

“The culture of leaks has to change”¹, but at what expense to congressional oversight of the Executive Branch? An examination of Title V. of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

*Roseanne Sessa**

INTRODUCTION	236
I: INTELLIGENCE LEAKS AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT	
WITH RESPECT TO THE MEDIA.....	237
A. Unauthorized and Authorized Disclosures	237
B. Congressional Oversight of the Executive Branch ..	239
C. Increase in Executive Power and Privilege Since	
September 11 th	241
D. Historical National Security Leaks in the Media	242
E. Recent National Security Leaks in the Media	244
II: THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL	
YEAR 2013.....	246
A. History and Purpose of the Intelligence	
Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013	246
B. Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year	
2013	247
C. § 505: Prohibition on Certain Individuals Serving	
as Consultants	248
D. § 506: Limitation on Persons Authorized to	
Communicate With the Media	248
III: CRITICISM AND RESPONSE.....	249
A. Journalists.....	249
B. The Sunshine in Government Initiative	251
C. American Civil Liberties Union.....	253
D. Response to the Criticism	254
IV: LEGAL AND POLICY BASED IMPLICATIONS	255

1. Press Release, U.S. Senate Select Comm. on Intelligence, Feinstein, Chambliss Announce Committee Approval of Fiscal Year 2013 Intelligence Authorization (July. 25, 2012), *available at* <http://www.intelligence.senate.gov/press/record.cfm?id=337333>.

* J.D. Candidate, 2014, Seton Hall University School of Law; B.A., summa cum laude, 2010, Ramapo College of New Jersey. Special thanks to my advisor, Professor Jonathan Hafetz, for his expertise and guidance throughout the writing of this Comment.

V: DISCUSSION	260
VI. CONCLUSION	262

INTRODUCTION

Government officials, including members of Congress, communicate with members of the media regarding sensitive material on a daily basis.² Subsequently, this information often reaches the public through various media channels,³ helping the public sort out critical issues, which is a core feature of our democracy.⁴

A recent example demonstrates just how important this system is: in April 2012, a year after the killing of Osama bin Laden, intelligence officials briefed journalists regarding the future threats al-Qaeda posed to the United States.⁵ Armed with this knowledge, the public was able to stay informed about related governmental policies. Due to a recent rise in unauthorized leaks, the Senate Intelligence Committee proposed and approved an amendment to the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.⁶ These provisions, which aim to disrupt the flow of classified information to the press and public, would severely infringe upon the media's relationship with the government, and in turn, the people. If provisions of this magnitude are enacted, information such as the recent assessment of al-Qaeda would never reach the public, leading to a number of unintended consequences.

After considerable congressional debate and public criticism, however, the anti-leak provisions were removed from the bill.⁷ While these provisions ultimately failed, the

2. Editorial, *A Bill to Stop Security Leaks Puts a Plug on Democracy*, WASH. POST (July 30, 2012), http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/squelching-public-interest-in-national-security/2012/07/30/gJQAF0pHLX_story.html.

3. *Id.*

4. *Id.*

5. *Id.*

6. Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, S. 3454, 112th Cong. §§ 501-511 (2012) (as reported by S. Comm. on Intelligence, July 30, 2012); *see also* Press Release, U.S. Senate Select Comm. on Intelligence, Feinstein, Chambliss Announce Committee Approval of Fiscal Year 2013 Intelligence Authorization (July 25, 2012), available at <http://www.intelligence.senate.gov/press/record.cfm?id=337333>.

7. *See infra* note 152.

problem of leaks persists.⁸ It remains extremely likely that new legislation will be crafted and proposed to combat this issue in the near future.⁹

This Comment will argue that legislation, namely, Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, would negatively impact the system of congressional oversight by prohibiting members of Congress from talking to the media about intelligence activities. Congress uses the media as a way to exercise its constitutionally implied duty of oversight of the Executive Branch. Title V would therefore limit Congress's ability to monitor the conduct of intelligence agencies and ultimately pose a great risk to the checks and balances of government and the national security of the United States.

Part I will discuss intelligence leaks and congressional oversight with respect to the media. Part II will provide an overview of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 and its relevant provisions. Part III will discuss the recent backlash from various groups and media outlets concerning the Act. Part IV will outline the Act's legal and policy implications for Congress, the media, and the public. Finally, Part V will argue that Congress should not adopt legislation of this nature.

I: INTELLIGENCE LEAKS AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT WITH RESPECT TO THE MEDIA

A. *Unauthorized and Authorized Disclosures*

Most discussions about intelligence leaks revolve around the government regulating the flow of national security information.¹⁰ This is because the government has a substantial interest in protecting the national security of the country.¹¹ As such, the "executive and legislative branches of government have elaborate machinery for protecting the confidentiality of information used in policymaking and

8. *See infra* text accompanying notes 148-149.

9. *Id.*

10. Alan Katz, *Government Information Leaks and the First Amendment*, 64 CAL. L. REV. 108, 109 (1976).

11. *Id.*

administration.”¹²

A leak by a government employee is considered “the release, outside official public information channels, of previously undisclosed government information.”¹³ Leaks can be classified as either authorized or unauthorized.¹⁴ An authorized leak is defined as “an established part of government policy,”¹⁵ while an unauthorized leak is said to “[occur] when a government employee makes public information that her superiors and the government information machinery have chosen not to disclose.”¹⁶ Whether a leak is authorized or unauthorized, those that are disseminated by the media are an important source of political news and are likewise an effective means of influencing government policy.¹⁷ This Comment will focus in particular on the consequences of unauthorized leaks.

In 2009, former Director of National Intelligence, Dennis Blair, wrote a memorandum to the directors of the sixteen United States Intelligence Community Agencies,¹⁸ discussing the severe consequences posed by the unauthorized disclosure of classified information.¹⁹ He noted that “disclosures of classified information, including ‘leaks’ to the media can compromise sensitive sources and methods . . . and may allow our adversaries to learn about, deny, counteract, and deceive our intelligence collection methods, leading to the loss of critical capabilities, resources, and even lives.”²⁰ Blair further noted that over recent years, unauthorized disclosures have impaired the ability of the Intelligence Community to accomplish its mission and support its national security objectives.²¹

12. *Id.* at 108.

13. *Id.*

14. *Id.*

15. *Id.*

16. Katz, *supra* note 10, at 109.

17. *Id.*

18. GARY ROSS, WHO WATCHES THE WATCHMEN? THE CONFLICT BETWEEN NATIONAL SECURITY AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS 5 (NI Press ed., 2011), available at <http://www.fas.org/sgp/eprint/ross.pdf>.

19. *Id.* at 5-6.

