

# EXHIBIT A

## DECLARATION OF ARTHUR BROWN

I, Arthur Brown, hereby declare:

1. I am a citizen of the United States. I have held several positions at the Central Intelligence Agency (“CIA”) between 1980 and my retirement in 2005. The bulk of this career was spent as an Operations Officer of the Directorate of Operations in overseas positions. I was the senior CIA representative in three Asian capitals in Northeast and Southeast Asia. I was Chief of East Asia Division for the CIA’s Clandestine Service at the time of my retirement in 2005 and was previously the National Intelligence Officer for East Asia between 2002 and 2003. I advised President George W. Bush in person and routinely testified in closed-door sessions before Congressional committees on national security, economic and regional stability issues. The CIA awarded me the Distinguished Career Intelligence Medal and the Donovan Award in 2005, the Director’s Award in 2004, the Exceptional Performance Award in 2002, 2003, and 2004, and the Meritorious Unit Citation in 1991, 1997, and 2000. I also received the following foreign awards: Order of Diplomatic Merit by South Korean President Kim Dae-Jung, 1999, and Director’s Service Plaque, Malaysian Special Branch, 1992.
2. During my twenty-five years in the CIA, I personally conducted interviews of various types of foreign sources and prepared at least 800 reports based on these interviews. By virtue of my subsequent positions as the Senior Agency Representative in Asian capitals and the CIA’s East Asia Division Chief, I was responsible for managing similar collection activity by numerous CIA subordinates. During the course of my career, I reviewed at least 10,000 “raw” or unfinished reports prepared by CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), and military services “collectors” reflecting “human intelligence” (HUMINT). From that experience, I learned the facts and reached the conclusions described below.
3. Repeating a source’s statements back to him/her was never considered a matter of “disclosure” of classified information under any scenario no matter what the content of those statements. In fact, it is normal in almost all intelligence interviews of consequence to repeat the source’s prior substantive statements to ensure the fullness of your understanding. This is in fact necessary in scenarios where language and cultural differences can cause misunderstandings and, if left uncorrected, the basis for error. I have personally done so and have directed subordinates to do the same, and have never considered such an action “disclosure” despite the fact that the initial report of those statements may have been classified in order to protect the identity of the source and the method used in obtaining that information from outside detection. Since the source obviously knew his own identify and was a party to the method of information transmission, there was nothing that would be “disclosed” in repeating to him some or all of his statements. Unless we attached independent confirmation of those statements or classified analytical judgments, simply repeating back a source’s statement did not provide that source with any additional knowledge that he/she did not already possess. You disclose nothing in that process.
4. The normal HUMINT collection process routinely utilizes a series of follow-up questions based on subsequent analysis of the source’s prior statements or information. It is, by nature, focused

on those statements the intelligence community deems significant. I have never met, nor heard of, a foreign intelligence source who possessed a US Government classified security clearance. Accordingly, if the selective repetition of the source's statements back to the source were considered to be "disclosure" of US Government classified information, the HUMINT process would grind to a halt. You cannot conduct meaningful HUMINT operations without the ability to reference previous source statements and ask follow-up questions.

5. There has been an argument that by revealing the fact that we noted some, but not all, of a source's statements may indicate some unique value we place on a particular statement. Selectiveness in follow-up questions was probably true in almost every source interview I conducted but at no time was my follow-up questioning constricted because of a potential "disclosure" issue based on that selectivity. It is simply not "disclosure" to repeat verbatim a source's statement back to him/her in any scenario I know from twenty-five years of actual practice.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 4, 2008.



ARTHUR BROWN