

LaRouche PAC Testifies To Senate Against Porter Goss

LaRouche PAC Executive Director Dr. Debra Hanania Freeman delivered written testimony, published here, to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on Sept. 21, opposing the nomination of Rep. Porter Goss (R-Fla.) to the post of Director of Central Intelligence.

The Freeman testimony, which was accompanied by EIR's articles documenting why Goss should be rejected, was widely distributed among Committee members and media and other attendees at the hearings. Her testimony buttressed strong attacks on Goss's qualifications by three Senate Democrats on the Committee, Jay Rockefeller (W.Va.), Carl Levin (Mich.), and Ron Wyden (Ore.). In the hearings, Rockefeller and Levin, in particular, backed Goss into a corner over the role of Vice President Dick Cheney in peddling fake allegations about Saddam Hussein's ties to the 9/11 attacks. We publish in this section a report on the hearing, and an investigative dossier on the dirty underside of Goss's Florida connections.

My name is Dr. Debra Hanania Freeman and I am the Executive Director of LaRouche PAC, the political action committee founded, July 31, 2004, by former candidate for the Democratic Party Presidential nomination Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. I come before the Committee today to urge you to reject the nomination of Porter Goss to the post of Director of Central Intelligence. Mr. Goss, in our judgment, lacks the professional expertise, the intellectual depth, and the record of ruthless non-partisanship, which is so vitally needed in this critical post at this moment in our nation's history.

The Bush Administration and the Congress appear hell-bent on an ill-conceived intelligence reorganization, which could place Mr. Goss in a position of even greater responsibility as Director of National Intelligence, perhaps before the November Presidential elections. Indeed, through a series of Aug. 27, 2004 Executive Orders, President George W. Bush has already greatly enhanced the powers of the DCI.

In the interests of national security, the debate over the selection of a new Director of Central Intelligence must take

place in a deliberative atmosphere, far removed from the super-charged partisan political climate of the final weeks of the Presidential and Congressional election campaign. In this particularly brutal partisan climate, Democrats are threatened with the label "soft on national security" if they dare allow the DCI post to remain "vacant" or dare to question the nominee's qualifications or impartiality. This serves no party's interest. This demeans the Senate as an institution at the heart of our Constitutional system, at a moment when the other pillar of our legislative branch, the House of Representatives, is virtually shut down by a Tom DeLay-led partisan lock-out. Mr. Goss, in fact, has been a key DeLay asset in that lock-out.

The Qualifications Required of the DCI

On Aug. 3, 2004, Lyndon LaRouche issued a critical white paper on the 911 Commission's recommendations for an overhaul of the U.S. intelligence community. While he did not take up the question of the nomination of Porter Goss, he did address some vital issues related to the nature of the mission of the U.S. intelligence community and its leadership, which define the criteria for selecting a DCI. The full text of that white paper is appended to this testimony, along with several other relevant documents; however, a few critical portions of that report must be cited here.

LaRouche wrote:

"The best argument which should have been made in [the 911 Commission] report for reorganization of the intelligence establishment, would be to point out the failure of the intelligence establishment to prevent the U.S.A.'s going to war in Iraq, when we as a nation were incompetently prepared, in mind-set and deployed means, for the asymmetric-warfare reaction which was the virtually inevitable, foreseeable consequence of launching that war. All of this blundering and worse was crafted on the basis of fraudulently crafted false premises, concocted chiefly by aid of the 'stove-piping' actions of neo-conservative 'chickenhawks' associated with Vice-President Cheney and his office. This was a war crafted, by aid of fraud, in a way directly violating those constitutional



The LaRouche Youth Movement sings and organizes in Washington, D.C. on Sept. 20, as the Senate hearings on the Porter Goss nomination were under way.

conditions which the framers of our Constitution intended in designing the powers of an incumbent President.”