20. *Id.*

21. *Id.*

B. Congressional Oversight of the Executive Branch

While these unauthorized disclosures have the potential to jeopardize national security, Congress also utilizes the media to exercise oversight of the Executive Branch. Among Congress's responsibilities are creating legislation, appropriating funds for Executive Branch operations, and monitoring whether the Executive Branch carries out its responsibilities effectively and in accordance with the law.²² This type of monitoring of the Executive Branch is also referred to as congressional oversight.²³ The Congressional Research Service defines congressional oversight as "the review, monitoring, and supervision of the implementation of public policy – of the Executive Branch,"²⁴ and this duty of oversight is embodied in Congress's implied powers under the Constitution.²⁵ Congress oversees the Executive Branch through a wide variety of channels, organizations, and structures.²⁶ Oversight techniques range from investigation and reporting requirements to more contemporary means,²⁷ such as utilizing media outlets.²⁸ Thus, "members of Congress, as the elected representatives of the American people, [have] the obligation to be the eyes and ears of the citizenry by closely watching over the policies of the President and executive officials."²⁹ This holds true for policies dealing with intelligence and national security where the President is the "sole organ for the Nation in foreign affairs . . . carrying with it preeminent authority in [these two policy areas]."³⁰

22. Kathleen Clark, *Congress's Right to Counsel in Intelligence Oversight*, 2011 U. ILL. L. REV. 915 (2011).

23. FREDERICK M. KAISER, WALTER J. OLESZEK & TODD B. TATELMAN, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., RL 30240, CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT MANUAL 1 (2011), available at <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30240.pdf>.

24. *Id.*

25. *Id.*

26. *Id.*

27. *Id.*

28. See *infra* text accompanying note 34; see also Letter from ACLU to U.S. Senate (Aug. 15, 2012) (on file with author), available at http://www.aclu.org/files/assets/8-15-12_-_aclu_on_s_3454_title_v_-_final.pdf.

29. Vicki Divoll, *President Obama's First Two Years: A Legal Reflection: The "Full Access Doctrine": Congress's Constitutional Entitlement to National Security Information from the Executive*, 34 HARV. J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 493, 500 (2011).

30. U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, LEGAL AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY DESCRIBED BY THE PRESIDENT 2 (2006), available at

Because the Executive Branch is traditionally responsible for intelligence and national security,³¹ it often uses its authority to limit the distribution of such information to the other branches of government.³² Some information, however, must be delivered to the Legislative Branch not only to help protect national security, but also to monitor the Executive Branch as a part of the system of separation of powers.³³ Because the Executive Branch is able to select what intelligence and national security information makes its way to the Legislative Branch, Congress often utilizes means, such as the media, to exercise its oversight function.³⁴

Congress empowers the media with information it receives to help moderate Executive Branch policies and activities that require close scrutiny.³⁵ With this information, the media attempts to influence executive behavior.³⁶ This relationship, however, is not one sided. The media also equips Congress with information it may need in order to perform its own job, creating a symbiotic relationship³⁷ whereby Congress has a chief ally in the mass media.³⁸ If the Executive Branch deprives Congress of access to this information, the public is in turn disposed of their power under the Constitution to ensure that the Executive Branch is not abusing its powers or using those powers poorly,³⁹ and the system of checks and balances is then disrupted.⁴⁰ What has further set this balance out of kilter has been the increase in executive power

<http://www.justice.gov/opa/whitepaperonnsalegalauthorities.pdf>; see also FREDERICK A. O. SCHWARTZ, JR. ET AL. UNCHECKED AND UNBALANCED: PRESIDENTIAL POWER IN A TIME OF TERROR, 1 (2007).

31. Louis Fisher, *Presidential Power in National Security: A Guide to the President-Elect*, THE WHITE HOUSE TRANSITION PROJECT (2007), <http://loc.gov/law/help/usconlaw/pdf/presidential-power-national-security.pdf>.

32. Clark, *supra* note 22, at 930-931.

33. *Id.*

34. See *supra* text accompanying note 28.

35. Clark, *supra* note 22, at 915.

36. *Id.*

37. Murrey Marder, *The Press and the Presidency: Silencing the Watchdog*, NIEMAN WATCHDOG (Apr. 16, 2008), <http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=240>; see also Mary-Rose Papandrea, Article, *Lapdogs, Watchdogs, and Scapegoats: The Press and National Security Information*, 83 IND. L.J. 233, 256 (2008).

38. Clark, *supra* note 22, at 915.

39. Divoll, *supra* note 29, at 493.

40. *Id.*

2014] *Examining Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act* 241

and privilege since the September 11th attacks.

C. Increase in Executive Power and Privilege Since September 11th

There has been a steadily increasing trend in executive power and the September 11th terrorist attacks have only accelerated this growth.⁴¹ For over a decade, the Executive Branch has operated on a “need to know” basis where certain information is safely protected and sparingly distributed.⁴² Congress has gradually found it more difficult to obtain information about how the Executive Branch exercises its power in various policymaking areas, specifically that of national security.⁴³

Executive privilege represents the President’s ability to withhold certain information sought by Congress.⁴⁴ Operating in a perfect system, this privilege would allow the President to seek candid advice from his advisors while still permitting Congress to obtain just enough information for it to perform its oversight function.⁴⁵ However, no system is perfect; in fact, executive privilege has recently limited Congress’s oversight function by denying it access to necessary information.⁴⁶ The President typically acts with little deference to or collaboration with Congress on matters relevant to national security.⁴⁷ History shows that executive power is not necessarily benign,⁴⁸ and that this newly expanded executive privilege has actually aided in tipping the

41. EMILY BERMAN, EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE: A LEGISLATIVE REMEDY 1 (2009), available at <http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/publications/Executive.Privilege.pdf>.

42. *Id.*

43. *Id.*

44. *Id.* at 2.

45. *Id.*

46. *Id.*

47. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30, at 1.

48. BERMAN, *supra* note 41, at 1. In her paper, Ms. Berman states that: (“When presidents are allowed to implement policies that have not been subject to scrutiny, the results have included justifying abusive interrogation and detention policies through flawed legal analysis; manipulating prosecutorial decision-making for partisan ends; engaging in unlawful conspiracies to influence the outcome of elections; unlawfully funding foreign paramilitary groups; and conducting unlawful surveillance of Americans.”)

constitutional balance of power.⁴⁹

The framers of the Constitution created a system of checks and balances to act as “a self-executing safeguard against the encroachment or aggrandizement of one branch at the expense of the other.”⁵⁰ This system relies on transparency⁵¹ and “when secrecy thwarts the efforts of the people and their elected representatives to obtain information, it undermines Congress’s core functions, its ability to enact legislation and exercise oversight.”⁵²

Therefore, the main problem with the rise of executive power and privilege is that it limits Congress’s oversight of the Executive Branch. To begin with, Congress has limited tools available to it to perform its oversight function.⁵³ Even when Congress does succeed in obtaining the information it seeks, it is often the case that too much time has passed for such information to serve a useful purpose.⁵⁴ To take away one of Congress’s primary means of oversight – the media – would exacerbate this problem.

