

**Written Questions for Former Director of National Intelligence James  
Clapper Submitted by Senator Patrick Leahy  
May 15, 2017**

The AP reported recently that when the Obama administration was preparing to take measures against Russia in response to the election interference, they did not brief the Trump transition. The article reports that this was “because they feared the transition team might give Moscow lead time to clear information out of two compounds the U.S. was shuttering.”<sup>1</sup>

**Question: Were you aware of concerns that members of the Trump transition would tip off the Russians about those retaliatory measures?**

**Answer: I was not aware of any such concerns.**

The *Guardian* reported that foreign intelligence agencies were the first to alert U.S. law enforcement to connections between the Trump campaign and Russian intelligence agents. A source from British intelligence commented that U.S. agencies were “asleep” and “slow to appreciate the extensive nature” of those contacts.<sup>2</sup>

**Question: Is this report true? Were our foreign counterparts the first to alert us to the threat?**

**Answer: To the best of my knowledge, neither the United Kingdom nor any other foreign intelligence service was the first to alert the United States regarding Russia’s activities. The Intelligence Community had its own indications of connections between the Trump campaign and Russia.**

**Question: Russia has attempted to sway elections in foreign states around the world for years. Why were our intelligence agencies not ready to detect and act upon the Kremlin’s efforts to hand the presidency to Donald Trump?**

**Answer: As addressed in the Intelligence Community Assessment, the Intelligence Community never before had observed a Russian influence campaign of this scale and scope. The theft of data and the use of social media and various third parties to disseminate that stolen information was unprecedented. The Intelligence Community detected this effort in early 2016 and kept the Executive Branch and Congressional leaders fully apprised of Russia’s activities throughout the run-up to the 2016 presidential election. Whether and how to act upon the Kremlin’s efforts was a decision for the policy-makers.**

Last week, President Trump fired FBI Director James Comey. While the White House claimed at first that Comey was fired because of a recommendation put forward by the Deputy

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://apnews.com/b109774705594ae887a86b337c444e6b/Trump-transition-raised-flags-about-Flynn-Russia-contacts>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/apr/13/british-spies-first-to-spot-trump-team-links-russia>

Attorney General, at his own initiative, President Trump later admitted that “I was gonna fire [Comey] regardless of [the] recommendation. . . . And in fact when I decided to just do it, I said to myself, I said you know, this Russia thing with Trump and Russia is a made up story.” His Deputy Press Secretary also stated, “We want this to come to its conclusion . . . [a]nd we think that we’ve actually, by removing Director Comey, taken steps to make that happen.”<sup>3</sup>

We both take this investigation very seriously, and I know that we both have great confidence in the men and women of the FBI.

Question: Are you at all concerned about the President’s justification for firing Director Comey, and the effect it may have on the integrity of the investigation?

**Answer: I previously remarked that I have concerns. However, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein’s appointment of former FBI Director Robert Mueller to serve as special counsel overseeing the Russia investigation is a welcome development. Director Mueller is principled, honorable, and incorruptible, and I am confident that he will fiercely protect the independence and integrity of the investigation.**

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.cnn.com/2017/05/11/politics/comey-fbi-investigation-russia-sarah-huckabee-sanders/index.html>

**Questions for the Record from Senator Charles E. Grassley  
for the Honorable James Clapper  
U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary  
Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism  
Hearing on “Russian Interference in the 2016 United States Election”  
Submitted on May 15, 2017**

**Investigations of Classified Leaks**

Since January 2017, news outlets have reported information leaked to them by senior government officials about the FBI’s investigation into the Russian government’s efforts to interfere with the 2016 presidential election.<sup>1</sup> At the hearing, you stated that you did not know whether any government agencies had referred leaks of classified information to the Department of Justice for criminal investigation. You also stated that you have not been interviewed by the FBI in relation to an investigation into classified leaks.

1. Does it remain accurate that you have not been interviewed by the FBI about leaks of classified information related to investigations into Russia’s interference in the 2016 presidential election?

