

SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE TRIED TO SAY WIKILEAKS CONSTITUTED – NOT JUST RESEMBLED – A SPY

The bill report for the Intelligence Authorization is out. Among other things, it provides more details on the Senate Intelligence Committee's efforts to get WikiLeaks treated as a non-state hostile intelligence service. It reveals that the original language of the bill

By voice vote, the Committee adopted a second-degree amendment by Senator King to an amendment by Senator Wyden that would have stricken Section 623 of the bill. Section 623 originally provided a Sense of Congress that WikiLeaks and its senior leadership constitute a non-state hostile intelligence service.

By a vote of 13 ayes to 2 noes, the Committee adopted the amendment by Senator Wyden that would have stricken Section 623 of the bill, as modified by the second-degree amendment by Senator King, to provide a Sense of Congress that WikiLeaks and its senior leadership resemble a non-state hostile intelligence service. The votes in person or by proxy were as follows: [my emphasis]

Chairman Burr–aye;

Senator Risch–aye;

Senator Rubio–aye;

Senator Collins–aye;

Senator Blunt–aye;

Senator Lankford—aye;
Senator Cotton—aye;
Senator Cornyn—aye;
Vice Chairman Warner—aye;
Senator Feinstein—aye;
Senator Wyden—no;
Senator Heinrich—aye;
Senator King—aye;
Senator Manchin—aye;
Senator Harris—no.

As you can see, Kamala Harris is the only one, besides Ron Wyden, who voted against this troubling amendment.

Here's her statement from the report:

In particular, I have reservations about Section 623, which establishes a Sense of Congress that WikiLeaks and the senior leadership of WikiLeaks resemble a non-state hostile intelligence service. The Committee's bill offers no definition of "non-state hostile intelligence service" to clarify what this term is and is not. Section 623 also directs the United States to treat WikiLeaks as such a service, without offering further clarity.

To be clear, I am no supporter of WikiLeaks, and believe that the organization and its leadership have done considerable harm to this country. This issue needs to be addressed. However, the ambiguity in the bill is dangerous because it fails to draw a bright line between WikiLeaks and legitimate journalistic organizations that play a vital role in our democracy.

I supported efforts to remove this

language in Committee and look forward to working with my colleagues as the bill proceeds to address my concerns.