More importantly, Congress’s need for information on national security issues is greater than its need for information in other policymaking areas.⁵⁵ Because this information is well guarded, the public depends on Congress to scrutinize national security policies to ensure that the government is not infringing on any of its rights.⁵⁶ The history of leaks, as discussed in the following section, shows just how vulnerable this area of policymaking is.⁵⁷

D. Historical National Security Leaks in the Media

Since the founding of the United States, leaks have played an important role in the country’s governance.⁵⁸ Nearly every

49. *Id.*

50. THE FEDERALIST NO. 47 (James Madison).

51. BERMAN, *supra* note 41, at 1.

52. *Id.*

53. *Id.* at 3.

54. *Id.* at 9.

55. *Id.* at 15.

56. *Id.*

57. See discussion *infra* Part I D.

58. Micha Zenko, *A Brief History of National Security Links, POLITICS, POWER, AND PREVENTATIVE ACTION* (June 8, 2012), <http://blogs.cfr.org/zenko/2012/06/08/a-brief-history-of-national-security-leaks/>.

administration is linked to leaking some type of national security information,⁵⁹ beginning with the first President of the United States, George Washington.⁶⁰ One of the first significant leaks that occurred during Washington's administration was when John Jay returned from Great Britain in 1795 with a treaty intended to end ongoing disputes carried forward from the American Revolution.⁶¹ Washington, however, did not want the contents of the treaty disclosed to the public until it was first reviewed by the Federalist Senate.⁶² Despite Washington's wishes, an Anti-Federalist newspaper acquired the entire text of the treaty and decided to publish it.⁶³

Other leaks of classified information throughout following administrations have included the details of the Iran-Contra Affair;⁶⁴ the Plame Affair;⁶⁵ the government's radiation and biological weapon experiments on unwitting Americans;⁶⁶ the effectiveness of weapons systems;⁶⁷ human rights abuses in Latin America, Asia, and Africa;⁶⁸ and many other illegally or

59. *Id.*

60. Papandrea, *supra* note 37, at 249.

61. *Id.*

62. *Id.*

63. *Id.*

64. John R. McGeehan, THE IRAN-CONTRA AFFAIR, NETPLACES, <http://www.netplaces.com/american-history/new-conservatism/the-iran-contra-affair.htm> ("In November 1986, word leaked to newspapers in November 1986 that the United States had secretly sold weapons to Iran.")

65. Tanya N. Ballard & Kevin Dumouchelle, *Key Players in the Plame Affair*, WASH. POST (Oct. 20, 2005, 5:02PM), <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/20/AR2005102001487.html> ("A July 14, 2003, newspaper column by Robert D. Novak sparked a two-year investigation into whether White House officials illegally leaked the identity of a covert CIA operative [Valerie Plume] in retaliation for public criticisms made by the operative's husband [Joseph C. Wilson] about the Bush administration's case for invading Iraq.")

66. *U.S. Promises to Release Data on Plutonium Test*, N.Y. TIMES (Nov. 21, 1993), <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/11/21/us/us-promises-to-release-data-on-plutonium-test.html> (discussing that 18 patients were injected with plutonium during secret experiments in the 1940s).

67. Eric Schmitt, Israel Plays Down Effectiveness of Patriot Missile, N.Y. TIMES (Oct. 31, 1991), <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/10/31/world/israel-plays-down-effectiveness-of-patriot-missile.html> ("Senior Israel scientists and military officers disclosed new information indicating that the American Patriot missiles used in Israel in the Persian Gulf war destroyed far fewer Scud missile warheads that previously believed.")

68. See Raymond Bonner, News Organizations Ask White House to Veto Secrecy Measure, N.Y. TIMES (Nov. 1, 2000), <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/11/01/us/news->

morally reprehensible government practices.⁶⁹ Moreover, some leaks have dealt with the exposure of questionable and potentially illegal practices, including the treatment of prisoners in Abu Ghraib⁷⁰ and Guantanamo Bay;⁷¹ wiretapping outside of the provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA); and extraordinary rendition.⁷² The nature and content of leaks has varied greatly since the founding of the United States, which will be demonstrated in the following section's discussion of the country's most recent national security leaks.

E. Recent National Security Leaks in the Media

Some media reports claim that the leaks of the Obama administration are "greater in magnitude and sensitivity than those of previous administrations."⁷³ President Obama, addressing the alleged leaks that occurred during his administration, stated in his remarks at a press conference in June 2012:

We're dealing with issues that can touch on the safety and security of the American people, our families, or our military personnel, or our allies. And so we don't play with that. And it is a source of consistent frustration, not just for my administration but for previous administrations, when this stuff happens.⁷⁴

Of the recent leaks in the United States, the more important ones⁷⁵ have been Stuxnet,⁷⁶ a classified cyber-

organizations-ask-white-house-to-veto-secrecy-measure.html.

69. Papandrea, *supra* note 37, at 254-255.

70. James Risen, *G.I.'s Are Accused of Abusing Iraqi Captives*, N.Y. TIMES (Apr. 29, 2004), <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/04/29/politics/29ABUS.html> ("American soldiers at a prison outside Baghdad have been accused of forcing Iraqi prisoners into acts of sexual humiliation and other abuses in order to make them talk.")

71. See Dana Priest & Joe Stephens, *Pentagon Approved Tougher Interrogations*, WASH. POST (May 9, 2004), <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2004/05/09/AR2005040206867.html>.

72. Erwin Chemerinsky, *Leaks Show Secrecy Overused*, NEWS OBSERVER (July 30, 2010), <http://www.newsobserver.com/2010/07/30/603536/leak-shows-secrecy-overused.html>.

73. Elise Cooper, *Political Leaks*, AMERICAN THINKER BLOG (Oct. 5, 2012), http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/10/political_leaks.html.

74. *Remarks by the President* (June 8, 2012), available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/06/08/remarks-president>.

75. *Id.*

76. Kim Zetter, *Sen. Feinstein Calls for Hearing on Stuxnet Leaks as FBI Begins*

attack program aimed at Iran's nuclear facilities,⁷⁷ the Obama administration's classified "kill list,"⁷⁸ a double-agent in Yemen,⁷⁹ and information relating to the bin Laden raid.⁸⁰ Moreover, the concern has become even greater as Americans, such as Edward Snowden⁸¹ and Bradley Manning,⁸² have used their jobs to leak some of the country's most sensitive intelligence information.⁸³ These latest leaks have sparked government officials' attention with a focus on reform.⁸⁴ Specifically, Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-California), Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, declared, "the culture of leaks has to change."⁸⁵

Probe, WIRED (June 6, 2012), <http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2012/06/stuxnet-leak-investigation/> (discussing that Stuxnext was a cyber-attack created as a "joint project of the U.S. and Israel, and that the worm that escaped its prescribed target after the Israelis made unspecified alterations to it. The spread of the worm ultimately led to its discovery by a computer security firm in Belarus in June 2010.").

