RISCH: I have more, but my time is up.
16	Thank you, Madam Chairman.
17	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you, Senator Risch.
18	Senator Mikulski?
19	Before you start, Senator, a vote is due to start at four. It's now five
20	after four. Senator Chambliss went to vote; as soon as he returns, I will go.
21	And we will just keep this going. So, Members, be guided by that.

1 The vote just started. Please go ahead.

SENATOR MIKULSKI: Mr. Brennan, first of all, welcome to the
 Committee. And in the short time I have -- you mentioned your wife, Kathy;
 could you introduce us to her?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, this is my wonderful, beautiful wife, Kathy, who's
been my spouse for 34 years and my partner in my work. And my brother,
Thomas, also is here, from New Jersey.

SENATOR MIKULSKI: Well, we'd like to welcome you. And we know that not only will you serve, but your entire family has served, and will continue to serve. And I'm going to echo the remarks of my colleague, Senator Warner, thanking the people of the Central Intelligence Agency for what they do every day in every way, working often in a way that is not known, not recognized, and quite frankly, not always appreciated.

So, let me get to my questions. I have been concerned for some time that there is a changing nature of the CIA, and that instead of it being America's top human spy agency to make sure that we have no strategic surprises, that it has become, more and more, executing paramilitary operations.

And I've discussed this with you in our conversation. How do you see this? I see this as mission-creep. I see this as overriding the original mission of the CIA, for which you're so well versed, and more a function of the 1 Special Operations Command.

Could you share with me how you see the CIA and what you think
about this militarization of the CIA that's going on?

4 MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Senator, and thank you --

SENATOR MIKULSKI: You might disagree with me, and I welcome your
 disagreement is you so do so.

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, the principal missions of the Agency is to
 collect intelligence, uncover those secrets, as you say, to prevent those
 strategic surprises, and to be the best analytic component within the U.S.
 Government, to do the all-source analysis that CIA has done so well for
 many, many years.

At times, the President asks and directs the CIA to do covert action. That covert action can take any number of forms, to include paramilitary. And, as we've discussed here today on the counterterrorism front, there are things that the Agency has been involved in since 9/11 that, in fact, have been a bit of an aberration from its traditional role.

One of the things that I would do if I would go back to the Agency is to take a look at that allocation of mission within CIA -- the resources that are dedicated to this, and, as we had the discussion when I paid my courtesy call, I am concerned that looking at the world, which is a very big place, we need to make sure we have the best intelligence collection capabilities possible and the best analytic capabilities possible. And the CIA should not
be doing traditional military activities and operations.

SENATOR MIKULSKI: Well, I appreciate that and look forward to
 working with you on this to really identify what's up with the CIA, and to
 DoD, which then takes me to the issue of cyber threat.

Both Secretary Panetta, General Dempsey, and so on -- and *we*, in your current role at the White House -- have talked about the cyber threat. You were a big help in trying to help us get the cyber legislation passed.

Now, tell us what you think is the role of the CIA in dealing with the
cyber threat in the area of human intelligence with the CIA? You have a
unique insight into it. We know what NSA does; we know what Homeland
Security is supposed to do; tell us where you see the CIA in this.

MR. BRENNAN: Well, first of all, the cyber threat that this country faces is one of the most insidious and one of the most consequential to our national security, and one that I think that our government as a whole and this body, the Congress, really needs to be focused on and do everything possible to prevent a devastating attack against this country because of our vulnerabilities on the cyber front.

¹⁹ CIA's traditional mission on the collection front is to try to determine ²⁰ the plans and intentions of foreign governments, foreign groups, sub-²¹ national groups, and others. Learning about those plans and intentions, and the development of capabilities in the cyber world, is something that CIA, I think, is best placed to do, so that we have an understanding of what foreign countries are doing, what organized criminal organizations are doing, what sub-national groups are doing, and the nature of the threat to us.

6 Then, in addition, the analysts at CIA can take that information, 7 working with the rest of the Community, to make sure that policymakers 8 have a good sense of the nature of the threat and some potential mitigation 9 strategies. And then, working with NSA, Department of Homeland Security, 10 and others, put together that structure that's going to make this country 11 resistant and resilient to those attacks.

SENATOR MIKULSKI: Well, Mr. Brennan, I really look forward to 12 working with you on this, because this cuts across all the agencies -- those 13 that have responsibility for work outside of this country, inside this country, 14 and yet, we all have to be doing -- what we're -- to use the Marine Corp 15 saying -- the best that we're best at and best that we're most needed for. 16 I consider this one of the greatest threats and one of the greatest 17 vulnerabilities, because we failed to pass the legislation ourselves. We can't 18 stop what foreign predators want to do. I mean, we can divert; identify an 19 attack. But we are making ourselves vulnerable. 20

Now, I want to get to the job of the CIA Director. I'm going to be blunt

-- and this will be no surprise to you, sir -- but I've been on this Committee
for more than 10 years, and with the exception of Mr. Panetta, I feel I've
been jerked around by every CIA Director. I've either been misled,
misrepresented, had to pull information out -- often at the most minimal
kind of way; from Tenet, with his little aluminum rods, to tell us that we had
weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, to Porter Goss -- not forthcoming.

You know the problems we've had with torture. The Chair has spoken
eloquently about it, all the way. And quite frankly, during those questions,
they were evaded; they were distorted, et cetera.

So, my question to you is: knowing your background, knowing your Jesuit education, knowing what I think your values are, can I have your word that you're going to be very forthcoming with this Committee, to speak truth *to* power, to speak truth *about* power, even when it's uncomfortable, or where we're going to have to probe in a way that is not an easy way to go?

MR. BRENNAN: Honesty, truthfulness, was a value that was inculcated
 in me in my home in New Jersey, from my parents, Owen and Dorothy. It
 still is to this day.

Honesty is the best policy. None of us are perfect beings. I'm far from
perfect. But, Senator, I would commit that I would be honest with this
Committee and do everything possible to meet your legitimate needs and
requirements. As I think I've told you before, I know that you are a very

1	proud senator of one of the jewels in the Intelligence Community, NSA,
2	which resides in Maryland, but it would be my objective to make CIA your
3	favorite intelligence agency and push Keith Alexander aside.
4	(LAUGHTER.)
5	SENATOR MIKULSKI: Well, I think you're pushing your luck now.
6	Thank you very much.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Senator Levin?
8	SENATOR LEVIN: Thank you.
9	Thank you for your willingness to serve here, Mr. Brennan.
10	You've said publicly that you believe waterboarding is inconsistent with
11	American values; it's something that should be prohibited, and it goes
12	beyond the bounds of what a civilized society should employ.
13	My question is this: in your opinion, does waterboarding constitute
14	torture?
15	MR. BRENNAN: The attorney general has referred to waterboarding as
16	torture. Many people have referred to it as torture. The attorney general,
17	premiere of law enforcement officer and lawyer of this country. And as you
18	well know, and as we've had the discussion, Senator, the term "torture" has a
19	lot of legal and political implications. It is something that should have been
20	banned long ago. It never should have taken place in my view. And,
21	therefore, if I were to go to CIA, it would never, in fact, be brought back.

SENATOR LEVIN: Do you have a personal opinion as to whether
 waterboarding is torture?

MR. BRENNAN: I have a personal opinion that waterboarding is
 reprehensible, and it's something that should not be done. And, again, I am
 not a lawyer, Senator, and I can't address that question.

SENATOR LEVIN: Well, you've read opinions as to whether or not
 waterboarding is torture. And I'm just -- do you accept those opinions of the
 attorney general? That's my question.

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, you know, I've read a lot of legal opinions.
I've read an Office of Legal Counsel opinion in the previous administration
that said in fact waterboarding could be used. So, from the standpoint of
that, you know, I cannot point to a single legal document on this issue.
But, as far as I'm concerned, waterboarding is something that never
should have been employed, and, as far as I'm concerned, never will be, if I
have anything to do with it.

16 SENATOR LEVIN: Is waterboarding banned by the Geneva

17 Conventions?

MR. BRENNAN: I believe the attorney general also has said that it's
 contrary, in contravention, of the Geneva Convention.

Again, I am not a lawyer, or a legal scholar, to make a determination about what is in violation of an international convention. SENATOR LEVIN: Mr. Rodriguez, the former CIA Deputy Director for
 Operations, was asked about his personal moral or ethical perspective on
 these enhanced interrogation techniques, including waterboarding.

He said that he knew of -- and these are his words -- "I know that many
of these procedures were applied to our own servicemen. Tens of thousands
of U.S. soldiers had gone through this."

Now, as we investigated, at Senate Armed Services Committee, in our
2008 report, these so-called "Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape" -- or
"SERE" -- techniques referred to by Mr. Rodriguez were used to train
members of our military. They were never intended to be used by U.S.
interrogators.

These techniques were based on Chinese Communist interrogation techniques used during the Korean War to elicit confessions, were developed to expose U.S. -- and the use of or the training of U.S. personnel and exposing of them for a few moments to these techniques which helped to -was meant to help them survive in the event they were captured and the event they were subjected to these techniques.

My question to you is this: is there any comparability between a friendly trainer in the United States exposing our troops to abuses -- these SERE techniques, including waterboarding -- for a few moments under close supervision; is there any possible comparability to that to using these 1 techniques on an enemy in an effort to extract intelligence?

2 **MR. BRENNAN:** They are for completely different purposes and 3 intentions. I do not see any comparability there.

SENATOR LEVIN: Now, the Chairman and I issued a report, or made a
 statement, on April 27, 2012. This also began with a statement of Mr.
 Rodriguez.

And here's what he said: "Information provided by CIA detainees Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and Abu Faraj al-Libbi about bin Laden's courier being the lead information that eventually led to the location of bin Laden's compound and the operation that led to his death."

That's what Rodriguez said. We said that statement is wrong. The 11 original lead information had no connection to CIA detainees. The CIA had 12 significant intelligence on the courier that was collected from a variety of 13 classified sources. While the CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques were 14 used against KSM and al-Libbi, the pair provided false and misleading 15 information during their time in CIA custody. 16 Now, my question to you is: are you aware of any intelligence 17 information that supports Mr. Rodriguez's claim that the lead information on 18

19 the courier came from KSM and al-Libbi?

20 **MR. BRENNAN:** I have not reviewed the intelligence thoroughly, but I 21 am unaware of any. SENATOR LEVIN: Next, Michael Hayden, former CIA Director, on May
 3, 2011, said that "What we got, the original lead information, began with
 information from CIA detainees at black sites."

The Chairman and I issued, in the same statement, the following -- that the statement of the former attorney general, Michael Mukasey, was wrong. Do you have any information to disagree with our statement?

7 MR. BRENNAN: I do not.

8 **SENATOR LEVIN:** The third statement that we quoted in our report --

9 out of Michael Hayden, former CIA Director: "What we got, the original lead

information, began with" -- excuse me; that was Mr. *Hayden* that I was

asking you about, not Mr. Mukasey. Your answer is the same, I assume?

12 **MR. BRENNAN:** Yeah, I do not know. I'm unaware.

13 **SENATOR LEVIN:** You don't have any information to the contrary?

14 MR. BRENNAN: Right.

SENATOR LEVIN: Now, Michael Mukasey, former attorney general, Wall
 Street Journal: "Consider how the intelligence that led to Bin Laden came to
 hand; it began with a disclosure from Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who broke
 like a dam under pressure of harsh interrogation techniques that included
 waterboarding. He released a torrent of information, including eventually
 the name -- the *name* -- of a trusted courier of bin Laden."

Our statement -- that of the Chairman and myself -- is that that

1 statement is wrong. Do you have any information to the contrary?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, my impression earlier on was that there was information that was provided that was useful and valuable, but, as I said, I've read now the first volume of your report, which raises questions about whether any of that information was accurate.