**Answer: Yes.**

**Unmasking the Identities of U.S. Persons**

You stated that to your knowledge, there has not been any declassification of information relating to President Donald Trump or his associates, yet a lot of apparently classified information has been reported in the press, citing government sources. You also stated that you have never been an anonymous source in a news report relating to President Trump, his associates, or Russia’s attempt to interfere in the 2016 presidential election. Finally, you stated that you have never authorized another government official to be an anonymous source about President Trump or his associates.

The records maintained by the government agency that reportedly recorded the phone calls between Retired Lt. General Michael Flynn and Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak should provide an accurate record of who within the government had access to the classified documents in which Flynn’s identity was unmasked.

1. Please describe the process for an intelligence consumer to submit an unmasking request and for the collecting agency to make a determination on such a request.

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g., David Ignatius, *Why Did Obama Dawdle on Russia’s Hacking*, Wash. Post (last updated January 13, 2017); Greg Miller et al., *National Security Advisor Flynn Discussed Sanctions with Russian Ambassador, Despite Denials, Officials Say*, Wash. Post (Feb. 9, 2017); Michael S. Schmidt et al., *Intercepted Russian Communications Part of Inquiry into Trump Associates*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 19, 2017); Michael Schmidt et al., *Trump Campaign Aides Had Repeated Contacts with Russian Intelligence*, N.Y. Times (Feb. 14, 2017).

**Answer: Part of my job as Director of National Intelligence was to ensure that all intelligence activities conducted by Intelligence Community elements were performed in a manner that protects the civil liberties and privacy rights of Americans. All information collected by the Intelligence Community is subject to rules that protect those rights. For collections conducted under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, these protections are found in court-authorized minimization procedures. For collections conducted under other authorities, these protections are found in procedures approved by the Attorney General. All of these procedures require that we protect U.S. Person information by limiting its retention and dissemination.**

**The Intelligence Community will issue an intelligence report only if there is a foreign intelligence reason to do so. The Intelligence Community will include a reference to a U.S. Person in that report only if including that information provides value to the report. In many cases—particularly where the National Security Agency is the reporting agency—the U.S. Person’s identity will be “masked.”**

**If an Executive Branch recipient of an intelligence report containing masked U.S. Person information believes that knowing the identity of the U.S. Person is necessary to fully understand the associated intelligence and assess whether it is relevant to a lawful activity of the recipient’s agency, and that recipient has the appropriate security clearance, then that recipient may request the U.S. Person identity information from the reporting agency. The individual Intelligence Community element that applied the masking in the first place will be responsible for approving any request to “unmask” a U.S. Person identity, in accordance with policies and procedures as established by that agency.**

2. Please describe any limits on disclosing or sharing information that may accompany a document containing unmasked identities of U.S. persons.

**Answer: If a request to unmask a U.S. Person identity is approved by the originating Intelligence Community element, then that information is provided only to the individual who requested the unmasking—not to everyone who had access to the report. In other words, reports are not rewritten to include the unmasked U.S. Person identity and redistributed to the original dissemination list. Additionally, the report would retain whatever classification level it originally had prior to the unmasking.**

3. After testifying in response to my questions that you had never been an anonymous source for news reports about President Trump, his associates, or Russia’s attempt to interfere in the 2016 presidential election, you later testified that you *had* spoken to reporters “on background.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> You stated that you “might have done the same thing” as Ms. Yates, after she stated that she had spoken to reporters on background.

- a. How do you reconcile your testimony denying having served as an anonymous source and your admission to having spoken to reporters on background?

**Answer: When I testified about speaking to reporters on background over the course of my career, it was in the context of a question posed by Senator Kennedy, who asked whether I had “ever given information to a reporter that [I] didn’t want to have [my] name connected with, but [I] wanted to see in the paper.” I had initially answered that I had not, but when Deputy Attorney General Yates referred to instances in which the Department of Justice authorized and arranged for her to speak on background, I recalled that I may have done so as well. My answer to that question does not contradict my statement that I never served as an anonymous source for news reports about President Trump, his associates, or Russia’s attempt to interfere in the 2016 presidential election.**

**Moreover, there are important differences between speaking “on background” to reporters and being an anonymous source for a story. I have done the former, but never the latter. When a member of the Executive Branch speaks on background, it is an authorized discussion. These conversations are generally for the purpose of explaining a particular policy or program; in other words, to ensure that the press understands what the Executive Branch is trying to do. An anonymous source, however, is acting without authorization.**

- b. Did you speak to reporters on background about matters related to President Trump, his associates, Russia’s attempt to interfere in the 2016 presidential election, or the FBI’s investigation of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s use of a private email server?