77. Evan Perez & Adam Entous, *FBI Probes Leaks on Iran Cyberattack*, WALL ST. J. (June 5, 2012), <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303506404577448563517340188.html> (discussing disclosure of a cyber-attack aimed at Iran's nuclear facilities).

78. Jeremy Herb, *Senate Democrats Blast National Security Leak About Cyberattack Against Iran*, HILL BLOG (June 5, 2012), <http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/230985-senate-dems-blast-leaks-about-iranian-cyberattacks>.

79. *Id.*

80. Elise Cooper, *Political Leaks*, AMERICAN THINKER BLOG (Oct. 5, 2012), http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/10/political_leaks.html.

81. Ashley Fantz, *Is the Snowden case Manning, Part II? Not quite, experts say*, CNN (Aug. 2, 2013), <http://www.cnn.com/2013/08/01/us/snowden-manning/> ("United States Army Pvt. Bradley Manning leaked hundreds of thousands of classified documents about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and sensitive correspondence written by U.S. diplomats—information that WikiLeaks published. Some of that information was also analyzed and reported by The New York Times, Der Spiegel and The Guardian newspapers as well as other news outlets.").

82. *Id.* ("Edward Snowden, a former CIA employee and National Security Agency contract employee, told a Guardian journalist that the NSA was operating classified surveillance programs that track cell phone calls and monitor the e-mail and Internet traffic of virtually all Americans. To tell his story, he left his job and life in Hawaii, fled to China and is now in Russia, where he has been granted temporary asylum.").

83. *Id.*

84. Press Release, U.S. Senate Select Comm. on Intelligence, Feinstein, Chambliss Announce Committee Approval of Fiscal Year 2013 Intelligence Authorization (July 25, 2012), available at <http://www.intelligence.senate.gov/press/record.cfm?id=337333>.

85. *Id.*

II: THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

A. History and Purpose of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013

A Congressional oversight committee enacted the first Intelligence Authorization Act in 1978 to give Congress the “ultimate oversight hammer-control over the Intelligence Community’s purse strings.”⁸⁶ By contrast, Senator Feinstein in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence proposed the Senate’s version of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 after frustrations over recent media reports that disclosed key details of the nation’s counterterrorism operations.⁸⁷ Members of the Committee opined that each unauthorized disclosure puts American lives at risk, makes it more difficult to recruit assets, strains the trust of partners, and threatens imminent and irreparable damage to national security, especially at a time where there are constant, rapidly emerging threats.⁸⁸ George Little, Pentagon Press Secretary, confirmed the purpose of the bill at a July 24, 2012 Department of Defense News Briefing, asserting that its provisions were not an attempt to go after the media, but rather to protect classified information.⁸⁹ Supporters argued the bill advanced the government’s obligation to protect classified information and national security.⁹⁰

Proponents of the bill claimed that it would safeguard the nation and protect its citizens⁹¹ by preventing leaks of

86. James S. Van Wagenen, *A Review of Congressional Oversight*, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY (Apr. 14, 2007, 04:51 PM), <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/97unclass/wagenen.html>.

87. Press Release, U.S. House of Representatives Permanent Select Comm. on Intelligence, Feinstein, Chambliss, Rogers, Ruppertsberger Deplore Leaks of Classified National Security Information (June 6, 2012), <http://intelligence.house.gov/press-release/feinstein-chambliss-rogers-ruppertsberger-deplere-leaks-classified-national-security>.

88. *Id.*

89. *Transcript of DOD News Briefing with George Little from the Pentagon*, U.S. DEPT OF DEFENSE (July 24, 2012), <http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=5085>.

90. *Id.*

91. Press Release, Senator Dianne Feinstein, Feinstein Announces Committee Approval of Fiscal Year 2013 Intelligence Authorization (July 25, 2012),

2014] *Examining Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act* 247

classified information, which “can disrupt intelligence operations, threaten the lives of intelligence officers and assets, and make foreign partners less likely to work with [the United States].”⁹² The two provisions at issue in this Comment, §§ 505 and 506, were said to give the intelligence community the resources it needs in order to do its job of protecting the public and the country.⁹³ In light of the recent surge of national security leaks that have occurred during the Obama administration, these changes are demanded by those who support leak reform.⁹⁴

The controversial provisions at the core of this Comment originated in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence’s version of the bill, encompassing Title V: Preventing Unauthorized Disclosures of Classified Information. The bill was introduced by Senator Feinstein and passed the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on July 24, 2012 by a vote of 14-1 with bipartisan support.⁹⁵ The sole dissenter, Senator Ron Wyden (D-Oregon), opposed the bill because its provisions “threaten[ed] to encroach upon the freedom of the press”⁹⁶ and would “damage the news media’s ability to report on national security issues.”⁹⁷

B. Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013

Title V contained eleven provisions,⁹⁸ several of which aimed to disrupt the flow of classified information to the press

<http://www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/press-releases?ID=d330ad36-865a-47b2-81e6-7e60e5ef3c5d>.

92. *Id.*

93. *Id.*

94. *See supra* text accompanying notes 84-85.

95. Press Release, Senator Dianne Feinstein, Feinstein Announces Committee Approval of Fiscal Year 2013 Intelligence Authorization (July 25, 2012), <http://www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/press-releases?ID=d330ad36-865a-47b2-81e6-7e60e5ef3c5d>. By contrast, the House of Representatives’ version did not include any amendments dealing with unauthorized disclosures. *See* H.R. 5743, 112th Cong. (2012), *available at* <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-112hr5743rfs/pdf/BILLS-112hr5743rfs.pdf>.

96. Press Release, Senator Ron Wyden, Wyden Places Hold on Intelligence Authorization Bill (Nov. 14, 2012), <http://www.wyden.senate.gov/news/press-releases/wyden-places-hold-on-intelligence-authorization-bill->.

97. *Id.*

98. Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, S. 3454, 112th Cong. §§ 501-511 (2012) (as reported by S. Comm. on Intelligence, July 30, 2012).

and public.⁹⁹ The pertinent provisions, for purposes of this Comment were §§ 505 and 506. Section 505 dealt with the prohibition on certain individuals serving as consultants. Section 506 dealt with limitations on persons authorized to communicate with the media.