6 **SENATOR LEVIN:** But I'm now referring not to the report, but to the 7 statement that Chairman Feinstein and I issued on April 27, 2012. We flat-8 out say that those statements are wrong.

9 MR. BRENNAN: Right.

10 **SENATOR LEVIN:** Do you have any basis to disagree with us?

11 MR. BRENNAN: I do not.

12 **SENATOR LEVIN:** Will you, when you become the CIA Director,

assuming you are confirmed, take the statement that we have issued, and
tell us whether or not you disagree with any of these statements that we
have made about those statements of those three men; will you do that if
you are confirmed?

MR. BRENNAN: I will look and consider that request, Senator. As I said, the report that this Committee has put together, I need to take a look at what CIA's response is to it, and that report raises serious questions about whether any worthwhile intelligence came from these individuals.

21 **SENATOR LEVIN:** Will you include, in your review, a review of our joint

statement and tell us whether, after your review, you disagree with anything
that we've said; will you do that?

3 **MR. BRENNAN:** I would be happy to.

4 **SENATOR LEVIN:** Now, there's one final point, and that has to do with 5 a very famous document. And that has to do with a cable that came in that 6 relates to the so-called "Atta" matter. Are you familiar with that issue?

7 MR. BRENNAN: Yes, I am, Senator.

8 **SENATOR LEVIN:** The issue here is whether or not there ever was a 9 meeting in Prague between Mohammed Atta, who is one of the people who 10 attacked the Trade Center, and the Iraqi Intelligence.

11 The cable that came in has been classified by the CIA, even though the 12 report of -- this is what the CIA did to the cable. *(Holds up a piece of paper* 13 *containing text that has been mostly redacted.)*

14 Now, will you check with the Czechs for the source of this cable and 15 see if they have any objection to the release of this cable relative to the 16 report of that meeting?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, Senator. And since our courtesy call, I have
 looked into this issue, and I know that you and Director Petraeus were
 involved in a discussion on this. And I would be happy to follow up on it.
 But there does seem to be some concerns about release of the cable.

21 SENATOR LEVIN: The unclassified report of the Intelligence Committee

-- which was not classified; was not redacted by the CIA -- made at least four
references to the Czech Intelligence Service providing the CIA with reporting,
based on a single source, about this alleged meeting, which never took
place. We *knew* it never took place. And yet, repeatedly -- particularly, the
Vice President -- made reference that there was a report of a meeting
between these two.

Now, it's very significant for the historical record here. We went to war 7 based on allegations that there was a relationship between Irag and the 8 attackers -- the 9/11 attackers. It's very important that this cable be 9 declassified. The only reason to keep it redacted and classified, frankly, is to 10 protect an administration, not to protect sources and methods, because the 11 sources and methods -- if you will check with the Czechs. I'm sure they will 12 tell you they have no objection to the release of that cable. 13 My question to you is will you check with the Czechs, if you are 14

15 confirmed, and determine whether they have any objection to the release of

- 16 the cable, which makes reference to them?
- 17 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely, Senator; I will.
- 18 **SENATOR LEVIN:** Thank you. My time is up.
- 19 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Thank you, Senator.
- 20 Senator Coats?
- 21 **SENATOR COATS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Brennan, we acknowledge your experience, and I think that 1 experience is important to have for the position that, if confirmed, you will 2 occupy. I acknowledge your service to the country and your experience in 3 this field. I think the President used that as one of the criteria, of course. 4 You and I, when we talked earlier in a private talk, talked about the 5 relationship that you want to have with this Committee -- not just with the 6 Chairman and the Vice Chairman, but with all the Committee Members. And 7 I appreciate your answers on that, and you addressed it again today, in 8 terms of a potential trust deficit or -- you said that that's "wholly 9 unacceptable" and that you would give straight answers and be blunt and 10 candid. 11

12 And you've been that today. It's not a prerequisite to be Mr.

Congeniality to occupy the position of Director of CIA, so I don't hold that as
-- in fact, it would be probably a red flag for me if somebody *did* have that
award and wanted your position.

The kind of issues that you have to deal with require straight talk, straight answers, and getting to the chase real quick. You said it's the "New Jersey" way. I'll accept that; it's bipartisan. Governor Christie exhibits the same kind of responses and has a pretty high approval rating.

20 So, we will go forward with taking you at your word that we'll have the 21 kind of relationship that we can have a blunt, straightforward, fully disclosed, working relationship. I think it's critical to our ability to provide
oversight, our ability to have the right kind of relationship with the Agency
so we know where each other is and can move forward together in terms of
what needs to be done to provide the intelligence necessary to protect the
American people.

So, I wanted to say that. I'd like to follow up a little bit more on the leaks question because I have a few more questions. I was going to delve into that in more detail, but it's already been discussed by Senator Risch and others. But let me just ask a couple of other questions to clear some things up in my mind.

My understanding is that the Associated Press had information relative to the intercept of a planned operation that perhaps had something to do with airlines and explosive devices; that apparently they had that for a few days and then either were about to or had gone ahead and released it. I'm assuming that your *then* calling the conference call was in response to what they had just released; is that correct?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes. A number of news networks have put out
 information about this. Yes.

SENATOR COATS: And you expressly arranged this teleconference for
 what exact purpose?

21 MR. BRENNAN: There were a number of people who were going to be

going out on the news shows that night who were asking about the reports
about this intercepted IED and wanted to get some context, as far as the
nature of the threat, and also were asking questions about -- "Well, you said,
and the U.S. Government said, that there was no threat during the
anniversary of the bin Laden take-down, so how could there not have been a
threat if, in fact, this IED was out there?"

SENATOR COATS: The question I have is this -- because based on what
 you said and what we have learned, you then, in that teleconference, talked
 about the fact that, in answering the question, "How do we know this?" -- I
 think the quote that came across from Richard Clarke was, "never came
 close, because they had insider information, insider control." And you had
 referenced that you had said that to the group.

MR. BRENNAN: No, what I said was inside control of the plot, and that
 the device was never a threat.

15 SENATOR COATS: Okay, "insider control."

16 MR. BRENNAN: No, I said "*inside* control" -- not "insider."

SENATOR COATS: Okay, "inside control." The Associated Press never made any mention about inside control. Why was it necessary, then, to add that? Why couldn't you have just simply said, "We've intercepted a plot -- it's been a successful interception"? Because once the word "inside control" got out, then all the speculation -- and correct -- was that that "inside control" 1 was interpreted as meaning "we've got somebody inside."

And the result of that was the covert action operation had to be
dissolved because the control agent, the inside person, was -- well,
essentially, the plot was exposed, and therefore, the whole operation had to
be dissolved.

6 MR. BRENNAN: Well, Senator, I must caution that there are still 7 elements of this event that remain classified and that we cannot talk about 8 in public. There was a lot of information that came out immediately after AP 9 broke that story. Unfortunately, there was a hemorrhaging of information 10 and leaks.

Again, what I said was that there was inside control, because what I needed to do, and what I said to the American public in open networks the following morning, is that during the anniversary period of the bin Laden take-down, when we said to the American public that there were no active plots, no threat to the American public, that we were aware of, that was specific and credible.

Well, why was not this IED that we had intercepted -- why wasn't that a threat? Well, because we had inside control of the plot, which means any number of things -- in terms of environmentally, working with partners, whatever else. It did not reveal any classified information. And as I said, we have to be careful here because there are still operational elements of this 1 that remain classified.

SENATOR COATS: And that's appropriate, but, you know, it was just a
 couple weeks later when Reuters reported publicly, and I quote, "As a result
 of the news leaks, U.S. and allied officials told Reuters that they were forced
 to end an operation which they had hoped could have continued for weeks
 or longer."

7 MR. BRENNAN: There were a lot of things that were reported by the 8 press -- accurate, inaccurate -- a whole bunch of stuff, Senator. So I would 9 not put stock in the types of things that you might be reading there. I know 10 that I engaged for an extended period of time both before that leak and 11 afterward to make sure we were able to mitigate any damage from that 12 initial leak, and the subsequent leaks, of classified information.

SENATOR COATS: So, you're essentially saying that this Reuters report
 may or may not be accurate, but had no link to what was disclosed to Mr.
 Clarke and then what he said shortly thereafter on ABC News?

MR. BRENNAN: What I'm saying, Senator, is that I'm very comfortable with what I did and what I said at that time to make sure that we were able to deal with the unfortunate leak of classified information.

SENATOR COATS: How frequently did you have to pull groups like this
 together in order to, in a sense, put out authorized, or at least what you
 think is appropriate, news for the correct purposes?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, frequently, if there is some type of event, or if there's a disrupted terrorist attack, whether it's some "underwear bomber" or a disrupted IED, or a printer bomb, or whatever else, we will engage with the American public. We'll engage with the press. We'll engage with individuals who are experienced professional counterterrorism experts who will go out and talk to the American public.

We want to make sure that there are not misrepresentations, in fact, of the facts, but at the same time, do it in a way that we're able to maintain control over classified material.

SENATOR COATS: Now, it does occur, I assume, or it is possible, to put out an authorized leak; is that correct?

MR. BRENNAN: No. Those are oxymorons: "*authorized leak*." It is something that would have to be declassified, disclosed, and done in a proper manner.

SENATOR COATS: And this, in no way, fell into that category?
 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely not. I was asked to engage with these
 individuals by the White House Press Office. I talked with them about the
 interception. No, it was not.

SENATOR COATS: There is a provision in last year's Intelligence
 Authorization Bill that requires a report to this Committee of any authorized
 leak; so, you are aware of that?

1	MR. BRENNAN: I'm aware of the provision, yes, that's been put
2	forward.
3	SENATOR COATS: And no report has come forward, so I assume there
4	haven't been any authorized leaks in the past year?
5	MR. BRENNAN: I think, you know, what we want to do is to make sure
6	if there's going to be any disclosures of classified information, that this
7	Committee is going to be informed about that. So we will adhere to the
8	provision that was in that Intel Authorization Bill.
9	SENATOR COATS: Thank you.
10	Mr. Chairman, my time is expired.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Senator Udall?
12	SENATOR UDALL: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman.
13	Good afternoon, Mr. Brennan. I can't help but observing that Senator
14	Coats talked about being governor of New Jersey, I think being governor of
15	Jersey is a piece of cake compared to being the Director of the CIA.
16	I hope Governor Christie won't take that in the wrong way, by the way,
17	because I have great respect for him.
18	MR. BRENNAN: I have no plans to run against Governor Christie.
19	(LAUGHTER.)
20	SENATOR UDALL: Thank you for your service. Thank you for your
21	willingness to continue serving as the head of the CIA. I have some

comments I'd like to share with you, and then of course I'll direct some
questions your way.

You've said that President Obama believes that, done carefully,
deliberately, and responsibly, we can be more transparent and still ensure
our nation's security. I absolutely agree. The American people have the
right to know what their government does on their behalf.

Consistent with our national security, the presumption of transparency
 should be the rule, not the exception, and the government should make as
 much information available to the American public as possible.

So when we, on the Committee, and we, as Members of Congress, push hard for access to the legal analysis justifying the authority of the Executive Branch to lethally target Americans using drones, for instance, it erodes the government's credibility of the American people.

I want to tell you I'm grateful to the President for allowing Members of
 this Committee to briefly use some of the legal opinions on targeting
 American citizens. This is an important first step. But I want to tell you, I
 think there's much more to be done in that regard. And you've heard that
 from my colleagues here today.