Where was Mr. Goss when those failures occurred? The House Select Committee on Intelligence, which Mr. Goss has chaired for years, has failed to hold a public hearing, failed to issue a bipartisan report, and failed to exert any oversight leadership. Instead, as Chairman, Mr. Goss has served the interests of Vice President Cheney, and other neo-conservatives in the upper echelons of the Bush Administration, who were directly responsible for those hideous intelligence hoaxes, which have resulted in tens of thousands of deaths and hundreds of thousands of casualties—American, British, Italian, Polish, and most of all, Iraqi.

The so-called “war on terrorism” which is the hallmark of the Bush-Cheney Administration’s foreign policy, has been drastically set back by that unilateral preventive war. This is not an issue of partisan squabbling. We have recently learned that the National Intelligence Council produced a July 2004 National Intelligence Estimate, warning that the so-far failed American-led Iraq occupation has created a “new Afghanistan” training ground for anti-American asymmetrical warfare cadre, which will haunt us for decades to come. When Mr. Goss received that NIE several months ago, did he take any corrective action? I think not.

Mr. LaRouche continued, addressing another issue of relevance to the case of Mr. Goss:

“Often, as in today’s crises, busy in-service political figures, gripped by the combination of their political-career ambitions and pressures of popular opinion, become so con-

cerned with near-term press and other public opinion, that they lose sight of the character of our nation, its purpose, and its future destiny, as a nation essentially rooted in the history of the way in which we came into being, and have survived ominous threats and other challenges over the course of the time since the founding of the first European colonies on our shores. Too often, as now, the in-service political figures’ preoccupation with notions of success of self or party faction, blinds them to those more profound, true interests of our republic, well known to the founders of our republic, which are rooted in our own history and the historical experience of a European civilization’s toils and torment, over a period since the time of the conflict between the struggle for freedom, led by Solon of Athens against the legacy of tyranny traced from Sparta’s Lycurgus.”

Mr. Goss’ record, particularly since the start of the Iraq war, as a shameless partisan, committed more to concealing the sins of the Vice President and his minions than pursuing the truth, has damaged the U.S. Congress. His now infamous “show me the blue dress” remarks, referring to the leaking of the identity of an undercover CIA officer, cannot be simply dismissed as unfortunate rhetorical carelessness. We are yet to learn of the full consequences of the leaking of the identity of the wife of Ambassador Joseph Wilson. At minimum, an undercover CIA officer’s cover was exposed, a longstanding CIA proprietary was blown, and assets built over years, providing crucial intelligence on weapons of mass destruction, were placed in grave danger. We have no access to classified material, so we do not know the severity of the damage, or

the results of the community's damage assessment, if one has been completed.

Whether or not prosecutors determine that the leak reached the threshold of a felony offense or not, the idea that top White House officials leaked the name of an active U.S. intelligence officer, as an act of revenge against an honest critic, is frightening. News reports in recent weeks make it clear that at least one focal point of the probe is the Office of Vice President Dick Cheney, and his chief of staff, Lewis Libby.

Three Major Intelligence Challenges

In his Aug. 3 paper, Mr. LaRouche next identified the leading threats to the security of our nation that must top the agenda of the intelligence community.

"The underlying root of our nation's present insecurity, which is only reflected by what the silly current Bush Presidency terms 'the war against terrorism,' is expressed in three principled forms.

"One: the insecurity caused by the onrushing general physical-economic collapse of the world's present monetary-financial system.

"Two: the reaction to the instabilities fostered by certain Anglo-American efforts to establish an imperialistic form of globalized society under conditions provided by the collapse of the Soviet system. The policy of the liberal-imperialist government of Fabian British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his Robert Cooper and Baroness Liz Symons, typifies a current expression of this.

"Three: the use of strategies mimicking Hermann Goering's setting fire to the Reichstag, in February 1933, to panic governments into proffering dictatorial powers to replace representative government, on the pretext of 'fighting terrorism,' for example.

"The role of the spin-offs of the British Foreign Office's child, the Muslim Brotherhood, such as Osama bin Laden's crew, is to be regarded as a typical reflection of the convergence of the effects of these three principal problems."