**Answer: No.**

4. You stated that on one occasion, you requested the unmasking of President Trump, his associates, or members of Congress. Please provide further information about this request, including the following:
  - a. The identity or identities of the individual or individuals whom you requested to be unmasked;
  - b. The date of the unmasking request; and
  - c. The collecting agency to which you made the request.

**Answer: Please direct your request to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which should have this information.**

5. You stated that you have reviewed classified documents in which President Trump, his associates, or members of Congress had been unmasked. Please provide further information, including the following:

- a. The titles of all such documents, document numbers, or other document- identifying information;
- b. The intelligence consumer who requested the unmasking, if not you;
- c. The identity or identities of the individual or individuals who were unmasked;
- d. The date(s) on which you reviewed these documents;
- e. The collecting agency that approved the unmasking request; and
- f. Any other government officials who reviewed the documents.

**Answer: Please direct your request to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which should have this information.**

6. You stated that you may have shared or discussed information about classified documents containing unmasked references to President Trump, his associates, or members of Congress. Please explain with whom you shared or discussed this information, and what information you shared or discussed.

**Answer: As I stated in my testimony, I may have discussed such matters with my deputy and my general counsel; however, I cannot recall the details of those conversations.**

### **Trump Dossier**

In January 2017, the NSA, FBI, and CIA issued an Intelligence Community Assessment about the Russian government's effort to influence the 2016 presidential election. The report did not include the dossier about President Trump. You stated that the dossier was not included because you "could not corroborate the sourcing, particularly the second, third-order sources."

1. Please explain any steps any component of the Intelligence Community or the Office of the Director of National Intelligence took to corroborate the information in the dossier.

**Answer: Please direct your request to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which should have this information.**

2. Please explain the outcomes of any efforts by any component of the Intelligence Community or the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to corroborate the information in the dossier.

**Answer: Please direct your request to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which should have this information.**

### **FBI Investigation of Trump Campaign Collusion with Russia**

In January 2017, the NSA, FBI, and CIA issued an Intelligence Community Assessment about the Russian government's efforts to influence the 2016 presidential election. The report did not

include evidence of collusion between members of the Trump campaign and the Russian government, and you have stated that you have no knowledge of such evidence.

However, you have suggested that the FBI may have withheld information from the other contributing agencies who worked on the report. You testified that at the time the report was issued, you were not aware of the FBI's counterintelligence investigation into potential collusion between members of the Trump campaign and the Russian government. You stated that "there is the possibility . . . acknowledging this role that the FBI plays in straddling both intelligence and law enforcement—that for whatever reason they may have chosen to withhold investigatory sensitive information from the report."

If true, the FBI's actions appear to defy President Barack Obama's instructions to the contributing agencies to coordinate, and conflict with your statement that the analysts "from each of the contributing agencies . . . were given complete, unfettered, mutual access to all sensitive raw intelligence data."

1. When and how did you initially become aware of the FBI's counterintelligence investigations into potential collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians?

**Answer: As I stated in my testimony, I first became aware of the FBI's counterintelligence investigation into potential collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians when former FBI Director Comey announced it during his hearing before the House Intelligence Committee on March 20, 2017.**

2. Prior to when you learned of the FBI's investigations, were you aware of any aspects of the FBI's investigations, including any applications for warrants to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court?

**Answer: No.**

3. Are you aware of any previous instance in which the FBI has withheld relevant information from an intelligence review in which the President had ordered all available information to be compiled?

**Answer: No, but I also am not aware of any past intelligence review that was conducted under the unique circumstances of this review. Additionally, while I testified that the FBI may have decided not to share sensitive investigatory information, I also testified that it was possible that the counter-intelligence investigation was not yet far enough along to generate information that warranted inclusion in the report.**

To the extent that any of these questions call for classified information, please contact Committee staff to make arrangements to receive the written answers in a secure manner and to schedule a follow-up briefing after you submit your answers.

**Hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary,  
Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism  
“Russian Interference in the 2016 United States Election”  
Questions for the Record Submitted by Senator Al Franken**

**Questions for James Clapper:**

**Question 1.** In December 2015, General Flynn spoke at a celebration marking the tenth anniversary of Russia’s state-owned television network, RT. General Flynn sat at the same table with Vladimir Putin. According to RT, General Flynn was invited because of his “expertise as an intelligence professional” and to “talk about the decision-making process in the White House—and the role of the intelligence community in it.” In the Intelligence Community’s unclassified assessment of Russia’s interference in the election, the agencies described RT as “the Kremlin’s principal international propaganda outlet.” Nonetheless, General Flynn was paid \$33,750 for attending RT’s anniversary party.

- Is it at all unusual or noteworthy for a man with General Flynn’s experience to participate in such an event?

**Answer: I was surprised to see General Flynn attend and speak at RT’s tenth anniversary gala. I would not have accepted such a speaking request.**

**Question 2.** General Flynn collected money from Russian interests beyond the payment he received for attending RT’s tenth anniversary party. He also received \$11,250 from a subsidiary of a Russian cybersecurity firm, and another \$11,250 from an air cargo company with close ties to a Russian businessman. And General Flynn was also paid for lobbying work on behalf of Turkish interests. But according to documents reviewed by the House Oversight Committee, General Flynn did not fully disclose these foreign payments when he renewed his security clearance in January 2016. He didn’t initially list these payments on his financial disclosure forms either. What I can’t understand is why the Trump administration didn’t turn this up when they vetted General Flynn for the job.

- If you were in charge of vetting candidates to serve as the president’s national security adviser, would you want to know whether a candidate accepted payments linked to foreign governments?

**Answer: I would want to know whether an individual being considered for any senior White House position had accepted payments from a foreign government. It would be important to also understand why the payments were made and whether they were reported as required by law.**

- Generally speaking, what’s the concern here? Is it just unseemly, or does accepting money from a foreign government suggest that an individual might be predisposed to view that country’s interests in a more positive light?



**Answer: There is nothing inherently wrong with accepting payments from foreign governments, provided that such payments are legally permissible and fully disclosed. This allows any concerns to be vetted, particularly regarding the motives behind the payments.**

- Given what we now know about General Flynn, do you have concerns about the vetting process for other national security officials selected by the Trump administration?

**Answer: I have no firsthand knowledge regarding the quality or thoroughness of the vetting process for national security officials selected by the Trump administration. As such, it would be inappropriate for me to comment. It is important to note, however, that the vetting process relies to some extent on the honesty and completeness of the vetted candidate's disclosures.**

**Question 3.** We know that between December 19 and December 29, General Flynn and the Russian ambassador were in contact at least five times. They spoke by phone on December 19, December 28, and reportedly several times on December 29. General Flynn and Kislyak texted each other on Christmas.

- Generally speaking, is it unusual for a president's incoming national security adviser to reach out to foreign diplomats?

**Answer: Whenever there is a change in administration, it is important that the incoming administration be fully prepared on day one, particularly for those incoming officials with national security responsibilities. As such, it is not unusual for members of an incoming administration to engage foreign counterparts prior to the Presidential inauguration. In fact, the outgoing administration is often involved in assisting and coordinating such communications.**

- Is it unusual for an incoming national security adviser—someone who is still a private citizen, as the president has not yet assumed office—to initiate so many contacts with a foreign government that is not closely aligned with American interests?

**Answer: The number and frequency of such contacts would vary depending on the specific circumstances that arise during the transition. It is difficult, in a vacuum, to assess whether the number of contacts is appropriate.**

- If you were General Flynn, how would you have conducted yourself?

**Answer: While I will not comment on any actions General Flynn reportedly took, I personally would have made sure that any substantive discussions with foreign officials were had with the full knowledge of both the transition team and the outgoing administration, so that I would abide by the long-held principle of “one President, one administration at a time.”**

**Question 4.** Do you have reason to believe that President Trump had knowledge of what General Flynn discussed with Kislyak, even while General Flynn was misrepresenting the content of those conversations to Vice President Pence?

