**Marne L. Levine Bio ("Meandered with a sense of purpose")**

This statement made to the Washington Post on Dec. 6, 2012 is a lie. Levine very evidently follows the orders of Larry Summers and Sheryl Sandberg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Primary Cartel Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Larry Summers, Sheryl Sandberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993-2001</td>
<td>Understudy</td>
<td>Larry Summers, Treasury Secretary</td>
<td>Larry Summers, Sheryl Sandberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001-2003</td>
<td>Chief of Staff to Larry Summers</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Larry Summers, Mark Zuckerberg, James W. Breyer, Accel Partners, Ping Li, James Swartz, Reid Hoffman, Peter Thiel, Harvard Crimson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>Product Manager</td>
<td>Cibernet Corporation</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Jan 21</td>
<td>Chief of Staff to Larry Summers</td>
<td>National Economic Council</td>
<td>Larry Summers, Barack Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Jun 24</td>
<td>Vice President for Global Public Policy</td>
<td>The White House</td>
<td>Larry Summers, Barack Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>May 01</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Chegg</td>
<td>Kleiner Perkins, funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jan 01</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
<td>U.S. Dept. of State, donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Oct 07</td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>Larry Summers, Marc Andreessen, directors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See enlarged timeline on next page.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/postlive/marne-levine-ive-meandered-with-a-sense-of-purpose/2012/12/06/9a1d796c-3fb7-11e2-ae43-cf491b837f7b_video.html
Marne L. Levine biographical information (to Washington Post, 2010) about her bio: "Meandered with a sense of purpose"

The timeline proves that her “meandered” statement is a lie. Her career is a straight line of Larry Summers orders.

"Marne is a lackey for Summers & the Cartel."

https://youtu.be/P-MUFB7Qs9E
Meet Facebook's New DC Schmoozer

Facebook made Washington insider Marne Levine it's first vice president of global public policy yesterday.

Till then, Marne worked as the chief-of-staff for National Economic Council head Larry Summers.

# ACCORDING TO WASHINGTON LIFE, SHE'S MARRIED TO PHILIP DEUTCH "A MANAGING DIRECTOR OF PERSEUS, LLC, A WASHINGTON, D.C. AND NEW YORK CITY-BASED PRIVATE EQUITY FUND. DEUTCH FOCUSES ON VENTURE CAPITAL INVESTING IN THE ENERGY AREA."

Image: Washington Life
ACCORDING TO REALCLEARPOLITICS, SHE HAS A 3 1/2-YEAR-OLD AND A 9-MONTH-OLD.

This is not actually Marne's kid.

Image: vauvau on flickr

MORE FROM BUSINESS INSIDER

A massive fire engulfed a Dubai hotel near the world’s tallest skyscraper

50 passengers were stuck on a ride at SeaWorld for over 2 hours

Chinese banks are using a ridiculously simple trick to limit the number of bad loans on their books

There is one force reshaping the entire world • and Wall Street is catching on

Virtual reality is teaching CEOs how to crush the competition

# SHE DONATED $4,600 TO PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS IN 2008 - $2,300 TO HILARY CLINTON AND $2,300 TO BARACK OBAMA
SHE USED TO BE DIRECTOR OF PRODUCT MANAGEMENT AT STEVE CASE'S STARTUP REVOLUTION MONEY.

DURING THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION, SHE WORKED AT THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT AS DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BANKING AND FINANCE IN THE OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC LIAISON.
SHE GRADUATED FROM MIAMI UNIVERSITY IN OXFORD, OHIO.

SHE HAS AN M.B.A. FROM THE HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL.
ACCORDING TO HER NEC BIO, "FROM 2001-2003, MS. LEVINE SERVED AS CHIEF OF STAFF FOR HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT LAWRENCE SUMMERS WHERE HELPED MANAGE OPERATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY'S 14,000 EMPLOYEES AND $2.4 BILLION OPERATING BUDGET."

SHE GOES OUT ON THE TOWN! HERE'S A PIC FROM SOCIETY MAGAZINE WASHINGTON LIFE...
...AND ANOTHER FROM WASHINGTON LIFE

Join the conversation about this story »
Something about Marne

June 26, 2010 by Elias Shams

Here are more information we digged out about the new facebook’s vice president of global public policy babe, Marne Levine, who just left her top position as the National Economic Counsel at the white house. I blogged about her yesterday.

According to Washington Life, Marne is married to Philip Deutch “a managing director of Perseus, LLC, a Washington, D.C. and New York City-based private equity fund. Deutch focuses on venture capital investing in the energy area.”
She donated $4,600 to presidential campaigns in 2008 – $2,300 to Hilary Clinton and $2,300 to Barack Obama.

She used to be director of product management at Steve Case’s start-up Revolution Money.
During the Clinton Administration, she worked at the Treasury Department as deputy assistant secretary for banking and finance in the office of legislative affairs and public liaison.

She graduated from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.
She has an M.B.A. from the Harvard Business School.