"Washington and London, chiefly, created Osama bin Laden as their instrument of policy [during the 1979-1990 'Afghanistan War' to uproot the Soviet Red Army from the Central Asian region]. We created and nurtured the operating environment in which he functions today. How do we dry out the conditions on which the continuation of his operations depends? What have we done wrong, not only to create him, but, as the Bush Administration did in its wildly insane and reckless launching of the current Iraq war (and it is still very much an ongoing, and spreading war) to nourish the kind of environment in which we, by our policies, are creating the very so-called 'terrorist' threat which we, on the other hand, claim to be devoutly committed to uprooting?"

These are tough words, but words which genuinely reflect the challenges facing the incoming DCI and the entire intelligence community. An extraordinary degree of intellectual integrity is going to be required of the new leader of the

nation's intelligence establishment, to take on those types of taboo issues and provide the President and the Cabinet with qualified, unbiased assessments and advice. Held up to those lofty standards, which are the only appropriate standards, given today's crisis-ridden world, Mr. Goss is found, in our judgment, to be seriously lacking.

An Appropriate Reform

Finally, Mr. LaRouche then addressed the issue of what kinds of structural reforms of the U.S. intelligence community would actually make sense, on the basis of the standards he spelled out:

"Before proposing to change the top-down organization of our republic's intelligence-security functions, consider a crucial test-question. Why did we not clean house of those accomplices of Vice-President Dick Cheney whose fraudulent concoctions and duplicitous schemes led the U.S.A. into an Iraq war which simply should not have happened as it did? In other words, why did we not fire Wolfowitz's and Cheney's crews, and do the same thing, in effect, with the core of the security problem, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and Vice-President Cheney? What prevented us from doing that in a timely way, and what changes might have caused that necessary reversal of the folly of failing to dump them before the war actually started?

"Any proposed change in the structuring of our intelligence-security establishment, which does not meet that test-question standard, should be sent back to the drawing board, or, probably, to a new firm of architects."

He continued:

"Would an 'intelligence czar's' appointment provide a solution? By no means. We must build into our intelligence-security system a set of checks and balances of the type which would have tended to break through the barriers against a constitutional regard for truth, barriers erected by those behind Tony Blair, Dick Cheney, and the latter's 'chickenhawk' crew.

"A replacement for the incompetent notion of a super-Golem of security intelligence, should be a process of controversy which will be efficiently brought to bear, even to the degree that discoveries made could lead to the impeachment of the incumbent President which that intelligence community has dutifully served, in bringing about the duly considered removal of that particular President from office. The standard of performance required, is not the assertion of absolute truth, but simply the fruit of competently pursued discovery of truthful conclusions.

"To that end, the functions of intelligence and security planning must assume the quality of a Platonic Socratic dialogue, a dialogue thus composed as a search for discovery of truth. All views must be openly set forth at a common table. In that function, leadership, strong leadership is needed, but no arbitrary boss can be tolerated. This will succeed only if the government, and a large portion of the citizenry is committed to, and supports the methods of a Socratic dialogue as the

means by which estimates of truth are composed.

“The standard for truthfulness we require to such ends, is the form of controversy we associate, typically, with great experimentally validated discoveries of universal physical principle, discoveries made in defiance of all supposedly self-evident definitions, axioms, and postulates. This requires a form of organization of the intelligence community at large, in which the inherent tendency for fallacy of composition by specialist agencies, or intruding partisanship, is corrected through an office which functions, not as a czar, but as a secretary of the assembled functions of all the relevant intelligence and security services. The secretary is so defined, as one which can never enjoy the authority of suppressing the evidence of any participating agency, but, on the contrary, acts as chief among equals in a general staff system, comparable to a military general staff system, in the assigned mission of ensuring that the government of the U.S.A. has the advantage of knowing even when it is wrong in even its currently steadfast, ostensibly principled opinion.