**Answer: I cannot speak to President Trump’s knowledge regarding any communications between General Flynn and Ambassador Kislyak.**

**Question 5.** Do you have reason to believe that associates of President Trump or the Trump organization, or former members of the Trump campaign or transition team, had knowledge of what General Flynn discussed with Kislyak?

**Answer: I cannot speak to such individuals’ knowledge of any such communications.**

**Question 6.** It was reported that President Obama personally warned then President-elect Trump against hiring General Flynn during their private meeting in the Oval Office on November 10, two days after the election.

- Do you know why President Obama felt compelled to warn the President-elect against hiring General Flynn as his national security adviser?

**Answer: No.**

**Question 7.** General Flynn served in the Obama administration—his last post under President Obama was as the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency. He was reportedly forced out of that job in 2014 for his “chaotic” and “toxic” management style. But aside from General Flynn’s suspicious contacts with the Russian ambassador, the reason we’re all talking about his security clearance is that he failed to disclose tens of thousands of dollars he received from entities linked to Russia and other foreign governments. When Flynn renewed his clearance in January 2016, he left those payments off the forms. My understanding is that when the FBI does a background investigation as a part of the security clearance process, the Bureau does not sift through applicants’ financial transactions. The FBI does a credit check and interviews applicants’ personal contacts, but the FBI relies on self-reporting for much of the financial information. According to a former FBI counterterrorism specialist, when it comes to presidential appointments, the FBI reports facts up the chain to the White House, but the vetting decisions are ultimately left to White House staff.

- Why didn’t the FBI screeners catch General Flynn’s omission?

**Answer: To the best of my knowledge, General Flynn’s background investigation and subsequent adjudication were conducted by the Defense Intelligence Agency, not the FBI. As I testified, vetting for White House positions and senior political appointees is conducted by the FBI—at least it was during the Bush and Obama administrations. I cannot speak to either General Flynn’s background investigation or any vetting that was conducted by the Trump administration. As I stated in my testimony, I underwent a very thorough FBI background investigation—**

**considerably more thorough than a typical security clearance investigation—when I served in both the Bush and Obama administrations.**

**"Russian Interference in the 2016 United States Election"**

**James R. Clapper**

**Questions for the Record**

**Submitted May 15, 2017**

**QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR FEINSTEIN**

**Russian Intrusions Into Voter Registration Systems**

1. The January 6, 2017 Joint Intelligence Community Assessment found that Russian intelligence had “accessed elements of multiple state or local electoral boards,” and had “researched US electoral processes and related technology and equipment.” This is deeply troubling.

- a. **What further unclassified information can you provide about what the intrusion involved? What did Russian intelligence do upon gaining access?**

**Answer: The Russians conducted what we considered to be “reconnoitering”; that is, they seemed to be probing and testing to see whether they could access particular databases. We were unable to definitively ascribe a motive for this activity, but we surmised it was to develop insight for potential future exploitation.**

- b. **To the extent you know, what steps have been taken to address any vulnerabilities? Are we better prepared now to prevent such an attack in the future? If not, what more should we be doing?**

**Answer: I cannot speak to what steps have been taken to address vulnerabilities as of today, other than noting that the nation’s election and voting apparatus has been declared to be critical infrastructure subject to regulation and oversight by the Department of Homeland Security. DHS also issued guidance to state and local officials regarding best practices to improve their cybersecurity defenses. To better prepare for future attempts to interfere in our election system, steps must be taken to better educate the public about Russia’s capabilities and tactics.**

**Russian Impact on Election Beyond Vote Tallies**

2. You testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 5, 2017, that the intelligence community had “no way of gauging the impact” that Russian hacking may have had on vote tallies. On March 20, 2017, NSA Director Rogers testified before the House Intelligence Committee that while he did not have evidence that Russia “changed vote tallies” in specific states, the NSA was “probably not the best organization” to gauge this kind of impact. President Trump took these statements to conclude in a March 20, 2017 tweet that “Russia did not influence electoral process.”