I've long believed that our government also has an obligation to the
 American people to face its mistakes transparently, help the public
 understand the nature of those mistakes, and correct them. The next

1 Director to the CIA has an important task ahead in this regard.

Mr. Brennan, I know you're familiar with the mistakes that I'm referring to. We've already discussed those here today to some extent. They're outlined in the Committee's 6,000-page report on the CIA's detention and interrogation program, based on a documentary view of over 6 million pages of CIA and other records, and including 35,000 footnotes.

I believe that this program was severely flawed. It was mismanaged.
The enhanced interrogation techniques were brutal, and, perhaps most
importantly, it did not work. Nonetheless, it was portrayed to the White
House, the Department of Justice, the Congress, and the media as a program
that resulted in unique information that saved lives.

And I appreciate the comments you made earlier about the misinformation that may have flowed from those who were in charge of this program to people like yourself. Acknowledging the flaws of this program is essential for the CIA's long-term institutional integrity, as well as for the legitimacy of ongoing sensitive programs. The findings of this report directly relate to how other CIA programs are managed today.

As you said in your opening remarks, and you so powerfully referenced the Memorial Wall, all CIA employees should be proud of where they work, and of all the CIA's activities. I think the best way to ensure that they're proud is for you to lead in correcting the false record, and instituting the necessary reforms that will restore the CIA's reputation for integrity and
 analytical rigor. The CIA cannot be its best until the leadership faces the
 serious and grievous mistakes of this program.

So, if I might, let me turn to my first question. Inaccurate information
on the management operation effectiveness of the CIA's detention and
interrogation program was provided by the CIA to the White House, the DoJ,
Congress, and the public. Some of this information is regularly and publicly
repeated today by former CIA officials, either knowingly or unknowingly.
And although we now know this information is incorrect, the accurate

information remains classified, while inaccurate information has been
 declassified and regularly repeated.

12 And the Committee will take up the matter of this report's

13 declassification separately. But there's an important role I think the CIA can

14 play in the interim: CIA has a responsibility to correct any inaccurate

information that was provided to the previous White House, Department of

Justice, Congress, and the public, regarding the detention and interrogation
 program.

18 So, here's my question: do you agree that the CIA has this 19 responsibility? And I'd appreciate a yes or no answer.

20 MR. BRENNAN: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR UDALL: Thank you for that. Again, yes or no -- will you

commit to working with the Committee to correct the public and internal
 record regarding the detention and interrogation program within the next 90
 days?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I think it's only fair of me to say that I am
looking forward to CIA's response to that report so that we're assured that
we have both the Committee's report, as well as CIA's comments on it. And I
will be getting back to you, yes.

SENATOR UDALL: I can understand you want to make sure you have 8 accurate time. I understand, as well, that the CIA will finish their analysis by 9 the middle of February. And so, I hope we can work within that time frame. 10 And I know that in your answers to the Committee in preparing for this 11 hearing, you wrote that "the CIA, in all instances, should convey accurate 12 information to Congress. When an inaccurate statement is made and the CIA 13 is aware of the inaccuracy, it must immediately correct the record. And 14 certainly, I would do so, if I were Director." 15

So, I take your answer in the spirit of the written testimony you
 provided to the Committee. Let me turn to the report and its eventual
 declassification, if I might.

I don't think it has to be difficult -- that is, the declassification -- for
 these reasons: the identities of the most important detainees have already
 been declassified; the interrogation techniques themselves have been

declassified; the application of techniques to detainees has been declassified
to some extent, with a partial declassification of the inspector general
report; and the intelligence was declassified to a significant extent when the
Bush administration described plots it claimed were thwarted as a result of
the program.

So long as the report does not identify any undercover officers, or
perhaps the names of certain countries, can you think of any reason why the
report could not be declassified with the appropriate number of redactions?
Can you answer yes or no to that question?

MR. BRENNAN: I would have to take that declassification request under serious consideration, obviously. That's a very weighty decision, in terms of declassifying that report, and I would give it due consideration. But there are a lot of considerations that go into such decisions.

SENATOR UDALL: I want to, again, underline that I think this would
 strengthen the CIA. It would strengthen our standing in the world. America
 is at its best, as we discussed earlier today, when it acknowledges its
 mistakes, and learns from those mistakes.

And I want to quote Howard Baker, who I think we all admire in this room. He spoke about the Church Committee, which he, you know, was an important effort on the part of this Congress. And there was much broader criticism of the CIA in that Church Committee process. And the CIA came 1 out of that stronger and more poised to do what it's supposed to do.

So I want to quote Howard Baker. He wrote: "In all candor, however, one must recognize that an investigation such as this one" -- he's referencing the Church Committee, but I think it could apply to what *this* Committee has done, as well -- "of necessity, will cause some short-term damage to our intelligence apparatus. A responsible inquiry, as this has been, will, in the long run, result in a stronger and more efficient Intelligence Community.

⁸ "Such short-term inquiry will be outweighed by the long-term benefits
 ⁹ gained from the restructuring of the Intelligence Community with more
 ¹⁰ efficient utilization of our intelligence resources."

So, again, Mr. Brennan, I look forward to working with you to complete these tasks that we've outlined here today. In the long run, I have faith in the CIA like you have faith in the CIA that it will come out of this study stronger and poised to meet the 21st Century intelligence challenges that are in front of us. Thank you again for your willingness to serve.

16 MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Senator.

17 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you, Senator Udall.

18 Senator Rubio?

SENATOR RUBIO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Brennan, for being here
 with us today, and congratulations on your nomination.

I wanted to ask, in the 2007 CBS interview, you said that information

obtained in interrogations have saved lives. In September of 2011, you said
in a speech at Harvard, that whenever possible, the preference of the
administration is to take custody of individuals so that we could obtain
information which is, quote, "vital to the safety and security of the American
people."

6 So, obviously, you believe that interrogations of terrorists can give us 7 information that could prevent attacks in the future?

8 **MR. BRENNAN:** Absolutely agree.

9 **SENATOR RUBIO:** But you don't believe the CIA should be in the

10 business of detention, correct?

11 **MR. BRENNAN:** I agree.

12 SENATOR RUBIO: So, who should be?

13 MR. BRENNAN: Well, there are a number of options -- U.S. military,

14 which maintains an active interrogation program, detention program; the

15 FBI, as part of its efforts on counterterrorism; and our international partners,

and working with them. And that's where, in fact, most of the interrogations

are taking place of terrorists who have been taken off of the battlefields in

- 18 many different countries.
- 19 **SENATOR RUBIO:** So there are active interrogations occurring?
- 20 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely -- every day.
- 21 **SENATOR RUBIO:** Okay. About the foreign partners that you talk

1	about, have you talked to folks in the CIA about their impressions of the
2	quality of information we're getting from our foreign partners?
3	MR. BRENNAN: Yes, on a regular basis.
4	SENATOR RUBIO: Would it surprise you to know that some of them
5	have indicated to us repeatedly, over the last couple of years that I've been
6	here, that the information we get directly is much better than anything we
7	get from our foreign partners on some of these issues?
8	MR. BRENNAN: Right. And that's why we work with our foreign
9	partners so that we can have direct access to these individuals that have
10	been detained.
11	SENATOR RUBIO: Well, I'll tell you why I'm concerned. Ali Ani al-Harzi
12	I think is how I pronounce his name he's a suspect in the Benghazi
13	attack, and the Tunisians detained him, correct?
14	MR. BRENNAN: Yes, he was taken into custody by the Tunisians.
15	SENATOR RUBIO: Did we not ask for access to him, to be able to
16	interrogate him and find out information?
17	MR. BRENNAN: Yes. And the Tunisians did not have a basis in their
18	law to hold him.
19	SENATOR RUBIO: So they released him?
20	MR. BRENNAN: They did.
21	SENATOR RUBIO: Where is he? We don't know?

1 **MR. BRENNAN:** He's still in Tunisia.

SENATOR RUBIO: That doesn't sound like a good system of working
 with our foreign partners.

MR. BRENNAN: No, it shows that the Tunisians are working with their
 rule of law, as well -- just the way we do.

6 **SENATOR RUBIO:** Well, we have someone who was a suspect in the 7 potential in the attack on Benghazi. They didn't give us access to him and 8 we don't have any information from him.

9 **MR. BRENNAN:** We work with our partners across the board, and when 10 they are able to detain individuals, according to their laws, we work to see if 11 we can have the ability to ask them questions -- sometimes indirectly and 12 sometimes directly.

SENATOR RUBIO: So your point is that Tunisian law did not allow them to hold him, and therefore they let him go before we could get there to talk to him?

MR. BRENNAN: And we didn't have anything on him, either, because if we did, then we would've made a point to the Tunisians to turn him over to us. We didn't have that.

SENATOR RUBIO: What role should the CIA play in interrogations?
 MR. BRENNAN: The CIA should be able to lend its full expertise, as it
 does right now, in terms of -- in support of military interrogations, FBI

debriefings and interrogations, and our foreign partner debriefings. And
they do that on a regular basis.

SENATOR RUBIO: And so, what's the best setting to do that in? For
example, if a suspected terrorist is captured, and we think we can obtain
information from them, where would they go? Where do you suggest that
they be taken, for example; what's the right setting for it?

7 **MR. BRENNAN:** There are many different options, as far as where they 8 go. Sometimes it is with -- foreign partners, they put the individuals in their 9 jails and in their detention facilities according to their laws, and people can 10 access that.

We take people, as we've done in the past, and put them on naval vessels and interrogate them for an extended period of time.

SENATOR RUBIO: Okay. So you think that's the best setting -- the naval vessel?

15 MR. BRENNAN: No, I think --

SENATOR RUBIO: -- from our perspective, leaving aside the foreign
 partners for a second -- for *us*.

MR. BRENNAN: I think each case requires a very unique and tailored
 response. And that's what we've done.

20 Whether somebody is picked up by a foreign partner, whether

somebody is picked up on the high seas, or anywhere else, what we need to

do is see what the conditions are, what we have as far as the basis for that
interrogation -- what type of legal basis we have for that. So it's very much
tailored to the circumstances.

SENATOR RUBIO: When we detain a suspected terrorist, the purpose
 of the interrogation -- and I think you'd agree with this statement -- the
 purpose of an interrogation is to develop information that could be used to
 disrupt terrorist activities and prevent attacks, correct?

8 **MR. BRENNAN:** Without a doubt.

9 **SENATOR RUBIO:** It's not to lay the case for a criminal conviction.

MR. BRENNAN: Well, I think, you know, you want to take the person off the battlefield. You also want to get as much intelligence as possible. You don't just want to get the information from somebody and then send them off. You need to be able to do something with them. And we've put people away for 99 years -- for life -- so that, in fact, they're not able to hurt Americans ever again.

16 So, what you want to do is get that intelligence, but also, at the same 17 time, put them away so that justice can be done.

SENATOR RUBIO: I understand. But the number one priority, initially,
 is not necessarily to protect the record for a criminal prosecution; it's to
 obtain timely information --

21 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely right.

1 SENATOR RUBIO: So we can act correctly --

2 **MR. BRENNAN:** Absolutely right.

SENATOR RUBIO: Priority number two is to take them off the

4 battlefield to ensure they can't attack us in the future.

5 **MR. BRENNAN:** Right. It's not an either-or, but I agree with you.

6 **SENATOR RUBIO:** Why shouldn't we have places where we interrogate

7 people; for example, Guantanamo? Why shouldn't we have a place to take

8 people that we obtain? 'Cause is it not an incentive to kill them rather than

9 to capture them, if we don't have a --

MR. BRENNAN: No, it's never an incentive to kill them. And any time that we have encountered somebody, we have come up with, in fact, the route for them to take in order to be interrogated, debriefed, as well as prosecuted.

SENATOR RUBIO: So, where would we -- but why is it a bad idea to have a place that we can take them to?