“Such a general staff mode of organization, can be achieved with the desirable least change in organization of government, by a certain concretizing of the separation of the function of Director of Intelligence from that of Director of Central Intelligence. The Director of Intelligence, functioning as a non-elected professional officer to the body of the Cabinet, with voice equal to that of the rank of a member of the Cabinet, would be a recommended change producing the needed Secretary-coordinator of a general staff system composed of the principal representatives of the various security and intelligence agencies of the Federal government. Under that Secretary (Director of Intelligence), the Director of Central Intelligence would rank as a coordinating first among equals for all other intelligence functions, but without the authority to suppress the voice of peers in matters presented to the Secretary and to the body of distinguished advisors associated with that Secretary.

“The included objective is to rid the system, as much as is feasible, of those abuses of the intelligence and security functions associated with the regrettable memories of such as Allen Dulles and James J. Angleton. This requires an adjustment, elevating the responsible directors of intelligence for other Federal agencies to the authority for intelligence matters associated with membership in a general staff system. If that specific intention is not made emphatically, even the best intentions otherwise, will fail; one can not cure the patient without addressing the disease, and the Dulles-Angleton syndrome has been an ugly disease.

“By a general staff system, we should intend to avoid the evils of a bureaucratic system. The serving director of each agency must have the degree of independence for investigations which the term general staff system connotes.”

The Case of Porter Goss

Nothing in Mr. Goss’ background, or his performance in his present post as Chairman of the House Select Committee

on Intelligence, suggests that he comes close to meeting the criteria set forward above. If anything, what little has been revealed publicly about Mr. Goss’ career as an intelligence officer, raises more questions and possible areas of concern, than confidence.

According to the available public record, Mr. Goss served in the CIA as a case officer from 1961-1971. His early postings were with the JM-Wave station in Miami, which was in charge of CIA covert operations against Cuban dictator Fidel Castro. He continued on the Cuban case, in subsequent postings in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Mexico.

In 1975, the Church Committee revealed that the CIA had carried out assassination programs against foreign leaders, including Castro. “United States government personnel plotted to kill Castro from 1960 to 1965,” the report stated. “American underworld figures and Cubans hostile to Castro were used in these plots, and were provided encouragement and material support by the United States.”

Among the CIA officers with whom Mr. Goss served in JM-Wave were a number of individuals who directly participated in Operation Mongoose, the Castro assassination program. Some of these individuals later participated in the Watergate burglary, on behalf of the Nixon White House, and later surfaced as key players in the 1980s Iran-Contra debacle.

Upon his medically-forced retirement from the CIA, Mr. Goss moved to the Gulf Coast of Florida, became involved in local businesses, including the newspaper business, and then became involved in local and state politics, eventually winning his present U.S. Congressional seat in 1988.

Mr. Goss’ involvement in county government in Lee County, Fla. in the mid-1980s overlapped the period of the now infamous Iran-Contra affair. One often buried aspect of that runaway intelligence fiasco was the involvement of rightwing Cuban exiles and Ibero-American organized crime figures in the secret supply operations to the Nicaraguan Contra rebels—what came to be known as “The Enterprise.” Sen. John Kerry produced the most comprehensive account of the involvement of narcotics traffickers in the Contra supply effort, in his 1988 Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee report, “Drugs, Law Enforcement and Foreign Policy.” In 1996, Mr. Goss, in an appearance on nationwide television, deliberately misrepresented the Kerry Commission findings, claiming that there was no evidence that the Contras had any involvement in or with drug traffickers.

Was this misstatement by Mr. Goss a simple matter of partisan Sophistry, or was it something far worse? At the height of the secret Contra supply operations, Mr. Goss was a member of the Lee County Commission. During that period, leading members of the Lee County Sheriff’s Department were caught, smuggling large quantities of drugs into the County, in league with former federal law enforcement officials and previously convicted narcotics dealers. We have interviewed members of the Joint Narcotics Task Force, who participated in that probe, and they still, to this day, complain bitterly, about interference by local officials and local mem-

bers of “the intelligence industry” in their efforts to shut down a major trafficking organization. I append several news accounts of the drug scandal to this testimony.