- a. **Even if Russia’s meddling did not influence vote tallies, does that mean that Russia did not “influence [our] electoral process” through its various tactics, including cyberattacks on the computer systems of our political parties and top campaign advisers and its overt propaganda campaign?**

**Answer: As I stated in my opening remarks and in my testimony, the Russians likely exceeded their wildest expectations in disrupting the 2016 presidential election as successfully as they have. It would be improper for the Intelligence Community to attempt to gauge if or how American voters might have been ultimately affected by Russia’s influence campaign.**

### **Russian Attempts to Cast Doubt on Fairness of Election**

3. The January 6, 2017 Joint Intelligence Community Assessment concluded that, as part of its strategic propaganda campaign, Russia attempted to “undermine public faith in the US democratic process” by “impugning the fairness of the election” and painting Donald Trump as an “outsider victimized by” a “faulty democratic election process.” The Joint Assessment also found that if Clinton had won the election, Russian diplomats “were prepared to publicly call into question the validity of the results.”

- a. **Following the election, did Russia continue to attack the US election system as rigged or compromised by voter fraud?**

**Answer: To my knowledge, no.**

- b. **If not, did the intelligence community makes an assessment of why they stopped?**

**Answer: No assessment was made before I departed my position as Director of National Intelligence.**

- c. **At the time you left, had the intelligence community been able to determine how the Russians might have used their successful cyber intrusion into electoral boards to undermine the election had Hillary Clinton won?**

**Answer: No. The Intelligence Community typically does not assess hypothetical questions such as this.**

- d. **Even without the capacity to change vote tallies, is it possible that Russia intended to reveal its instruction so that this fact alone could be used to call the election result into question?**

**Answer: It is possible, but I am aware of no direct evidence of such an intent.**

## **RT Collaboration with Wikileaks**

4. Director Clapper, the January 6, 2017 Joint Intelligence Community Assessment concluded that Russia's state-owned television network, RT, has "actively collaborated with Wikileaks" and "routinely gives [WikiLeaks founder Julian] Assange sympathetic coverage and provides him a platform to denounce the United States." For example, on August 6, 2016, RT published "an English language video called 'Julian Assange Special: Do Wikileaks have the Email That'll Put Clinton in Prison,'" along with an interview with Assange titled "Clinton and ISIS Funded by the Same Money." The timing of these stories, just months before the election, raises a number of questions.
  - a. **Could you comment on the ways in which Russia, through RT, might have collaborated with Wikileaks to overtly influence the 2016 US election in addition to its covert cyber operations?**

**Answer: Please direct your request to the National Intelligence Council within the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.**

**Senator Mazie K. Hirono**

*Questions for the Record following hearing on May 8, 2017 entitled:*

*“Russian Interference in the 2016 United States Election”*

**The Honorable James R. Clapper**

1) In response to my question about the vetting process for General Michael Flynn to be National Security Advisor, you stated that the vetting process for someone working in the White House is “far, far more invasive and far, far more thorough than a standard TS/SCI clearance process,” although you stated you did not know what process was used for General Flynn.

- a. Was it inaccurate for White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer to claim that everyone in government goes through the same clearance process and that there’s no difference in a security clearance once it’s done?

**Answer: It is my understanding that the intensity and scrutiny of the security clearance process depends on the level of the security clearance. I believe that obtaining a Top Secret security clearance, for example, requires a more thorough investigation than obtaining a Secret security clearance. And, as I said in my testimony, the vetting process for a high-level Executive Branch position is even more intense than for a typical Top Secret security clearance investigation. However, I cannot speak to what additional vetting the current administration performs, if any.**

- b. Do you believe that it would be irresponsible for the White House to depend on a former clearance in lieu of the more invasive and thorough full vetting process for positions on the National Security Council? Even if not, do you believe that this would be true for General Flynn, who was terminated by the administration that provided his initial clearance, which also warned against hiring him?

**Answer: I am not aware of what vetting process the current administration used for positions on the National Security Council.**

2) In response to my questions about President Trump’s efforts to influence the FBI investigation into his campaign’s connection to Russian interference in the election, you stated that, although you were reluctant to comment on the President’s tweets and other statements, you were confident that they would not have any influence on the investigation. On May 9, President Trump fired FBI Director James Comey. It was later reported that Director Comey had asked for additional funds to conduct the Trump campaign investigation days before his firing. And when asked about his decision to fire Director Comey, the President referred to the investigation. Are you concerned about the President’s termination of the FBI director who was overseeing an investigation of his campaign, and does it change your conclusion that the President will not successfully be able to influence the investigation? Is this what you meant when you stated during an interview on Sunday that “our institutions are under assault internally”? If your view on

the President's influence on the investigation has changed, do you agree with many members of the Committee that an independent investigation is necessary?