16 MR. BRENNAN: It's not a bad idea. We need to have those places.

And again, sometimes it might be overseas, sometimes it might be a naval vessel, a lot of times it's back here in the States, where we bring someone back because we, in fact, have a complaint on them or an indictment on them, and then we bring them into an Article 3 process. And so we can elicit information from them and put them away behind bars. SENATOR RUBIO: Is the Article 3 process, in your mind, an ideal way
 to develop this kind of information, or aren't there limitations in the Article 3
 process?

MR. BRENNAN: I'm very proud of our system of laws here and the
 Article 3 process. Our track record is exceptionally strong over the past
 dozen years, couple dozen years; that so many terrorists have been, in fact,
 successfully prosecuted and will not --

SENATOR RUBIO: No, I understand, but in terms of -- our first priority
 9 is to develop information --

10 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely; the FBI does a great job.

SENATOR RUBIO: But an Article 3 setting is not the most conducive to that.

13 MR. BRENNAN: I would disagree with that.

14 **SENATOR RUBIO:** Well, they're immediately advised about not

15 cooperating and turning over information that would incriminate them.

16 **MR. BRENNAN:** No. Again, it's tailored to the circumstances.

17 Sometimes an individual will be Mirandized. Sometimes they will not be

18 Mirandized right away. Mirandizing an individual means only that the

information that they give before then cannot be used in Article 3 court.

But, in fact, the FBI do a great job, as far as listing information after

they're Mirandizing them, and so they can get information as part of that

1 type of negotiation with them, let them know they can in fact languish

² forever, or we can in fact have a dialogue about it intelligently.

3 SENATOR RUBIO: Just one last point, and I'm not going to use all my -4 I only have a minute left.

This Harzi case that I talked about -- you're fully comfortable with this notion that because the Tunisians concluded that they didn't have a legal basis to hold him, we now lost the opportunity to interrogate someone that could've provided us some significant information on the attack in Benghazi?

9 MR. BRENNAN: Senator, you know, this country of America really 10 needs to make sure that we are setting a standard and an example for the 11 world, as far as the basis that we're going to, in fact, interrogate somebody, 12 debrief somebody. We want to make sure we're doing it in conjunction with 13 our international partners.

We also want to make sure that we have the basis to do it, so that we don't have to face, in the future, challenges about how we, in fact, obtained the --

SENATOR RUBIO: What is that law? You keep on talking about the basis of our law; what law exactly are you talking about in terms of the basis of detaining someone? When you say that we want to make sure that we have a basis to -- because you said that --

21 MR. BRENNAN: Well, that's right.

SENATOR RUBIO: Based on what? Which law are we talking about?
 MR. BRENNAN: Well, it all depends on the circumstance. Are we
 talking about law of war detention authority, which the U.S. military has? Are
 you talking about Article 3 authority that the FBI has?

5 **SENATOR RUBIO:** Right.

6 **MR. BRENNAN:** The CIA does not have, by statute, any type of 7 detention authority.

8 **SENATOR RUBIO:** The point I'm trying to get at is we don't -- the truth 9 of the matter is we don't know Harzi knew anything about the Benghazi 10 attack.

We don't know if he knew about future attacks that were being planned by the same people, because we never got to talk to him because Tunisia said their laws wouldn't let them hold him, which is an excuse we've heard in other parts of the world, as well.

And that doesn't concern you, that we don't -- that we weren't able to
 obtain this information?

MR. BRENNAN: We press our partners and foreign governments to hold individuals and to allow us access to it. Sometimes their laws do not allow that to happen. I think the United States government has to respect these governments' right to, in fact, enforce their laws appropriately.

21 What we don't want to do is to have these individuals being held in

1 some type of custody that's extrajudicial.

2 **SENATOR RUBIO:** Okay, thank you.

3 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you, Senator Rubio.

4 Senator Warner?

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you, again,
 Mr. Brennan, for your testimony today.

One of the things that I think we've heard from a number of my 7 colleagues, and we had this discussion when we discussed the Committee's 8 study on detention and interrogation, is, should you be confirmed, how do 9 we ensure that the CIA Director is always going to be well-informed? 10 And particularly, to a -- we've questioned you today about a number of 11 key sensitive programs. The nature of the Agency's work is that a lot of 12 these programs are disparate, varied. And there needs to be some ability to 13 measure *objectively* the success of these programs; not simply by those 14 individuals that are implementing the programs. 15

And while this is not the setting to talk about any individual of these programs, I guess what I'm interested in is pursuing the conversation we started about how you might set up systems so that, to the best extent possible, as the CIA Director, you're going to make sure what's going on, get an accurate, objective review, and not simply have the information that simply bucks up through the system? MR. BRENNAN: Yes, that's an excellent point, Senator -- one that I'm very concerned about. In order to have objective measures of effectiveness, the metrics that you want to be able to evaluate the worth of a program, you cannot have the individuals who are responsible for carrying it out. As hard as they might try, they cannot help, I think, view the program and the results in a certain way. They become witting or unwitting advocates for it.

So what we need to do is to set up some type of system where you can have confidence that those measures of effectiveness are being done in the most independent and objective way. And that's one of the things that I want to make sure I take a look at, if I were to go to the Agency.

SENATOR WARNER: Again, the nature of so many programs -- all very 11 sensitive in nature; you have to have almost, as we discussed, probably not 12 an IG type vehicle, something that is more run out of the Director's Office, 13 but you've got to have some kind of red team that's going to be able to 14 check this information out to make sure you've -- so that you hear colleagues 15 here press on what you have done, or could have done, or should have done, 16 or if you had that oversight, you've got to have that objective information to 17 start with. 18

MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely. I tend to have a reputation for being a
 detailed person. And having been an analyst in an intelligence office for
 many years, I need to see the data. I cannot rely just on some interpretation

of it. So, I do very much look forward to finding a way that the Director's
Office can have this ability to independently evaluate these programs so that
I can fairly and accurately represent them to you. I need to be able to have
confidence, myself.

SENATOR WARNER: As you know -- and we all know -- our country is
 grappling with enormous fiscal challenges. And that means, well, national
 security remains our most essential requirement for our national
 government. Everything's going to have to able to be done in a fiscally
 constrained period.

You know, how are you going to think about thinking through those 10 challenges on where cuts, changes need to be made? And if you can 11 specifically outline -- one of the concerns that I have is, kind of, division of 12 labor and appropriate roles between the CIA and the DoD SOCOM 13 operations, fields where that kind of potential build-up in that capacity is --14 how do we get that done in these tight budget times? 15 If you could address both of those, I'd appreciate it. 16 MR. BRENNAN: In a fiscally constrained environment, we have to make 17 sure, more than ever, that every single dollar that's dedicated to intelligence 18 is going to be optimized. And in fact, if sequestration kicks in, what I 19 wouldn't want to do as CIA Director is do the salami-slicing, which is, you 20

know, five percent off the top of gross, all programs, because all the

1 programs are not --

SENATOR WARNER: One of the reasons why we need to make sure
 sequestration --

MR. BRENNAN: That's absolutely right, because it's going to have a
 devastating impact on the national security of this country.

And so, I would want to make sure, even if it doesn't happen in a
fiscally constrained environment, that I look at the programs and prioritize.
And we really have to take a look at what are those programs that we really
need to resource appropriately.

As we're going to have -- and we've had some benefits from pulling folks out of Iraq, and with the continued draw down of forces in Afghanistan, there's going to be some resource and assets that we're going to have to reallocate there. So I'll look carefully at that.

So what I want to do is to make sure that if I go to CIA, I have an
understanding about exactly how this -- these monies are being spent.
Then, as you point out, there is quite a bit of intelligence capability within
the Defense Department, and I know there's been recent press reports about
the Clandestine HUMINT Service -- Defense Clandestine Service -- and its
work with, in fact, CIA.

I want to make sure these efforts are not redundant whatsoever. And
 I've had these conversations with Mike Morell, as well as with General Flynn

over at DIA, to make sure that these efforts are going to truly be integrated
and complementary, because we cannot have unnecessarily redundant
capabilities in this government, particularly in an environment that we have
right now on the fiscal front.

SENATOR WARNER: I think this is an area that's going to need a lot of
attention and a lot of oversight. I get concerned at times that the IC, on one
hand, and the DoD on the other hand, think they're coming from separate
originators of funding, and ultimately, they still have to be within the greater
budget constraints.

Let me -- I know my time is running down. Your background, and most of your expertise, has been on the CT side. Clearly, the challenge we've got is we see emerging threats in parts of the world that we're not on the front line, as we see disruptions particularly through the Middle East, where, perhaps in retrospect, we didn't have the right kind of coverage on social media and on to the streets.

How do we make sure we're going to get within the kind of fiscal constraints, that we don't go complete CT; that we make sure we've got the coverage we need, the capabilities we need, and the worldwide coverage we need, with your approach, particularly with your background; if you could address that.

21 MR. BRENNAN: Well, clearly, counterterrorism is going to be a priority

area for the Intelligence Community and for CIA for many years to come.

² Just like weapons proliferation is, as well. Those are enduring challenges.

3 And since 9/11, the CIA has dedicated a lot of effort -- and very successfully;

4 they've done a tremendous job to mitigate that terrorist threat.

At the same time, though, they do have this responsibility on global 5 coverage. And so, what I need to take a look at is whether or not there has 6 been too much of an emphasis of the CT front. As good as it is, we have to 7 make sure we're not going to be surprised on the strategic front and some 8 of these other areas; to make sure we're dedicating the collection 9 capabilities, the operations officers, the all-source analysts, social media, as 10 you said, the so-called "Arab Spring" that swept through the Middle East. It 11 didn't lend itself to traditional types of intelligence collection. 12

There were things that were happening in a populist way, that, you know, having somebody, you know, well positioned somewhere, who can provide us information, is not going to give us that insight, social media, other types of things.

So I want to see if we can expand beyond the soda straw collection capabilities, which have served us very well, and see what else we need to do in order to take into account the changing nature of the global environment right now, the changing nature of the communication systems that exist worldwide.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you for that. I just would, again -- back to 1 my first point, and my time's about out -- I think, should you be confirmed, 2 that trying to make sure you've got that objective oversight, the ability to 3 make sure that you have the best knowledge and best metrics possible so 4 that when future challenges arise, you can come to this Committee and 5 others and make sure that the President and this Committee is informed 6 with the best information possible. 7 Thank you, Madam Chair. 8 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you very much, Senator. 9 Mr. Brennan, so you can be advised, we are not going to do the 10 classified hearing following this. We will do it Tuesday at 2:30. We will, 11 however, do another round just with five minutes per senator, so people can 12 wrap up whatever it is they want to ask. I hope that is okay with you. 13 MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely. 14 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you. Thank you. 15 Senator Collins? 16 SENATOR COLLINS: Thank you. 17 Mr. Brennan, I want to follow up on an issue that several of my 18 colleagues have raised on the issue of *capturing* a terrorist versus *targeted* 19 killing of a terrorist. 20

In a recent speech that you gave at the Wilson Center, you said: "Our

unqualified preference is to only undertake lethal force when we believe that
 capturing the individual is not feasible."

Yet, a study by The New American Foundation, as well as numerous press reports, indicates that in the first two years of President Obama's administration, there were four times the number of targeted killings, than in eight years of President Bush's administration. Is your testimony today that the huge increase in number of lethal strikes has no connection to the change in the Obama administration's detention policy?

Because obviously, if we're capturing a terrorist, we have the
opportunity to interrogate that individual and perhaps learn about ongoing
plots; but if the strike is done, that opportunity is lost. Are you saying today
that it is totally unconnected to the Obama administration's shift in its
detainee policy?