C. § 505: Prohibition on Certain Individuals Serving as Consultants

Section 505 “prohibit[s] certain persons possessing an active security clearance from entering into contracts or binding agreements with the media in order to provide analysis or commentary on matters concerning classified intelligence activities or intelligence related to national security.”¹⁰⁰ This section further prohibits those persons who had previously possessed an active security clearance for access to top secret, sensitive, compartmented information from entering into such contracts or agreements for a period of one year after their government service.¹⁰¹ The purpose of this particular provision, as outlined by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, was to prohibit the practice of current and former employees who have or had an active security clearance from appearing in media broadcasts to discuss matters concerning classified intelligence activities.¹⁰²

D. § 506: Limitation on Persons Authorized to Communicate With the Media

Section 506 provides: “for each element of the Intelligence Community, only the Director and Deputy Director of such element and individuals in the offices of public affairs who are specifically designated by the Director may provide background or off-the-record information regarding intelligence activities to the media.”¹⁰³ Subsection 506(b)

99. S. REP. NO. 112-192 (2012), available at <http://www.intelligence.senate.gov/pdfs112th/112192.pdf> [hereinafter Senate Report].

100. Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, S. 3454, 112th Cong. §§ 501-511 (2012) (as reported by S. Comm. on Intelligence, July 30, 2012).

101. *Id.*

102. Senate Report, *supra* note 99.

103. Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, S. 3454, 112th Cong. §§ 501-511 (2012) (as reported by S. Comm. on Intelligence, July 30, 2012).

2014] *Examining Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act* 249

made clear that it did not prohibit an officer or employee of an element of the Intelligence Community from providing authorized, unclassified, on-the-record briefings to the media or to any person affiliated with the media.¹⁰⁴ This provision did not prohibit an Intelligence Community official from providing necessary threat or other unclassified information to the public so long as the official was acting in their official capacity and was authorized to speak to the media on-the-record.¹⁰⁵

III: CRITICISM AND RESPONSE

Title V instantly created a surge of backlash from journalists and other organizations across the country within days of passing the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.¹⁰⁶ The bill was criticized on numerous grounds, some of which will be discussed in the following subsections.

A. *Journalists*

Journalists had nothing positive to say about Title V of the bill and instead, many called for its defeat. *The Washington Post* took a harsh view on the proposed legislation, using such words to describe the bill as “crude and dangerous,” “poorly drafted,” and “hastily conceived.”¹⁰⁷ The main problem journalists had with the bill is that it could end present dialogues between them and intelligence officials.¹⁰⁸ If provisions like this pass, these dialogues will have to be logged and reported, and as *The Washington Post* asserts, the result will be fewer such conversations.¹⁰⁹ Overall, the bill’s provisions were a “draconian attempt at anti-leaking legislation,”¹¹⁰ that would do the complete opposite of what it

104. Senate Report, *supra* note 99.

105. *Id.*

106. Mark Hosenball, *Senate Intelligence Panel to Reconsider Anti-Leak Plan*, REUTERS (Aug. 3, 2012), <http://www.reuters.com/assets/print?aid=USBRE8721DU20120803>.

107. Editorial, *A Bill to Stop Security Leaks Puts a Plug on Democracy*, WASH. POST (July 30, 2012), http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/squelching-public-interest-in-national-security/2012/07/30/gJQAF0pHLX_story.html.

108. *Id.*

109. *Id.*

110. David Ignatius, Editorial, *Senate’s Anti-Leaking Bill Doesn’t Address the Real*

was intended to do by instead creating a counter-intelligence problem.¹¹¹ By interfering with the daily give-and-take between the media and intelligence agencies, the “lifeblood of a democratic society while trying to solve a leak problem [would be impacted] . . . without making the nation in any way more secure.”¹¹²

Likewise, *Reuters* called Title V’s provisions “strict new measures” which would stop the commonplace practice of journalists occasionally being briefed by intelligence officials who were directly involved in the news events under discussion.¹¹³ Section 505, the provision which *Reuters* believed to be the most threatening, would ban any intelligence official, other than press officers and agency directors or deputy directors, from giving non-attributable background briefings to journalists.¹¹⁴ To end this practice would be a radical change from the approach of nearly all recent United States administrations.¹¹⁵

Bill Keller, former executive editor and current columnist of *The New York Times*, commented on the bill’s provisions, stating that although the government “has [the] right and [the] responsibility to protect secrets whose disclosure could undermine American security,” it also has “a responsibility to explain and justify what it is doing in our name.”¹¹⁶ Keller, like the journalists at *The Washington Post*, also agreed that the added provisions were draconian and asserted that as a result, the public and Congress will know less about how well the intelligence agencies are doing their jobs.¹¹⁷ Likewise, an editorial in *The New York Times* called the legislation “misguided,” claiming that the provisions would impair news coverage of national security issues.¹¹⁸ The editorial called

Sources of Information, WASH. POST (July 31, 2012), http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/david-ignatius-senates-anti-leaking-bill-doesnt-address-the-real-sources-of-information/2012/07/31/gJQAPBEINX_story.html.

111. *Id.*

112. Editorial, *supra* note 107.

113. Hosenball, *supra* note 106.

114. *Id.*

115. *Id.*

116. *Id.*

117. *Id.*

118. Editorial, *A Pernicious Drive Toward Secrecy*, N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 2, 2012), http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/03/opinion/a-pernicious-drive-toward-secrecy.html?_r=4&smid=tw-share&.

2014] *Examining Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act* 251

the bill dangerous because Congress drafted the bill “in secret without public hearings.”¹¹⁹

B. The Sunshine in Government Initiative

The Sunshine in Government Initiative (“SGI”) “is a coalition of media groups committed to promoting policies that ensure government is accessible, accountable, and open.”¹²⁰ In other words, its mission is primarily dedicated to oversight of the government to safeguard democracy.¹²¹ It claims that citizens have a right to information that is best served when news media act on behalf of the public to gain access to information.¹²²

On August 10, 2012, the SGI wrote a letter about its concerns with Title V to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.¹²³ In this letter, the SGI analyzed certain provisions that it found to be troubling and that it believed would curtail public access to information about news events and what the government is doing in the public’s name.¹²⁴ In particular, the SGI claimed that §§ 505, 506, and 508 threatened the basic role of the press in the relationship between the government and the public.¹²⁵ It claimed that these provisions “significantly undermine common practice in reporting on national security issues of vital public interest and appear to be unconstitutionally vague and overbroad.”¹²⁶

Section 505, the SGI argued, prevented the news media’s, and consequently, the public’s, ability to benefit from a present or former government official’s expertise.¹²⁷ Through

119. *Id.*

120. SUNSHINE IN GOV’T INITIATIVE, <http://www.sunshineingovernment.org/index.php?cat=38> (last visited Jan. 8, 2014).

121. *Id.*

122. *Id.*

123. Sunshine in Government Initiative, *SGI Letter to Senate Intelligence Committee Regarding S. 3454 (Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2013)*, THE SUNSHINE IN GOV’T BLOG (Aug. 31, 2012), <http://sunshineingov.wordpress.com/2012/08/31/sgi-letter-to-ssci-on-intelauthfy13/>.

124. *Id.*

125. *Id.* For purposes of this note, the discussion about § 508 will be omitted.