**Answer: I previously remarked that I have concerns. However, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein's appointment of former FBI Director Robert Mueller to serve as special counsel overseeing the Russia investigation is a welcome development. Director Mueller is principled, honorable, and incorruptible, and I am confident that he will fiercely protect the independence and integrity of the investigation.**

- 3) In recent weeks, the FBI has announced the charging and arrests of a number of Russian cyber hackers. The indictment of Evgeny Bogachev describes how he was working hand in glove with the Russian intelligence services. How pervasive is the problem of Russian hacking? How much are Americans losing financially as a result? What is the relationship between the Russian hackers and the Russian state security apparatus?

**Answer: Russian hacking remains a serious problem for both the United States government and the private sector. The Director of the National Security Agency, Admiral Mike Rogers, has said that hacking costs Americans hundreds of billions of dollars; in fact, Russian hackers reportedly directly stole more than \$900 million from U.S. and international financial institutions in 2015. It is often difficult to distinguish Russian criminal hacking and Russian state hacking—the case of Mr. Bogachev is a prime example of that. While Mr. Bogachev was using bank account information on infected computers to steal money, the Russian government was searching those same computers for intelligence-gathering purposes.**

- 4) President Trump recently restated his speculation that the hacking of the DNC could have been done by the [sic] China, not Russia, a statement you called regrettable during the hearing. What is the impact on the intelligence community's morale when the President repeats these unsupported speculations? What is the broader impact of the President's repeated questioning of the judgment of intelligence analysts when it comes to our international relations and ability to address foreign crises?

**Answer: A President is free to publicly critique the judgment and findings of the Intelligence Community. Such criticism, however, should be done in a thoughtful way that minimizes any impact on the public's faith and trust in the Intelligence Community.**

- 5) President Trump has praised Wikileaks in the past. The organization describes itself as journalistic and anti-secrecy, but CIA Director Pompeo and former FBI Director Comey have describe it as an instrument of foreign intelligence, an assessment you agreed with during the hearing. What particularly leads you to believe they are now operating as an instrument of a foreign power? Was President Trump briefed on that assessment? If so, when?

**Answer: I testified that I agreed with Director Pompeo's description of WikiLeaks as a non-nation state intelligence service; however, I did not describe it as "an**



**instrument of foreign intelligence.” As discussed in the Intelligence Community Assessment, the Intelligence Community assessed with high confidence that WikiLeaks worked with the Russian General Staff Main Intelligence Directorate to release data obtained from hacks of the Democratic National Committee and senior Democratic Party officials. President-elect Trump was briefed on the findings of the Intelligence Community Assessment on January 6, 2017.**

- 6) President Trump accused the British government of tapping his phones. Did you hear from your former counterparts in the British government about this accusation? How did they take it? What was the impact to US intelligence collection and our relations with the United Kingdom?

**Answer: These accusations were made after I left my position as the Director of National Intelligence. As such, I cannot assess any impact these accusations had on U.S. intelligence collection and our relationship with the United Kingdom.**

- 7) Russia has continued to interfere in elections to favor political candidates and parties in Europe and possibly elsewhere in the world. Could you describe the strategy, tactics, and motivations of the Russians in supporting these candidates and parties? Do you think that the possibility of connections between the Trump campaign and Russia is leading to concerns and reluctance among our allies to share information with the US government?

**Answer: The strategy, tactics, and motivations of the Russians are well laid out in Heather A. Conley’s “The Kremlin Playbook.” The Russians use a host of tactics to influence national and local elections around the world—including fake news, trolls, and propaganda—to sow confusion and doubt regarding a politician or political party and to benefit their preferred candidates. They also often use their economic clout to develop financial ties to those candidates and parties, which they then attempt to use as leverage to enhance Russia’s influence and control over a state’s key political and economic institutions. Russia’s ultimate goal remains the same as it has for decades: to undermine Western democracies and the Western liberal democratic order created in the aftermath of World War II that has kept the peace for more than 70 years.**