MR. BRENNAN: I can say unequivocally, Senator, that there's never been occasion, that I'm aware of, where we had the opportunity to capture a terrorist and we didn't, and we decided to take a lethal strike. So, certainly, there is no correlation there as far as any type of termination of the CIA's detention and interrogation program and that increase in strikes.

Now, I will say that if you look out over the last four years, what
 happened in a number of places, such as Yemen, and other areas, was that
 there was, in fact, a growth of al-Qa'ida, quite unfortunately.

And so, what we were trying to do, in this administration, is to take every measure possible to protect the lives of American citizens, whether it be abroad or in the United States, as well as a maturation of capabilities and insight into those intelligence plots as a result of the investment that was made in the previous administration that allowed us, in *this* administration, to take appropriate actions.

SENATOR COLLINS: Well, let's talk further about the targeted killings. 7 When the targeted killings began several years ago, the first-order effect of 8 these operations was the elimination of the senior operational leadership of 9 al-Qa'ida, many of the core leaders. Obviously, that is a critical priority. 10 We have heard both former CIA Director Michael Hayden, in an 11 interview on CNN, and General McChrystal say that it is now changed, and 12 that the impact of those strikes is creating a backlash. 13 For example, General McChrystal said, "The resentment created by 14 American use of unmanned strikes is much greater than the average 15 American appreciates. They are hated on a visceral level, even by people 16

17 who have never seen one or seen the effects of one."

He added that the targeted killings by remotely piloted aircraft add to the perception of American arrogance that says, "Well, we can fly where we want; we can shoot where we want, because we can."

And General Hayden has also expressed concerns, that now that the

strikes are being used at the lower levels, arguably, that they are creating a
backlash that is undermining the credibility of governments and creating
new terrorists when a neighbor or family member is killed in the course of
the operations.

5 Do you agree with General McChrystal and Director Hayden about the 6 potential backlash from the strikes, from the targeted killings, at this point? 7 I'm not talking about the initial strikes.

8 **MR. BRENNAN:** I think that is something that we have to be very 9 mindful of, in terms of what the reaction is to any type of U.S.

10 counterterrorism activities that involve the dropping of ordnance anywhere 11 in the world; absolutely. Whether it's a remotely piloted aircraft or whether

12 it's a manned aircraft, I think we have to take that into account.

But I would not agree with some of the statements that you had quoted there, because what we, in fact, have found in many areas is that the people are being held hostage to al-Qa'ida in these areas and have welcomed the work that the U.S. Government has done with their governments to rid them of the al-Qa'ida cancer that exists.

SENATOR COLLINS: Finally, today, this Committee received the OLC
 memos describing the legal justifications that many of us, particularly those
 who have been on the Committee far longer than I, have been seeking for
 some time. And I, too, spent a large part of this morning reading them.

1	Yet the Obama administration within months of taking office released
2	several OLC memos describing the legal justification for the treatment of
3	terrorist detainees that were held in U.S. custody.
4	Do you think it was appropriate that a different standard was applied to
5	the release of the memos from the Bush administration than those produced
6	by the Obama administration?
7	MR. BRENNAN: Well, respectfully, Senator, I don't think it was a
8	different standard. Not being a
9	SENATOR COLLINS: Well
10	MR. BRENNAN: a lawyer
11	SENATOR COLLINS: Well, one was released within four months
12	MR. BRENNAN: Right.
13	SENATOR COLLINS: of the Obama administration taking office.
14	MR. BRENNAN: Right.
15	SENATOR COLLINS: The other had been requested for a very long
16	much longer time.
17	MR. BRENNAN: Right.
18	SENATOR COLLINS: And released only today.
19	MR. BRENNAN: I'm not a lawyer. I've come to learn the term sui
20	generis, which means that, you know, it has obviously unique circumstances
21	surrounding it.

The OLC memos that were released shortly after the President came into office -- they were released because the program was terminated. It was no longer in existence. OLC -- Office of Legal Counsel -- opinions that deal with ongoing activities, ongoing programs -- it's a different animal.

And, therefore, I think those decisions were looked at in a much, sort
 of, different way because of those sui generis circumstances.

SENATOR COLLINS: Well, I would say to you that both are absolutely 7 essential to the ability of Congress to carry out its oversight responsibilities. 8 Finally, the Intelligence Reform Act and Terrorism Prevention Act of 9 2004, with which you're very familiar, and of which I was a co-author, 10 requires the Director of National Intelligence to recommend who the CIA 11 Director should be to the President of the United States. 12 I'm aware of General Clapper -- the DNI's letter endorsing your 13 nomination, but that's different from his actually *recommending* to the 14 President that you be chosen. To your knowledge, did General Clapper 15 recommend to the President that you be nominated for this position? 16 **MR. BRENNAN:** I know for certain that he made a recommendation to 17 the President, but I would defer to General Clapper to tell you what that 18

19 recommendation is.

20 **SENATOR COLLINS:** Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Senator Heinrich?

1 **SENATOR HEINRICH:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Brennan, let me join my colleagues in thanking you for your service to your country and welcoming you to the Committee. And should you be confirmed, I'd like to start by just inviting you to visit New Mexico at some point, and in particular, Sandia and Los Alamos National Labs. Because, while you often don't hear about the contributions that they make to our Intelligence Community, I can assure you that that support is vital to keeping our nation safe.

I've got a few questions, and please forgive me if some of these return
to some of the things you've heard from other senators. I want to start with
your November 2007 interview with CBS News, where you said: "There has
been a lot of information that has come out of these interrogation
procedures that the Agency has, in fact, used, against the real hard-core
terrorists. It has saved lives."

Other intelligence officials went a lot further than that in defending the use of so-called "enhanced interrogation techniques" at the time, and some still do.

If your review of the Committee study convinces you that these
 techniques did not, in fact, save lives, I'd like to ask -- will you be as public in
 condemning the program as you were in its defense; in other words, will you
 set the record straight?

1 **MR. BRENNAN:** I will do whatever possible to make sure that the 2 record is straight and that I speak fully and honestly on it.

SENATOR HEINRICH: I want to return to a question that Mr. Udall
 asked you. Would you object -- and if so, why -- to a public release of a truly
 declassified version of the Committee's report?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I would give such a request for
declassification every due consideration. There is a lot of information and
material in those volumes with a lot of potential consequences, as far as its
public release. And at the same time that we have a commitment to
transparency, we also, though, have a tremendous commitment to making
sure that we keep this country safe by protecting its secrets.

There are a lot of equities as far as liaison partners, other types of things, operational activities, maybe source and method, so it has to be looked at very, very carefully.

SENATOR HEINRICH: Well, I would just say I agree with you that
 sources and methods, and many of the operational details, absolutely should
 never be declassified, but there's some basic principles, I think, in that
 report that I think it's going to be very important for history to be able to
 judge. And I would urge you to look closely at that.
 Senator Levin asked about waterboarding. Let me follow up a little bit.

In November 2007 interview with CBS News, you were asked if

waterboarding was torture, and you said, "I think it is certainly subjecting an
individual to severe pain and suffering, which is the classic definition of
torture. And I believe, quite frankly, it's inconsistent with American values
and it's something that should be prohibited." Is that still your view?

5 **MR. BRENNAN:** Yes, Senator, it is.

6 **SENATOR HEINRICH:** Thank you. Do you believe that all agencies of 7 the United States Government should be held to the interrogation standards 8 that are laid out in the Army Field Manual, as currently required by Executive 9 Order 13491? And do you support efforts to codify those requirements into 10 law?

MR. BRENNAN: The Army Field Manual certainly should govern the U.S. military's detention and interrogation of individuals.

13 The FBI has its own processes and procedures and laws that govern its 14 activities. So, what I wanted to do is to make sure that, you know,

appropriate sort of attention is paid to FBI as opposed to the military.

SENATOR HEINRICH: I understand. Back in 2006, you were part of an
 online discussion with The Washington Post, and you suggested at that time
 that the Director of the CIA should have a set five-year term, like the FBI
 Director, to guarantee "the absolute need for independence, integrity, and
 objectivity in the senior ranks of our Intelligence Community."

Given that you will instead serve at the pleasure of the President, how

1 do you maintain your independence?

MR. BRENNAN: Having grown up in the intelligence business for 25 2 years, I truly understand the importance and value of maintaining 3 independence, subjectivity, and integrity of the intelligence process. 4 I know when I've sat in the White House Situation Room and when I've 5 looked to the intelligence briefer, that if they were to advocate in any way a 6 policy preference, it really calls into question the independence, subjectivity, 7 and basis of that intelligence. I want them to give me the facts as it is, 8 irrespective of what their policy leanings or preferences might be, because 9 policymakers need to do that. 10 So, in order for me to maintain my integrity as an intelligence 11 professional, as I would go to the President or the Secretaries of State or 12

Defense, or into the National Security Council meetings, I would need to make sure I can say it straight, give it straight, and let the policymakers determine exactly the best course of action.

16 **SENATOR HEINRICH:** Thank you.

One last question: I believe it was during that same online discussion with Washington Post, you said, quote, "I think that there is an effort underway to get the CIA to adapt to the new realities of the Intelligence Community. The CIA has resisted many of these changes, which has been a problem. It's time to move forward." 1 What exactly did you mean, and has the CIA made progress in that 2 direction?

MR. BRENNAN: Well, Senator, a credit to you and your staff for pulling up that Washington Post online interview because I had not, you know, read that or thought about that in a while. And I must say that having grown up in the Agency for 25 years, as I said in my testimony, I have tremendous respect for that organization. It is exceptionally capable; competent.

But almost by dint of the nature of its work, it also at times is insular. 8 And it has not interacted and interoperated the way it needs to with the rest 9 of the Intelligence Community, the rest of the U.S. Government. At times, 10 that is to protect source and methods and to protect the secrets that it has. 11 But given the changes in the environment, given the changes in the 12 nature of our government, the CIA needs to play a part in this larger role. 13 And so, now, the head of the CIA does not sit on top of the Intelligence 14 Community; it is part of a larger Intelligence Community that is led by the 15 Director of National Intelligence. 16

So, my objective would be to make sure CIA's capabilities are truly
 going to be leveraged and empower the -- the responsibilities, the missions
 of the rest of the government. The Department of Homeland Security is a
 new creation. They need intelligence just like others do as well.

So, what I think I was conveying there is that, you know there was

resistance at the time of the IRTPA, as we well know, that they didn't want to
sort of break some of the past practices. Well, I think a lot of that resistance
is overcome and now I think CIA sees the benefits of having somebody that
can sit on top of the Community, and not have to sit on top of the Agency,
as well.

6 **SENATOR HEINRICH:** That's very helpful. Thank you very much.

7 I yield back, Madam Chair.

8 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much, Senator.

9 Senator King?

SENATOR KING: Thank you for your testimony and your stamina
 today.

First, I should tell you that in an earlier hearing today, Secretary Panetta was testifying before the Armed Services Committee. And, in answer to a question, he strongly endorsed your nomination. And I think the record should show that -- that Secretary Panetta was very complimentary of your capabilities and experience.

Secondly -- and this isn't really a question -- it's incredibly important for the CIA to be totally open with this Committee. The reason is that there's no one else watching. Typically in our country, the public is involved. The press is involved. There are a lot of people that have access to information of what the Department of Commerce is doing, or the Department of State. This is a unique situation, where *this* Committee and a comparable committee in the House are the only places that are really paying attention, in terms of our separation of powers. So it's not just *nice* to have that kind of openness; I think it's critically important. And I hope you subscribe to that view.

6 **MR. BRENNAN:** Absolutely; I do, Senator.