We are not making a “guilt-by-association” charge against Mr. Goss. We are merely raising one of a number of issues that remain unresolved, as this Committee, under clear political pressure from the White House, rushes to judgment on Mr. Goss’ qualifications to head up the American intelligence community.

Would the nation not be better served by a more careful look? Has this Committee gone into closed session to thoroughly probe Mr. Goss’ relationship to those Lee County events? Have the members of the Joint Narcotics Task Force been invited to appear? Has Mr. Goss been asked to discuss his knowledge about those events?

Can we afford to rush to confirm a highly partisan figure, with potential still-unexplored skeletons in his closet, as the new Director of Central Intelligence? We are convinced that Mr. Goss is not qualified or suited to assume the post. We oppose his nomination. But some of you, who may be inclined to give Mr. Goss the benefit of the doubt, should consider the option of shelving the nomination, pending a far more thorough review of the concerns that I have raised here today. Either way, the United States interests, at home and abroad, will be ill-served by a Senate confirmation of Porter Goss as Director of Central Intelligence.

Thank you.

EIR Online

Gives subscribers online the same economic analysis that has made *EIR* one of the most valued publications for policymakers, and established LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world.



EIR Contributing Editor,
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Issued every Tuesday, *EIR Online* includes:

- Lyndon LaRouche’s economic and strategic analyses;
- Charting of the world economic crisis;
- Special features not in the print version of *EIR*.

\$360 per year Two-month trial, **\$60**

For more information,

Call **1-888-347-3258** (toll-free)

VISIT ONLINE:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Goss Hammered For Protecting Cheney

by Michele Steinberg

Dick Cheney’s neo-conservative cabal, which has run the nation as its own private fascist state since the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, is finally about to get what it has long wanted: control of the Central Intelligence Agency. On Sept. 21, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence voted 12-4 to send the appointment of Porter Goss as Director of Central Intelligence (DCI), to the Senate for a vote in the immediate days ahead. The Democratic leadership did not oppose Goss, and he was confirmed on Sept. 22, by a vote of 77-17.

Goss showed he is a “true believer” in a government of secret tribunals, of maneuvers to legalize torturing prisoners, of corporate corruption, and will serve nicely as Bush-Cheney’s “Heinrich Himmler.” And, if Cheney and Goss have their way, the Sept. 20 hearing on Goss’s nomination will be the *last* chance the committee will ever have to exercise “oversight” of U.S. intelligence.

Senators Expose Cheney

The questions put to Goss by three senior Democratic Senators, Jay Rockefeller (W.Va.), Carl Levin (Mich.), and Ron Wyden (Ore.), on Sept. 20 were the most detailed and rigorous defense of Constitutional rights, and of U.S. national security, to come from the Congress since 9/11. And appropriately, they exposed the abuses of Dick Cheney.

Early on, Rockefeller asked, “What kind of a man is Porter Goss? . . . [F]or example, in the case of Mohammed Atta and the famed non-trip to Prague [allegedly to meet with Iraqi intelligence], which the Vice President is still referring to and talking about, proving therefore a relationship between 9/11 and—quote, ‘proving’—and the Twin Towers. *That’s stunning to me, shocking to me. I mean, I don’t know why he says that, how he says that. It’s not responsible.*

“Now, you’re the head of the CIA, and he says that, but he says it very—he says it publicly, as he does. What do you do about that? You can answer, ‘Well, that’s a policymaking question and not a matter for me.’ On the other hand, you are the head of the CIA and he is misusing intelligence, he’s misleading the American people. . . . What do you do with that?” [Emphasis added.]

When Goss said he would only *privately* talk to the policymaker, Rockefeller pressed him, saying, “Would you correct the public record on the matter?” Goss again tried to evade, but Rockefeller again pressed asking, wouldn’t the “only