126. Sunshine in Government Initiative, *SGI Letter to Senate Intelligence Committee Regarding S. 3454 (Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2013)*, THE SUNSHINE IN GOV’T BLOG (Aug. 31, 2012), <http://sunshineingov.wordpress.com/2012/08/31/sgi-letter-to-ssci-on-intelauthfy13/>.

127. *Id.*

their analysis and commentary, these officials assist journalists and the public to understand issues and ensure the accuracy of the stories' details.¹²⁸ These officials likewise allay fears during major national crises, such as the September 11th terrorist attacks.¹²⁹

Section 506 poses an even greater threat to the public's access to information because it would significantly constrain the flow of information from the government to the press and public on important national security issues.¹³⁰ The SGI claims that this provision would change a practice that has been a part of our democracy from the beginning.¹³¹ Government officials and journalists have used background briefings and off-the-record briefings to their mutual benefit since the founding of our country.¹³² Both are vital because they help journalists understand the full context of the story, get key details right, and ensure that individuals or the United States as a whole will not be harmed by the publication of incorrect or sensitive information. Furthermore, these officials can share information with the press without fearing for their security if their names are published.¹³³

The SGI argued that careful and thoughtful deliberation should be given before enactment of provisions like these, which impact the delicate balance between the government's right to keep certain information secret to protect national security and the press's right to gather news and inform citizens about what the government is doing in their name.¹³⁴ Journalists handle leaks responsibly and follow procedures which mitigate any potential harm when reporting stories based on unauthorized disclosures.¹³⁵

128. *Id.*

129. *Id.*

130. *Id.*

131. *Id.*

132. Sunshine in Government Initiative, *SGI Letter to Senate Intelligence Committee Regarding S. 3454 (Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2013)*, THE SUNSHINE IN GOV'T BLOG (Aug. 31, 2012), <http://sunshineingov.wordpress.com/2012/08/31/sgi-letter-to-ssci-on-intelauthfy13/>.

133. *Id.*

134. *Id.*

135. *Id.*

C. American Civil Liberties Union

The American Civil Liberties Union (“ACLU”) “is a national organization advocating individual rights, by litigating, legislating, and educating the public on a broad array of issues affecting individual freedom in the United States.”¹³⁶ On August 15, 2012, the ACLU wrote a letter urging the United States Senate to strip Title V from the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, claiming that the anti-leak measures would threaten freedom of speech and the press and would also violate due process and separation of powers.¹³⁷ Most of the ACLU’s arguments focus on §§ 505 and 506 of the bill.¹³⁸

The ACLU outlined various arguments against the bill. First, it contends that §§ 505 and 506 unconstitutionally limit the free speech rights of government workers and contractors in the intelligence and defense communities.¹³⁹ Second, the ACLU maintained that these sections unconstitutionally limit the ability of the press to report on matters of public interest involving intelligence activities. Thus, the sections deny the public access to information necessary for voters to make informed decisions on national security. Furthermore, the sections would deny Congress information it may need to form the basis for congressional oversight.¹⁴⁰ Third, they argued that these sections unconstitutionally discriminate against the media.¹⁴¹ Fourth, §§ 505 and 506 unconstitutionally violate both the First Amendment and separation of powers by prohibiting members of Congress from talking to the press about intelligence activities.¹⁴² Fifth, the ACLU argued these sections unconstitutionally deny Congress and the public access to information about government waste, mismanagement, abuse or fraud by outlawing leaks in the public interest. Finally, these sections were said to violate open government principles.¹⁴³

136. AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, <http://www.aclu.org/>.

137. Letter from ACLU, *supra* note 28.

138. *Id.*

139. *Id.*

140. *Id.*

141. *Id.*

142. *Id.*

143. Letter from ACLU, *supra* note 28.

Overall, the crux of the ACLU's argument was that the proposed bill was an anti-media bill disguised as an anti-leaks bill which would "place a Berlin Wall between the press and the intelligence community" and should be opposed in its entirety.¹⁴⁴ The two greatest victims would be Congress and the public. Congress would no longer be able to perform its oversight function without access to national security information that is disclosed without organization, and as such, would be "cutting out its eyes and off its ears."¹⁴⁵

D. Response to the Criticism

Only a week after the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence approved Title V and in response to the overwhelming criticism the bill from members of the media, a Senate panel was established to reevaluate its provisions.¹⁴⁶ The Senate panel, chaired by Senator Dianne Feinstein, reviewed comments and criticism and considered alternative ideas and modifications to the bill as it moved forward.¹⁴⁷

On November 14, 2012, however, a public hold¹⁴⁸ was placed on the bill by Senator Wyden to prevent it from passing without a debate or amendments.¹⁴⁹ In placing the bill on hold, Senator Wyden cited significant concerns over the bill's anti-leak provisions in a floor statement.¹⁵⁰ Senator Wyden objected to these provisions because they "would [have] harmed first amendment rights . . . led to less-informed public debate about national security issues, and also undermined the due process rights of intelligence agency employees, without actually enhancing national security."¹⁵¹

144. *Id.* at 14.

145. *Id.* at 14-15.

146. Hosenball, *supra* note 106.

147. *Id.*

148. *Reference Home*, U.S. SENATE, http://www.senate.gov/reference/glossary_term/hold.htm (stating that: an informal practice by which a senator informs his or her floor leader that he or she does not wish a particular bill or other measure to reach the floor for consideration. The majority leader need not follow the senator's wishes, but is on notice that the opposing senator may filibuster any motion to consider the measure.").

149. Communications Office, *What to Know about Hold on Intelligence Authorization Bill*, SENATOR RON WYDEN BLOG (Dec. 18, 2012), <http://www.wyden.senate.gov/news/blog/post/what-to-know-about-wyden-hold-on-intelligence-authorization-bill>.

150. *Id.*

151. Press Release, Senator Ron Wyden, Wyden Floor Statement on the Removal of

2014] *Examining Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act* 255

As time ran out on passing the legislation, the controversial anti-leak provisions meant to lessen the amount of unauthorized disclosures of classified information were removed.¹⁵² On December 21, 2012, the only provision that remained was one that would mandate the Executive Branch to alert Congress when it “declassif[ies] information to disclose it to the press.”¹⁵³ With the anti-leak provisions removed, the bill moved forward and was approved with unanimous consent.¹⁵⁴ However, there is a concern that such provisions may be proposed again in the future,¹⁵⁵ as the problem of leaks does not appear to be diminishing any time soon.¹⁵⁶

IV: LEGAL AND POLICY BASED IMPLICATIONS

Congressional oversight is often seen as inadequate.¹⁵⁷ It is frequently said that the press is the entity most capable of providing oversight of government activity.¹⁵⁸ Senator Wyden confirmed in a recent floor statement that members of Congress do in fact use the media to exercise oversight of the Executive Branch, stating:

And while members of Congress don't like to admit it, members often rely on the press to inform them about problems that congressional overseers have not discovered on their own. I have been on the Senate Intelligence Committee for twelve years now, and I can recall numerous specific instances where I have found out about serious government wrongdoing – such as the NSA's warrantless wiretapping

Controversial Leaks Provisions from Intelligence Authorization Bill (Dec. 21, 2012), <http://www.wyden.senate.gov/news/press-releases/wyden-floor-statement-on-the-removal-of-controversial-leaks-provisions-from-intelligence-authorization-bill>.