SENATOR KING: Just briefly, and I think Senator Warner touched on
 this -- going forward, there needs to be some serious discussion with the
 Department of Defense about where the CIA ends and the Department of
 Defense starts, in terms of counterterrorism activities and operations.
 And I don't need to pursue that, but I think Senator Warner raised an

And I don't need to pursue that, but I think Senator Warner raised an important point, because in this day and age, we just can't be duplicating a whole set of capabilities and priorities and officers and procedures and everything else.

15 I take it you subscribe to that.

MR. BRENNAN: I do agree, Senator, and I look forward, in a closed
 session, to talking to you about some specific areas where I really do believe
 that Defense-CIA relationship and integration of effort is critically important
 to the safety and security of this nation.

20 So again, redundant -- mindful of not having any type of redundant 21 capabilities or waste resources, we need to make sure that we can leverage 1 the capabilities that exist in both organizations for the good of this country.

SENATOR KING: And the area I want to spend a little bit of time on is
the drone policy, and particularly as it relates to American citizens. There's
a lot of law and history involved in our system of checks and balances.
James Madison famously, in the 51st Federalist, said: "If people were angels,

6 we wouldn't need a government, and if the government was run by angels,

7 we wouldn't need checks and balances."

8 He concluded that angels were in as short supply then as they are 9 today. And therefore, we need these kinds of checks and balances.

The Fifth Amendment is pretty clear: no deprivation of life, liberty or 10 property without due process of law. And we're depriving American citizens 11 of their life when we target them with a drone attack. Now, I understand 12 that it's under military circumstances; these are enemy combatants and all of 13 those kinds of things. But I would like to suggest to you that you consider --14 and Madam Chairman, I'd like to suggest to the Committee that we consider 15 -- a FISA court-type process where an American citizen is going to be 16 targeted for a lethal strike. 17

And I understand you can't have co-commanders in chief, but having the Executive being the prosecutor, the judge, the jury, and the executioner, all in one, is very contrary to the traditions and the laws of this country, and particularly in a situation where there's time. If -- a soldier on a battlefield doesn't have time to go to court, but if you're planning a strike over a matter
of days, weeks or months, there is an opportunity to at least go to
something outside of the Executive Branch body, like the FISA court, in a
confidential and top-secret way, make the case that this American citizen is
an enemy combatant, and at least that would be -- that would be some check
on the activities of the Executive.

I have great confidence in you. I have great confidence in President
Obama. But all the lessons of history is it shouldn't matter who's in charge,
because we should have procedures and processes in place that will protect
us no matter who the people are that are in the particular positions.

11 How do you react to this suggestion?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I think it's certainly worth of discussion. Our tradition -- our judicial tradition is that a court of law is used to determine one's guilt or innocence for past actions, which is very different from the decisions that are made on the battlefield, as well as actions that are taken against terrorists, because none of those actions are to determine past guilt for those actions that they took.

The decisions that are made are to take action so that we prevent a future action, so we protect American lives. That is an inherently Executive Branch function to determine, and the Commander-in-Chief and the Chief Executive has the responsibility to protect the welfare, well-being of 1 American citizens.

So the concept I understand and we have wrestled with this in terms of
whether there can be a FISA-like court, whatever -- a FISA-like court is to
determine exactly whether or not there should be a warrant for, you know,
certain types of activities. You know --

6 **SENATOR KING:** It's analogous to going to a court for a warrant --7 probable cause --

MR. BRENNAN: Right, exactly. But the actions that we take on the counterterrorism front, again, are to take actions against individuals where we believe that the intelligence base is so strong and the nature of the threat is so grave and serious, as well as imminent, that we have no recourse except to take this action that may involve a lethal strike.

SENATOR KING: I completely agree with you, and I understand the 13 dilemma. And I'm not trying to suggest anything that would limit our ability 14 to take action on behalf of American citizens. I would just feel more 15 comfortable if somebody other than a Member of the Executive said, "Yes, 16 we agree that the evidence is so strong," et cetera, as you stated it. 17 In the Hamdi decision, Sandra Day O'Connor had a wonderful 18 statement: "A state of war is not a blank check for the President when it 19 comes to the rights of the nation's citizens." 20

21 MR. BRENNAN: Right. And that's why I do think it's worthy of

discussion. And the point particularly about due process really needs to be
taken into account because there's not a different standard as far as if a U.S.
citizen joins al-Qa'ida, you know, in terms of the intelligence base or
whatever. But American citizens by definition are due much greater due
process than anybody else by dint of their citizenship.

So I think this is a very worthwhile discussion. I look forward to talking
to the Committee and others about it. What's that appropriate balance
between Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branch responsibilities in this
area?

10 **SENATOR KING:** I appreciate your consideration and, again, appreciate

11 your testimony today. And thank you for your service to the country.

12 Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

13 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much, Senator.

We'll do another quick round. I think one of the problems is now that the drone program is so public, and one American citizen is killed, people don't know much about this one American citizen -- so-called. They don't know what he's been doing. They don't know what he's connected to. They don't know the incitement that he has stirred up.

And I wonder if you could tell us a little bit about Mr. al-Awlaki and what he had been doing?

21 MR. BRENNAN: Well, Senator, I'm not going to talk about any particular

operation or responsibility on the part of the U.S. Government for anything -CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: See, that's the problem. That's the problem. I
think when people hear "American citizen," they think somebody who's
upstanding; this man was not upstanding, by a longshot. And now, maybe
you cannot discuss it here, but I've read enough to know that he was a real
problem.

7 **MR. BRENNAN:** Well, I can talk about Mr. al-Awlaki.

8 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** And if you were in jeopardy -- that's right.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, and before he died he was intimately involved in
activities that were designed to kill innocent men, women, and children, and
mostly Americans. He was determined to do that. He was not just a
propagandist. He was, in fact, part of the operational effort that is known as
al-Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula and had key responsibilities in that regard.

14 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Can I ask you some questions about him?

¹⁵ **MR. BRENNAN:** You're the Chairman.

16 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** You don't have to answer. Did he have a 17 connection to Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, who attempted to explode a

18 device on one of our planes over Detroit?

19 MR. BRENNAN: Yes, he did.

20 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Could you tell us what condition it was?

21 MR. BRENNAN: I would prefer not to at this time, Senator. I'm not

1 prepared to.

CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Okay. Did he have a connection to the Fort
 Hood attack?

MR. BRENNAN: That is al-Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula has -- as a 4 variety of means of communicating and inciting individuals, whether that be 5 websites, or e-mails, or other types of things. And so, there are a number of 6 occasions where individuals, including Mr. al-Awlaki, has been in touch with 7 individuals. And so, Senator, again, I'm not prepared to address the 8 specifics of these, but suffice it to say --9 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** I'll just ask you a couple questions. Did Faisal 10 Shahzad, who pled quilty to the 2010 Times Square car bombing attempt, 11 tell interrogators in 2010 that he was inspired by al-Awlaki? 12 **MR. BRENNAN:** I believe that's correct, yes. 13 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Last October, al-Awlaki -- did he have a direct 14 role in supervising and directing AQAP's failed attempt, well, to bring down 15 two United States cargo aircraft by detonating explosives concealed inside 16 two packages, as a matter of fact, inside a computer printer cartridge? 17 MR. BRENNAN: Mr. al-Awlaki was involved in overseeing a number of 18 these activities. Yes, there was a relationship there. 19 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: And was it true that they were so concealed 20

that the first attempt to find and did not reveal them? It took an asset

coming back with -- to say, "Go again, look at this," to find it? 1 **MR. BRENNAN:** Yes the concealment method that was used in that was 2 one of the best we had ever encountered. 3 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: So, Mr. al-Awlaki is not, by far, an American 4 citizen of whom anyone in America would be proud? 5 MR. BRENNAN: Mr. al-Awlaki was part of al-Qa'ida, and we're at war 6 with al-Qa'ida, and it was his strong determination to kill Americans on 7 behalf of al-Qa'ida. 8 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you. 9 Is it true that in the last four years, the FBI has arrested 100 people, 10 either planning, conspiring, or trying to commit a terrorist attack on this 11 nation? 12 MR. BRENNAN: I don't know the exact number, Chairman, but yes --13 they have arrested a lot of people. 14 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: It's over 100, but they have arrested a lot of 15 people, and that's because of good -- of good, sound intelligence. 16 I think -- and this is just me -- what people forget is that they will kill us 17 if they can, and it's extraordinarily difficult if you can't get in to where they 18 were hiding. Would it have been possible to have arrested Mr. al-Awlaki 19 where he was, in Yemen? 20 MR. BRENNAN: It is -- there are parts of Yemen that are ungoverned 21

128

and beyond the reach of the Yemeni government security and intelligence
services. And we work very closely with the Yemenis to see if we can arrest,
detain, individuals. Whenever we can, we want to do that, because it's very
valuable for us.

Any actions that are taken in concert with the Yemeni government are done -- in terms of any type of strikes that we might engage there with them -- are done only because we do not have the ability to bring those individuals into custody.

- 9 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Thank you. My time is up.
- 10 Senator Chambliss?

¹¹ **VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS:** Thanks, Madam Chair.

In 2002, what was your knowledge of interrogation videotapes about

13 Abu Zubaydah, and did you seek any information about an Office of General

14 Counsel review of them in 2002?

¹⁵ **MR. BRENNAN:** I don't have a recollection of that, Senator.

¹⁶ **VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS:** Of the tapes, or that request?

17 MR. BRENNAN: At the time, in 2002, I do not know what my

involvement or knowledge was at the time of the tapes. I believe that they --

19 I was aware of the Abu Zubaydah debriefings and interrogation sessions

20 being taped.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Okay, it should be no surprise that

many Members have been dissatisfied with the administration's cooperation
 on the Benghazi inquiries.

For example, Senator Graham asked Director Clapper, in a hearing, if he was aware of the series attacks in Benghazi, in the summer of 2012, and asked if he had informed the President about those attacks. Now, that seemed like a perfectly reasonable question, and the DNI said he would get us an answer.

8 When we got answers back from the DNI's office, there was a notation 9 next to this particular question that Senator Graham asked, and here's what 10 it said, and I quote, "Per NSS" -- that's the National Security Staff -- "No 11 response required."

Mr. Brennan, that's your shop; do you have any knowledge about why Senator Graham's question was not to be answered?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I think there's a longstanding tradition
 understanding of respecting the executive privilege that exists in the Office
 of the Presidency, and in terms of what information is provided to the
 President, or advice, counsel, to him.

So it's -- I would suspect, then, that that question gets into this issue of
 the executive privilege, which I think, again, has been a longstanding
 tradition.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Now, are you sure that's the answer, or

1 you think that's probably what it was?

2 **MR. BRENNAN:** I don't know, firsthand, because that would not been a 3 request coming to me.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: And I understand that, so my direction
to you -- what I'll ask of you -- is that you go back and review that; we'll get
you notation if necessary, and if you could just give us a written response to
that, if possible.

8 **MR. BRENNAN:** You deserve a response, certainly.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: This weekend, Secretary Panetta
10 confirmed that information that led to Bin Laden came from detainees and
11 the CIA's EIT program. His account comports with information we were
12 provided immediately after the raid, and in months to follow, from the CIA
13 analyst who actually tracked down bin Laden. These analysts told us it was
14 detainee information that was key to them finding the courier and,
15 ultimately, bin Laden.

Now, were you briefed by any of the analysts who tracked down bin
 Laden?

- 18 MR. BRENNAN: Before the operation?
- 19 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Yes.

20 MR. BRENNAN: Oh, absolutely; I was engaged with them.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Okay. And is that the information that

was given to you -- that it came from interrogation of detainees on whom
2 EITs had been used?

