

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.

# 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

## 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](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw)**

way” to deal with this be “by correcting the public record?” Goss finally conceded, “I agree that if somebody is abusing the product [i.e., intelligence reports] . . . [the DCI] has a reason to go forward and say that’s not what we said.”

But later, after Chairman Pat Roberts (R-Kans.) lambasted the Democratic Senators for “partisanship,” especially because Rockefeller’s staff had prepared ten volumes of Goss’s speeches and statements, in order to hold him to the truth, Goss went on the offensive, trying to twist the questions put to him.

The Goss-Levin exchange says it all. Levin returned to probing about Cheney’s statements on the Mohammed Atta meetings, and Goss shot back: “Senator, I don’t believe any public official in a position of responsibility has deliberately mischaracterized or misled anybody in the United States or anyplace else.” The exchange continues:

**Levin:** That wasn’t my question.

**Goss:** You asked me if I could give you an example. I can’t—

**Levin:** Example—I didn’t use the word deliberately or intentionally or purposefully or willfully. . . . I just simply said mischaracterized the intelligence. . . . I’m looking for independence. Can you give us an example to show that you are willing to challenge the policymakers, that you are willing to speak truth to power?

Later, Goss again said, “If you’re asking me do I know of anybody who has deliberately mischaracterized or exaggerated intelligence, I don’t believe that’s the case.”

Levin replied: “That’s not what I asked you, but you’re again responding to a question that wasn’t asked. . . . Let me give you an example. Dec. 9th, 2001. Vice President Cheney said that it’s ‘been pretty well confirmed’ that 9/11 al-Qaeda hijacker Mohammed Atta did go to Prague, and ‘he did meet with a senior official of the Iraqi intelligence service in Czechoslovakia last April, several months before the attack.’ Now that went significantly beyond what the underlying intelligence said.”

Next Goss claimed that there might be information that Cheney used that he did not know about, and tried to contradict Levin’s assertion that the documents about Atta had all been declassified.

**Levin:** I’m just asking you a very simple question.

**Goss:** Yes.

**Levin:** Do you believe the statement that was made on Dec. 9th, 2001, by Vice President Cheney, that it’s “been pretty well confirmed” that that meeting took place, was an accurate reflection of intelligence that existed at the time. . . ? Do you—I’m just asking you a direct question.

**Goss:** Is the statement itself, that it was “pretty well confirmed”—if that’s your question—is I don’t think it was as well confirmed perhaps as the Vice President thought. But I don’t know what was in the Vice President’s mind, and I’ve

certainly never talked with him about this. So I don’t know how we came to that conclusion.

There were also tough questions, and more evasive answers about Cheney’s assertions about Iraq training al-Qaeda in using chemical weapons, about Doug Feith’s “rogue intelligence” operation in the Pentagon, and the recent National Intelligence Estimate that indicates that the Administration is *again* misleading the American people and Congress about what is happening in Iraq (see *Feature* in this issue).

## Goss Protects Feith

Goss’s own testimony established that he believes in the following policies:

- allowing the CIA to surveil, and possibly even assassinate American citizens and foreigners in the United States. He sanctimoniously insists only that the CIA should *not* have “arrest powers” domestically, even though he sponsored a June 2004 bill giving the CIA all these powers. He claims he was just playing devil’s advocate;

- he would *not* publicly inform the American people that Cheney, or any other “policymaker,” had presented false information about security threats to the nation, because the intervention by the CIA head would have a chilling effect on policymakers. He made no commitment to correct disinformation, even to Congress;

- he will curtail, if not abolish, the House and Senate Intelligence Committees as oversight bodies by: 1) defining their role as dealing only with the intelligence “product” and *not* the actions of the President, Vice President, and the Executive branch; and 2) supporting the White House in withholding information from the Intelligence committees, on “national security” grounds. This “oversight” function was put into law in the 1970s, after the Senate’s Church Committee investigated the U.S. intelligence community’s programs to assassinate foreign leaders, and spy on Americans;

- he *rejects* the description by Senators Rockefeller and Levin of the neo-con apparatus in the Pentagon as a “rogue intelligence” outfit. Goss instead defends the neo-cons’ lie factory as an exemplar of healthy competitive “dissent” and a safeguard *against* “group think.”

- he believes that Iraq did have WMD up through 2002-03, and that “we still don’t know what happened about the weapons.”

One consolation is that Goss will be a lame duck, if thinking Americans make sure his tenure at the CIA will only hasten the defeat of Dick Cheney’s police state in the November elections.

As Goss was confirmed, the neo-conservatives’ war-whoops against Iran have gotten louder and louder, and wildly exaggerated claims are emanating from Israeli Likud fanatics that Iran will have nuclear weapons “by 2005.” Having Goss in the CIA director position could mean that a Cheney-directed military action against Iran, could be the “October surprise.”