152. *Id.*; see also Senate Report, *supra* note 99; Rick Blum, *Diverting the avalanche of leaks: a (temporary) win for responsible news coverage*, REPORTERS COMMITTEE (2013), <http://www.rcfp.org/browse-media-law-resources/news-media-law/news-media-and-law-winter-2013/diverting-avalanche-leaks-t>.

153. *Id.*

154. *Id.*

155. Josh Gerstein, *Senate Panel Nixes Anti-Leak Measures*, POLITICO (Dec. 22, 2012), <http://www.politico.com/blogs/under-the-radar/2012/12/senate-panel-nixes-antileak-measures-152684.html>.

156. Elise Cooper, *Political Leaks*, AMERICAN THINKER BLOG (Oct. 5, 2012), http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/10/political_leaks.html.

157. ROSS, *supra* note 18, at 5.

158. *Id.*

program, or the CIA's coercive interrogation program – only as a result of disclosures by the press.¹⁵⁹

Senator Wyden's account illustrates that members of Congress are dependent on the information they receive from the press to make informed decisions. Provisions like those included in Title V would severely impair Congress's ability to act as a check on the intelligence community.¹⁶⁰ In light of the threat of ongoing terrorism, this limitation is especially troubling.¹⁶¹ Congress, however, is not the only body that stands to be affected; the media and the public will also be impacted by legislation curtailing such valuable oversight.

Recognizing the media for the important function they perform, former CIA Director Michael Hayden stated, "I have a deep respect for journalists and their profession. Many of them – especially in the years since September 11th – have given their lives in the act of keeping citizens informed. They are smart, dedicated, and courageous men and women."¹⁶² The media, as Hayden acknowledged, are important to a free society and a key to an informed electorate.¹⁶³ To a certain extent, unauthorized disclosures are both justified and essential to preserve democracy.¹⁶⁴ Thus, any harm to national security is generally outweighed by the benefits of an independent and informed press.¹⁶⁵ The reason most cited by advocates of the media's right to publish classified information is increasing public knowledge and promoting informed debate.¹⁶⁶

Justice Potter Stewart epitomized this point in his dissent in *Branzburg v. Hayes*.¹⁶⁷ Justice Stewart averred, "enlightened choice by an informed citizenry is the basic ideal upon which an open society is premised, and a free press is thus indispensable to a free society."¹⁶⁸ The proposed anti-leaks legislation had the potential to completely change the

159. Press Release, *supra* note 151.

160. Letter from ACLU, *supra* note 28.

161. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30, at 5.

162. ROSS, *supra* note 18, at 29.

163. *Id.*

164. *Id.*

165. *Id.*

166. *Id.*

167. 408 U.S. 665, 726 (1972).

168. *Id.*

way that the media can interact with government officials, mainly by limiting Congress's ability to talk to members of the press about issues of national security and intelligence.¹⁶⁹ Such legislation seems to threaten the very purpose of the media's existence, and to leave the media unable to report on critical matters. This would undermine democracy by denying Americans access to this information that is essential to national debate on these critical issues.¹⁷⁰

"At the beginning of the chain of democratic responsibility stand the people. It is the people who are entitled to decide the course of the Republic based on a clear view of the facts."¹⁷¹ Thus, in a democratic society, the national security interest must be balanced against the public's right to know.¹⁷² The term, "right to know," refers to a variety of concepts: the public's general right to be informed about governmental activities and performance; the right to compel the government to produce specific information within its control; and the right of access to particular government proceedings.¹⁷³ Provisions like Title V "limit a government employee's dissemination of information about the government,"¹⁷⁴ restrict the public's right to know, and forge a barrier between the government and the people.¹⁷⁵ In essence, the public will no longer have information about how the government is managing national security issues aside from authorized disclosures.¹⁷⁶

Lack of access to this information will in turn impact the public's ability to make informed decisions about who they choose to elect to office and subsequently heighten skepticism of government, "for without an informed and free press there

169. Jennifer Lynch & Trevor Timm, *Senate Anti-Leaks Bill Threatens the Rights of the Press and the Public*, ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION (Aug. 6, 2012), <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2012/08/senates-anti-leaks-bill-threatens-rights-press-and-public>.

170. *Id.*

171. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30, at 161.

172. Lynch, *supra* note 169.

173. E.E.B. & K.E.M., Note, *Plugging the Leak: The Case for a Legislative Resolution of the Conflict Between the Demands of Secrecy and the Need for an Open Government*, 71 VA L. REV. 801, 830 (1985).

174. *Id.* at 823.

175. *Id.*

176. *Id.*

cannot be an enlightened people.”¹⁷⁷ To imagine a world in which these provisions were to exist would be to envision one where the Pentagon Papers, the Watergate Scandal, crimes of torture, extraordinary rendition, or the targeted killing program under President Obama, would have never been disclosed to the American public.¹⁷⁸ Of all of these leaks, the one most frequently cited over the years where the value of an enlightened citizenry was perceived to overcome the harm to national security has been the incident of the Pentagon Papers.¹⁷⁹

In 1971, *The New York Times* began to publish the Pentagon Papers,¹⁸⁰ a document that outlined the involvement of the United States in the Vietnam War.¹⁸¹ This document revealed to the public that the Johnson administration had lied to both it and Congress about vital issues of national security.¹⁸² The Nixon administration took action, obtaining court orders to enjoin *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* from publishing any articles containing information regarding the Pentagon Papers because both newspapers had published articles containing classified information prior to the injunction.¹⁸³ The Court in *New York Times Co. v. United States* ultimately ruled that the newspapers could resume publication.¹⁸⁴ Three concurring opinions discussed the media’s role in maintaining an enlightened citizenry.¹⁸⁵

Justice Potter Stewart, concurring, emphasized the importance of such enlightenment, stating, “the only effective restraint upon executive policy and power in the areas of

177. 403 U.S. 713, 728 (1971).

178. Letter from ACLU, *supra* note 28.

179. ROSS, *supra* note 18, at 37.

180. Michael Cooper & Sam Roberts, *After 40 Years, the Complete Pentagon Papers*, N.Y. TIMES, June 7, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/08/us/08pentagon.html>; see also *Pentagon Papers*, ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/450326/Pentagon-Papers> (last visited Feb. 11, 2014) (the Pentagon Papers, also known as the Report of the O.S.D. Vietnam Task Force, were a top secret, classified government study of the Vietnam War and the role of the U.S. government in Indochina from World War II to May 1968).