MR. BRENNAN: I don't recall if I was given that information specifically.
 They talked about the chain of sort of collection that took place that was
 related to some of the information coming from the detainees. Yes, so,
 there was some there.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Do you agree with Secretary Panetta's
 comments?

MR. BRENNAN: That there some information that came out from there?
 VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Yes, that led to the courier.

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I now, again, looking at this document from SSCI, this report, I don't know what the facts are, or the truth is. So I really need to look at that carefully and see what CIA's response is because the SSCI report calls into question whether or not any of the information was unique and led to it.

VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS: Fair enough. Suffice it to say, Secretary Panetta's comments are in direct conflict with the report that came out of this Committee recently. And you know I have serious concerns about that interrogation study that was voted out by Committee.

Now, you told me a couple of days ago when we met that the study was not objective," and it was "a prosecutor's brief, written with an eye toward finding problems." And you went on to say that you're withholding
judgment on the merits and action until you read the response.

And it's my understanding, from what you've said, that that's what 3 you're going to do. Suppose the CIA takes the position that the study's 4 Finding and Conclusions are wrong? I think I know John Brennan well 5 enough to know that you're going to stand up and say whatever's on your 6 mind, and whatever you conclude. And I'm not going to ask you for a 7 response to that, but I know you'll review it with an open mind, and give us 8 your thoughts and your opinions about the CIA's response to it, and how we 9 move forward with this. 10

11 MR. BRENNAN: I assure you, Senator, I will do that.

12 **VICE CHAIRMAN CHAMBLISS:** Thank you very much.

13 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much, Senator.

14 Senator Wyden?

15 **SENATOR WYDEN:** Thank you.

16 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Oh, excuse me -- Senator Rockefeller?

17 **SENATOR ROCKEFELLER:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

18 I was just making a comment to the Chair, Mr. Brennan, that I've been

19 through a whole lot of confirmation hearings in 28 years here -- and

including quite a few CIA directors -- and I quite honestly do not recall

anybody who was more forthright, more direct, more accommodating,

without violating who you are, more open to the possibility of working with
this Committee in a way that will do two things: one, that will give the folks
at CIA, who probably constantly worry about what is the next awful thing
that we're going to say about them -- but that's not our intention, because
we're into the business of problem-solving, and if we have to write a 6,000page thing, it isn't fun for us; we're trying to solve a problem.

I have a feeling you understand that. I have a feeling that you feel that
the CIA, if they felt that they were working in -- you know, with some
contention with the oversight committee in the Senate, but, nevertheless,
that the Senate was involved, was informed, was interested; that this would
be something that they would welcome; that there are a lot of people who've
been at the CIA for quite a while, who may be sort of stuck in that mid-rank
crisis, et cetera, who are looking for an open, fresh, strong leader.

I happen to think you are that leader. I've felt that since our
 conversation. I felt that from before our conversation. And we haven't had
 our secret meeting yet, so I always -- but I'm not going to -- I'm sure I'm not
 going to change my mind.

I just think you've done an extraordinary job of patience, of courtesy, of
wisdom, of being able to -- the only question that you couldn't answer that
I'm aware of was who was it that took notes on some meeting that you had,
teleconference that you had 20 years ago. But I find it in my heart to forgive

1 you for that.

2 So, to me, I think you're a terrific leader, and I'll look forward to 3 Tuesday. But I think you're the guy for the job, and the *only* guy for the job.

MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Senator, for those very kind words. And I
haven't lived up to them yet. And if I were to go to CIA, as I think some
people have said -- some senators have said, you want to hear not just
words, but you want to actually see the actions.

It's a daunting task to go over to CIA. I want every Member of this 8 Committee to be an ardent advocate, proponent, and defender of the men 9 and women of the Central Intelligence Agency. And I see it as my obligation 10 to represent them to you on their behalf, so that when times get tough, and 11 when people are going to be criticizing and complaining about the CIA, I 12 have all of you to say you knew about what the CIA was doing, you 13 supported it, and you will defend it. 14 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Senator Burr? 15

16 **SENATOR BURR:** Thank you, Chairman.

17 I'm going to try to be brief, because I've noticed you're on your fourth

18 glass of water, and I don't want to be accused of waterboarding you.

19

20 Mr. Brennan, with the exception of our request for the Presidential Daily

(Laughter.)

21 Briefs around the time of Benghazi for which there was executive privilege

claimed, do you know of any other claim of executive privilege on any of the
documents that this Committee's waiting on right now?

MR. BRENNAN: Senator, I know that there are requests for some emails that might have taken place between the Intelligence Community and the White House, whatever, and so there are a number of sort of elements that I think people are looking at. So --

SENATOR BURR: But none that executive privilege have been claimed
 on. Correct?

9 **MR. BRENNAN:** Well, I am not in a position to say that, Senator, and I 10 would defer to those individuals -- the White House counsel and others -- to 11 make those determinations about what they want to --

SENATOR BURR: Well, let me say it from this end. They have not
 justified not producing those documents based upon executive privilege.
 So, I assume, if they're going to claim it, then they need to claim it quick.
 On January 13th of this year, the President signed into law the 2013
 Intelligence Authorization Act, which requires congressional notification of
 any authorized disclosure of national intelligence.

18 Now, we've not received any notifications of authorized disclosures.

19 Have there been any authorized disclosures, to your knowledge?

20 **MR. BRENNAN:** I would like to say that since you haven't received any 21 notifications, there haven't been.

SENATOR BURR: Would you consider the information reported in the 1 press about the counterterrorism playbook an authorized disclosure? 2

MR. BRENNAN: I don't know which piece you're talking about. There's 3 been a lot of -- of discussion out there in the - in the media and in the 4 newspapers about this. 5

And so, I don't know specifically about any classified information. The 6 fact that the administration may be going through a process to try to 7 institutionalize, codify, make as rigorous as possible, our processes and 8 procedures in and of itself is not a classified issue. 9

So those details that are classified, I don't know of any that came out in 10 some of those reports. 11

SENATOR BURR: Well, if there is classified information that's out there, 12 and it was not authorized, was there a crime report filed relative to the 13 playbook? 14

MR. BRENNAN: Presumably there was, Senator. Those decisions, as far 15 as initiating criminal investigations, are done by those departments and 16 agencies that have stewardship of that classified information and in 17 discussions with the Department of Justice to make a determination whether 18 or not in light of the fact that maybe so many people have access to it, how 19 they can proceed with some type of criminal investigations. 20 SENATOR BURR: As we prepare for the closed hearing on Tuesday --

21

this is not a question -- I'll ask you today that you be prepared to provide for
the Committee any specific discussions that you had where you were
authorized to reveal classified information or to talk about information on
covert action.

Again, not something I'd like to do today. The answer may be zero. If there are things, Tuesday would be an opportunity for you to provide. That was a question from -- a pre-hearing question from the Committee that was unanswered.

My last question is this: I'm still not clear on whether you think the information from CIA interrogations saved lives. Have you ever made a representation to a court, including the FISA court, about the type and importance of information learned from detainees, including detainees in the CIA detention and interrogation program?

MR. BRENNAN: First of all, on the first part of your question, that you're not sure whether or not I believe that there has been misinformation, I don't know --

SENATOR BURR: I said I wasn't clear whether I understood, whether I
 was clear.

MR. BRENNAN: And I'm not clear at this time, either, because I've read a report that calls into question a lot of the information that I was provided earlier on my impressions. When I was in the government as the head of National Counterterrorism Center, I know that I had signed out a number of affirmations related to the continuation of certain programs based on the analysis and intelligence that was available to analysts. And I don't know exactly what it was at the time, but we can look at that.

6 **SENATOR BURR:** But the Committee can assume that you had faith -- if 7 you make that claim to a court, including the FISA court -- you had faith in 8 the documents and in the information that was supplied you to make that 9 declaration?

MR. BRENNAN: Absolutely. At the time when, if I made any such affirmation, I would have had faith that the information I was provided was an accurate representation.

13 **SENATOR BURR:** Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: Senator Wyden?

15 **SENATOR WYDEN:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

16 We have talked for several hours now about the question of targeted

17 killings of Americans, and you've heard it from a number of senators. And

18 I'd like to get your reaction on one point in particular. And that is this

19 question, particularly in the context that you've given, that you've tried to

²⁰ focus in areas where the evidence is substantial, the threat is imminent,

²¹ where there is a particularly persuasive case that the targeted killing of an

1 American is warranted.

In that kind of case, do you believe that the President should provide an 2 individual American with the opportunity to surrender before killing them? 3 **MR. BRENNAN:** Senator, I haven't spoken about any specific operations 4 5 ---SENATOR WYDEN: I'm talking about the concept --6 MR. BRENNAN: Right. 7 **SENATOR WYDEN:** -- because you talk about the concept. 8 MR. BRENNAN: Right. Absolutely. 9 **SENATOR WYDEN:** You said imminent threats, serious evidence, grave 10 concern; certainly words that strike a chord with me. And that's why I'd be 11 interested in your thoughts on whether, in those kind of instances, the 12 President ought to give -- should give -- an individual American the 13 opportunity to surrender. 14 **MR. BRENNAN:** Right. I think in those instances, and right now, let's 15 use the example of al-Qa'ida, because if an American were to join al-Qa'ida, 16

we have routinely said -- openly, publicly, repeatedly -- that we're at war with

al-Qa'ida. We have repeatedly said that al-Qa'ida is in fact trying to kill

19 Americans, and that we are going to do everything possible to protect the

20 lives of American citizens from these murderous attacks from al-Qa'ida.

21 We have signaled this worldwide. We have repeatedly said it openly

and publicly. Any American who joins al-Qa'ida will know full well that they
have joined an organization that is at war with the United States and that has
killed thousands upon thousands of individuals, many, many of them who
are Americans.

So I think any American who did that should know well that they, in
 fact, are part of an enemy against us, and that the United States will do
 everything possible to destroy that enemy to save American lives.

SENATOR WYDEN: And I certainly -- and I said this at the very
 beginning -- I certainly want to be part of that effort to fight al-Qa'ida on all
 of these key fronts. I just want to have some answers -- and I'll give you
 another chance --whether you think the President should give an individual
 American the opportunity to surrender.

I think that Senator King, for example, talked about the idea of a new
 court, and there are going to be colleagues that are going to talk about a
 whole host of ideas. And I commend you for saying that you're open to
 hearing about that.

This is something that can be set in motion, I think, in a straightforward way, as a general principle. We're not talking about any one individual. And I think you've answered the question, and I won't go any further, unless you want to add anything to it.

The only other point I'd say is we've covered a lot of ground today. And

as far as I'm concerned, we've got a lot of ground still to cover. I've made it
clear that we've got to see any and all of those legal opinions, the ones that
the bipartisan group of senators asked for, before the vote. And to your
credit, you said you'd take the message back to the White House.

Because what it really goes to, Mr. Brennan, is this question of checks
and balances -- and we probably didn't use that word enough this afternoon -because I think that's really what this is all about. Our Constitution
fortunately gives the President significant power to protect our country in
dangerous times.

But it is not unfettered power; it's power that is balanced through this 10 special system that ensures congressional oversight and public oversight. 11 And so that's why these questions that I and others have been trying to get 12 at, in terms of congressional oversight, being able to get all of the opinions 13 that are relevant to the legal analysis for targeting Americans, and then to 14 learn more about how you're going to bring the public into the discussion. 15 And certainly you've been patient this afternoon, and I want you to 16 know I think we've covered a lot of ground, but I think we've got a lot to go. 17 And I'd be happy to give you the last word. I've got a little more time if you 18 want it. 19

20 **MR. BRENNAN:** Thank you, Senator. First of all, any member of al-21 Qa'ida, whether a U.S. citizen or non-U.S. citizen, needs to know that they have the ability to surrender, the right to surrender, anytime, anywhere
throughout the world. And they can do so before the organization is
destroyed. We will destroy that organization. And again, out there in alQa'ida, U.S. citizens and others, they can surrender anytime, turn themselves
in.