181. See generally *Pentagon Papers*, N.Y. TIMES, http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/p/pentagon_papers/index.html.

182. *Id.*

183. ROSS, *supra* note 18, at 32.

184. *Id.*

185. *Id.*

national defense may lie in an enlightened citizenry – in an informed and critical public opinion which alone can here protect the values of a democratic government.”¹⁸⁶ As previously discussed, restraints on executive power are especially important to preserve Congress’s ability to exercise oversight due to the rise in executive power.¹⁸⁷ This rise shows that the country is at its strongest when policies are created through deliberative, open, and democratic processes.¹⁸⁸ Without informed criticism and candid public debate providing clarity about the nation’s ends and means, our security policy risks becoming illicit, foolish, and harmful.¹⁸⁹

Thus, a provision like Title V’s § 505 would cordon off an important source of information to Congress.¹⁹⁰ The media’s coverage of intelligence matters provides vital information to Congress in its role as a check against the Executive Branch.¹⁹¹ The fact that executive power is on the rise means that Congress needs to be even more diligent in its oversight of the Executive Branch.¹⁹² Past executive unilateralism has provoked torture, extraordinary rendition, and domestic surveillance.¹⁹³ This unilateralism not only undermines the delicate balance of our Constitution but also lessens our human liberties and impairs vital counterterrorism campaigns.¹⁹⁴ Questions about what can properly be kept from the public are entirely in the hands of the presidents, leaving them free to declassify selectively for narrow partisan or protective ends.¹⁹⁵ Congress needs to ensure that there is a continuous flow of accurate information about the functioning and malfunctioning of the Executive Branch, and the most effective way it is able to do this is by its oversight through the media.¹⁹⁶ Congress can do this by using the tools available to them: investigations and crafting careful

186. 403 U.S. at 728 (1971).

187. See discussion *supra* Part I C.

188. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30, at 8.

189. Letter from ACLU, *supra* note 28.

190. *Id.*

191. *Id.*

192. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30, at 1.

193. *Id.* at 8-9.

194. *Id.* at 201.

195. *Id.* at 207.

196. *Id.* at 205.

legislation.¹⁹⁷

Furthermore, § 505's prohibition on former and current government employees acting as consultants and advisors to the media could also extend to members of Congress and to members of their staff.¹⁹⁸ Congress's responsibilities include criticizing abuses by the Executive Branch, and this is frequently done through the media.¹⁹⁹ Section 505's provisions would thus deny members of Congress access to the media and would greatly lessen their ability to exercise their oversight over the Executive Branch.²⁰⁰

Overall, should it enact provisions of this nature, Congress will be denied the information it needs about national security and intelligence to effectively perform its job.²⁰¹ To inhibit Congress from its constitutionally granted oversight function would be to diminish its balance among the other branches, and to impair two key allies along the way: the media and the public.

V: DISCUSSION

Since September 11th, there has been a near decade-long war against terror.²⁰² The War on Terror has generated an increased campaign to stop leaks of classified information from being reported to the media.²⁰³ Such leaks have risen over the course of recent administrations, particularly during President Obama's administration.²⁰⁴ In light of the nation's history of leaks that have impacted our national security, it seems as though this is a problem we will continue to face in the future. As the character and nature of leaks change throughout history, adaptive measures need to be taken to protect the national security of our country while still protecting the free press and an informed public.²⁰⁵ The measures proposed in Title V, however, were ill-conceived,

197. *Id.* at 207; *see also* discussion *supra* Part I, Section B.

198. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30 at 207; *see also* discussion *supra* Part I, Section B.

199. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30 at 207; *see also* discussion *supra* Part I, Section B.

200. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30 at 207; *see also* discussion *supra* Part I, Section B.

201. Letter from ACLU, *supra* note 28.

202. Press Release, *supra* note 151.

203. *Id.*

204. *See supra* text accompanying notes 73-80.

205. Press Release, *supra* note 151.

2014] *Examining Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act* 261

hastily drafted, and it is fortunate that they were not enacted as a means to eliminate the current leak epidemic. “[Legislation of this kind] could tip the balance dangerously”²⁰⁶ and the tension between the need for secrecy and the democratic requirements of openness and transparency will only be exacerbated. “Congress has abundantly passed the buck.”²⁰⁷

As succinctly stated by Harvard law professor Jack Goldsmith, “there is no perfect solution to the problem.”²⁰⁸ The leak problem is not one that can be solved with one piece of legislation quickly passed through Congress. The tension that exists requires that there be more informed debate among members of the public regarding any legislation that potentially affects their right to know.

Congress must therefore look for ways to help the Executive Branch safeguard information that intelligence agencies wish to keep a secret. Legislation that threatens to encroach upon the rights of the media or that would lessen the public’s access to information for which they have a right to know should be critically analyzed and thought about before an attempt is made to hastily attach it to a piece of legislation. The Director of National Intelligence has even stated that provisions such as these would not significantly deter leaks nor would it help protect sensitive national security information.²⁰⁹ Furthermore, Robert Litt, the General Counsel for the Director of National Intelligence, recently informed the American Bar Association that the proposals “really would not have any deterrent impact or punitive impact on leaks, and might in fact have an adverse impact on the free flow of information to the American people.”²¹⁰ Based on this information alone, it is apparent that the very purpose which the bill has set out to achieve has failed.

Additionally, in crafting new legislation, Congress must be

206. *Id.*

207. SCHWARTZ, *supra* note 30, at 203.

208. Leonard Downie Jr., Editorial, *Why We Don’t Need Another Law Against Intelligence Leaks*, WASH. POST, Dec. 6, 2012, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-12-06/opinions/35673556_1_intelligence-authorization-act-director-of-national-intelligence-news-media.

209. Press Release, *supra* note 151.

210. *Id.*

careful not to limit its oversight function of the Executive Branch. If members of Congress no longer have access to media reports on national security issues, they would be ineffective in their oversight duties, resulting in the Executive Branch wielding more power – an undesirable consequence that would tip the balance of powers among the three branches. “It [ultimately] comes down to striking a balance.”²¹¹

VI. CONCLUSION

The act of leaking important information about national security is something that has occurred on a regular basis since the founding of the United States, and has only increased in volume in recent years. Title V of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 included provisions that, had they been adopted, would negatively impact the system of congressional oversight by prohibiting members of Congress from speaking to the media regarding intelligence activities. Congress regularly interacts with the media to ensure that the Executive Branch does not wield too much authority and does not tip the balance of powers among the three branches. Based on the rise in number of unauthorized disclosures, legislation must be carefully debated, crafted, and revealed to the media and members of the public, as it may potentially affect their individual rights. “It is important for Congress to remember that not everything that is done in the name of stopping leaks is necessarily wise policy.”²¹² Thus, Congress must look for a cautious, long-term solution to a recurring, long-standing problem.

211. *Id.*

212. *Id.*