SENATOR WYDEN: Just on that point, I don't take a backseat to 6 anybody, in terms of fighting al-Qa'ida. That was why I came out with it 7 right at the outset. But I asked you a different guestion, and on the guestion 8 of what kind of evidence ought to be applied, whether there ought to be 9 geographic limits, the question of whether an individual should be allowed 10 to surrender. For -- for example, there is I think also a question whether the 11 obligation changes if, you know, a valid target has not been publicly 12 reported. 13

14 So there are issues, you know, here. And I think we're going to have to 15 continue those -- those discussions.

16 And Madam Chair, I thank you for this extra round.

17 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you.

18 Senator Coats?

19 **SENATOR COATS:** Thank you, Madam Chairman.

John, I want to just say, and I'm not going to go into it here -- I think it

21 may be better held for further discussion next week in a classified room --

but this whole idea of leaks -- nothing upsets me more on this Committee,
and we've had a raft of these in the last couple of years, than to see
something that was discussed in classified area written up the next day in
the newspapers or on the part of the media. It drives some of us crazy. It
does me, anyway.

And so, maybe I'm a little paranoid about all this, and so forth. I just can't totally get my hands around this AQAP situation that we discussed earlier. But I'm going to defer that until Tuesday so we can discuss it in more detail.

Let me just ask you one question here. You said -- I don't have the date -- "The al-Qa'ida core has been decimated in the FATA." And we're aware of the significant efforts we've made and the progress we've made in that regard. But we see this thing metastasizing now across northern Africa and other parts.

What's your, you know, latest assessment of al-Qa'ida, in terms of its
control and operation of these smaller efforts that are popping up like a
whack-a-mole machine in different parts of the Middle East and North Africa?
MR. BRENNAN: Well, Senator, you used the exact right term when you
said al-Qa'ida has been metastasizing in different parts of the world. We
have the al-Qa'ida core that, in the past, I think exerted quite a bit of
orchestration or order over a number of these franchises that have

1 developed.

Now, as a result of the decimation of the core, and our ability to
interrupt a lot of the interaction and communication between them, a lot of
these different elements, like al-Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula, al-Qa'ida in
the Islamic Maghreb, and other elements, have grown up and developed as a
result of the domestic and local sort of environment.

And so they're all sort of, you know, unique unto themselves. They have different features and characteristics. We need to make sure that we're able to work with the governments and the intelligence and security services in the area so that we can put as much pressure on them as possible.

A number of them have, you know, local agendas. Some of them have local agendas as well as international agendas. Al-Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula in Yemen has a very determined insurgency effort underway in side of Yemen to try to, you know, bring that government down. And the government has done a great job, you know, fighting back.

There are other elements -- al-Qa'ida in Islamic Maghreb. You know, they're counter-narcotics -- they're narcotics smugglers. They're human traffickers. They involve quite a bit in kidnapping and ransoms, and also involve in tourist attacks.

20 So, what we need to do is to take into account what the environment is, 21 who we can work with, and how we're going to put pressure on them. But any element that is associated with al-Qa'ida has, as part of its agenda,

² death and destruction. And so, I fully agree what we need to do is be

³ mindful of the metastasization of the al-Qa'ida cancer.

SENATOR COATS: But in relationship to some kind of centralized
 control over all these things, having said that, the core is decimated.

MR. BRENNAN: It really varies, you know. We do see al-Qa'ida core
trying to exert some control over some of these elements. There's a lot of
independence of effort, you know, autonomous efforts that are underway.
And I'd be happy to be able to talk in, you know, closed session about the
particular relationships that exist between al-Qa'ida and some of these other
elements.

12 **SENATOR COATS:** Very good. Thank you.

13 Thank you, Madam Chairman.

14 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much, Senator.

15 Senator Collins? Last, but far from least.

16 **SENATOR COLLINS:** Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Brennan, I want to follow up on the point that Senator Coats just

raised with you, because if you looked at a map back in 2001, you would see

19 that al-Qa'ida was mainly in Afghanistan and Pakistan. And if you look at a

²⁰ map today, you would see al-Qa'ida in all sorts of countries.

That's not to say that there weren't cells in other countries back in

2001, but it raises the question in my mind of whether, even though we've
been successful in taking out some of the core of al-Qa'ida and some highlevel leaders, whether our strategy is working. If the cancer of al-Qa'ida is
metastasizing, do we need a new treatment?

MR. BRENNAN: What we've tried to do, Senator, over the past decade
and longer, is to be able to treat this real cancer in a number of ways:
sometimes it takes lethal force, sometimes it takes military might,
sometimes it takes working with our partners in a variety of ways,
sometimes it takes addressing some of the infrastructural, institutional, and
other deficiencies that exist in these countries that al-Qa'ida takes advantage
of.

If you look at the geographic map, you know, in the area from South Asia over to the Middle East and North Africa, there has been tremendous political turbulence in that area over the past decade, and particularly in the last couple years. There are a lot of spaces -- ungoverned spaces -- that al-Qa'ida has taken advantage of. We've been able to make some significant progress in certain areas.

Somalia is, in fact, a good example of a place where we have worked with neighboring countries, we've worked with the local government, and we've worked with AMISOM, a multilateral element within Africa, to try to suppress the efforts of Al Shabaab and al-Qa'ida in East Africa; good progress we made there. Because it has to be comprehensive; it's not just a
kinetic solution to this by any means.

Now, as we look at the Sahel, and the area in Mali, and other areas, 3 these are tremendous expanses of territory where al-Qa'ida can put down 4 roots beyond the reach of local governments. And so they've been able to 5 put down roots, and they've been -- it's been unattended because of the 6 difficulties that these countries have even feeding their people, much less 7 putting in place a system of laws and the intelligence and security capability. 8 So, is it a different strategy; it has to be a comprehensive one. But al-9 Qa'ida and this -- you know, the forces of Islamic extremists, that have really 10 corrupted and perverted Islam, are making some progress in areas that give 11 me real concern. That's why I look at a place like Syria right now, and what 12 is going on in that country; we cannot allow vast areas to be exploited by al-13 Qa'ida and these extremist forces, because it will be to our peril. 14

SENATOR COLLINS: I certainly agree with you on that, and in our
 classified or closed hearing next week I'm going to be asking you about
 Syria, and also the Iranian threat. But I don't think those are appropriate in
 open session.

Just two final questions: one has to do with priorities that you would set as Director if you are confirmed. In recent years, paramilitary operations obviously had consumed a lot of resources, expertise, time, energy, and effort at the CIA; do you believe this has been at the expense of traditional
CIA responsibilities -- collection, analysis, all source?

MR. BRENNAN: Well, certainly, there have been opportunity costs
 because of the dedication of those resources. What I would need to do, if I
 were to go to CIA, is to inventory exactly how our resources are being
 dedicated against the wide variety of strategic priorities to protect our
 country.

In terms of operational collection activities worldwide, in terms of the all source analysis being done, what are we doing in these other areas? Cyber, you know, weapons proliferation, political turbulence -- there are so many different areas. Counterterrorism is an important one. There is also an intersection between counterterrorism and a lot of these other areas, counter-proliferation, international organized crime, other things.

14 So we really want to optimize those resources so that we can, in fact, 15 leverage the capabilities we have, in order to deal with these very 16 challenging issues across a very large globe.

SENATOR COLLINS: Mr. Brennan, you have devoted a great deal of
 your life to public service, for which I thank you. And you obviously
 understand the world of intelligence in a way that few people do. You've
 been an intelligence professional for much of your professional life.

In the last four years, you have held a political position at the White

House. And I have been talking to people at the CIA, whom I respect, and 1 one intelligence official told me that a key question for the men and women 2 of the CIA is which John Brennan are they going to get? Are they going to 3 get John Brennan who's been the right-hand advisor of President Obama in a 4 political White House -- and by the *nature* of the position -- I don't say that 5 critically; that's the position -- or are they going to get John Brennan, who 6 was a career CIA officer, who worked his way up in the ranks? 7 And the concern is that they want to hear that you are going to be the 8 CIA's representative to the White House, not the White House's 9 representative to the CIA. And I just want to give you the opportunity today 10

11 to respond to that concern.

I would note that I also heard very good comments from people with
 whom I talked, and -- but I think it's important, when someone's coming
 from a political role, to make clear that you're going to be the leader of the
 Agency and not the White House's agent within the Agency.

MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Senator. I think if I were to be fortunate, privileged, and honored to go out to CIA, the CIA would get the John Brennan who is neither a Democrat nor Republican, nor has ever been; a John Brennan who has a deep appreciation and respect for the intelligence profession -- one who has been fortunate to have lived it for 25 years; a John Brennan who has had the great fortune to be in the White House the past four years, watching and understanding how intelligence is used in support
 of our national security. CIA would get a John Brennan who has been
 working national security issues for my life.

They would get a John Brennan who really understands that the value of 4 intelligence, the importance of intelligence, is not to tell the President what 5 he wants to hear, not to tell this Committee what it wants to hear, but to tell 6 the policymakers, the Congressional overseers, what they need to hear --7 what the Intelligence Community, with all its great capability and expertise, 8 has been able to uncover and understand about world events that 9 fundamentally affect the lives of not just this generation of Americans, but 10 of future generations of Americans. 11

And so, if I had the great privilege to lead the men and women of the CIA, it would be the biggest honor of my life, and I would understand just how important and weighty that would be. And if I ever dishonored that responsibility, I couldn't look myself in the mirror. I couldn't look my parents, my family in the mirror. I couldn't look *you* in the face, and that is something that is very important to me.

So, I guess the proof will be in the pudding, the tasting of the pudding, and if I do have that opportunity, it would be my intention to make sure I did everything possible to live up to the trust and confidence that this Congress, this Senate, and this President might place in me.

1 **SENATOR COLLINS:** Thank you very much.

² Thank you, Madam Chairman.

3 **CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN:** Thank you very much.

If there are no further questions, John, I would like to associate myself
with what Senator Rockefeller said. I've sat through a number of these
hearings; I don't think I've ever heard anyone more forthright or more honest
or more direct. You really didn't hedge. You said what you thought. And I
want you to know that that's very much appreciated.

9 And I actually think you are going to be a fine and strong leader for the 10 CIA, and, you know, I can't help but say I am really fully supportive of this 11 and will do everything I possibly can to see that our Committee works with 12 you closely and honestly.

We will have a classified hearing. I am specifically going to just warn you that I would like to have you respond in detail to what I perceive as a difficult, evolving situation in North Africa now, with Tunisia, with Libya, with all these countries, and certainly with Mali, and how you plan to direct the Agency to deal with this evolving momentum that's taking place in Northern Africa.

So that will be for Tuesday. And at the request of Senator Levin, I ask
 unanimous consent to enter into the record a Joint Statement that he and I
 made on April 27, 2012.

1	(Whereupon, the Joint Statement of Senators Feinstein and Levin,
2	dated April 27, 2012, was submitted for the record. A copy of the
3	Statement follows.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: And secondly, in order to have Mr. Brennan's
2	answers to questions for the record by the time he returns before us in
3	closed session, I ask Members to the right questions for the record by 5
4	o'clock p.m. tomorrow that's Friday, February the 8^{th} so we have them
5	for you as soon as possible so that you can respond to them Tuesday.
6	I want to thank you and your family for being here, and I wish you well.
7	Thank you, and the hearing is adjourned.
8	MR. BRENNAN: Thank you, Chairman.
9	(Whereupon, at 6 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	