According to her NEC bio, “From 2001-2003, Ms. Levine served as Chief of Staff for Harvard University President Lawrence Summers where helped manage operations of the universities 14,000 employees and $2.4 billion operating budget.”
She goes out on the town! Here’s a pic from society magazine Washington Life...
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- Facebook snags White House economic adviser Levine as global policy head
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About Elias Shams
Serial Washingtonian Entrepreneur in Telecom & Social media space and love Washington, DC
Marne Levine

November 21, 2012

Vice President, Global Public Policy, Facebook

Marne Levine is Vice President, Global Public Policy and oversees the company's efforts to educate governments and non-governmental organizations on its plans, products and

https://www.washingtonpost.com/postlive/marne-levine/2012/11/21/0ec44f94-33fa-11e2-9cfa-e41bac906cc9_story.html
policies to foster understanding and support for innovative technologies like Facebook.

Marne has substantial government experience working on international issues and particular sensitivity to navigating policy challenges in an Internet company. She joined Facebook from the Obama Administration, where she served as Chief of Staff at the White House National Economic Council. In that role, she helped coordinate the development of domestic and international economic policy along with the strategies for communicating these policies to stakeholders.

Previously, Marne helped launch an online peer-to-peer payment platform, and helped manage its privacy and compliance issues. She also served as Chief of Staff for Larry Summers when he was President of Harvard University. She began her career at the United States Department of Treasury, where she served in the Office of Legislative Affairs and Public Liaison.

Marne has a Bachelor's in Political Science and Communications from Miami University and an MBA from the Harvard Business School.
WEDDINGS/CELEBRATIONS; Marne Levine, Philip Deutch

Published: June 22, 2003

Marne Lynn Levine, a daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Mark Levine of Shaker Heights, Ohio, was married last evening to Philip Joseph Deutch, a son of Samayla D. Deutch of New York and John M. Deutch of Belmont, Mass. Rabbi Stuart A. Gertman officiated at the National Museum of Women in the Arts in Washington.

Ms. Levine, 32, is keeping her name. She is the chief of staff to Lawrence H. Summers, the president of Harvard. She graduated from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. Her father is a plastic surgeon at Associates in Ophthalmology in South Euclid, Ohio. Her mother, Teri Levine, is on the board of the Cleveland chapters of the American Red Cross and the Jewish Community Federation.

Mr. Deutch, 38, is a managing director and venture capitalist at Perseus, a venture capital and leveraged buyout company in Washington. He graduated from Amherst and received a law degree from Stanford. His mother is a lawyer in New York. His father, who was the director of Central Intelligence from 1994 to 1996, is an institute professor at M.I.T.

The bridegroom is a stepson of Patricia Deutch and of Richard Sigal. His previous marriage ended in divorce.

The wedding was a stepson of Patricia Deutch and of Richard Sigal. His previous marriage ended in divorce.

Photo (Ralph Alswang)
John Deutch

AKA John Mark Deutch

Born: 27-Jul-1938
Birthplace: Brussels, Belgium

Gender: Male
Religion: Jewish
Race or Ethnicity: White
Sexual orientation: Straight
Occupation: Government
Party Affiliation: Democratic
Nationality: United States
Executive summary: CIA Director, 1995-96

Former CIA Director, lost a PowerBook containing government secrets.

Wife: Patricia Lyon Deutch

University: BA History and Economics, Amherst College
University: BS Chemical Engineering, MIT (1961)
University: PhD Physical Chemistry, MIT (1966)
Professor: Chemistry, Princeton University (1966-69)
Professor: Chemistry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1970-77)
Administrator: Chairman, Department of Chemistry, MIT (1976-77)
Administrator: Dean of Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1982-85)
Administrator: Provost, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1985-90)
Professor: Institute Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1990-)

CIA Director (1995-96)
US Energy Department Undersecretary (1979-80)
US Energy Department Director of Energy Research (1977-79)
Member of the Board of Citigroup
Member of the Board of Raytheon (1998-)
Member of the Board of Schlumberger (1997-)
Member of the Board of Cummins
Member of the Board of ARIAD Pharmaceuticals (1997-?)
Boston Museum of Fine Arts Trustee
Bilderberg Group
Bill Bradley for President
Bretton Woods Committee
Carol Moseley Braun for President
Council on Foreign Relations
Forum for International Policy Trustee
Friends of Dick Lugar
Friends of Hillary
Gephardt for President
Gorbachev Foundation Senior Fellow
Hillary Clinton for President
New Leadership for America PAC
Nixon Center Advisory Council
Obama for America
Psi Upsilon Fraternity Amherst College
Resources for the Future Board of Directors
Mishandling Classified Materials pled guilty (19-Jan-2001)
Pardoned For unauthorized retention of classified material by President Clinton (20-Jan-2001)

New! Create a map starting with 🧑‍ mktime John Deutch

Requires Flash 7+ and Javascript.
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# CIA Director

## US GOVERNMENT OFFICE

Head of the Central Intelligence Agency. See also [CIA Deputy Director](#) and [CIA employee](#).

**Official Website:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23-Jan-1946</td>
<td>10-Jun-1946</td>
<td>Sidney Souers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Jun-1946</td>
<td>1-May-1947</td>
<td>Hoyt Vandenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May-1947</td>
<td>7-Oct-1950</td>
<td>Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Oct-1950</td>
<td>9-Feb-1953</td>
<td>Walter Bedell Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Feb-1953</td>
<td>29-Nov-1961</td>
<td>Allen W. Dulles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Nov-1961</td>
<td>28-Apr-1965</td>
<td>John McCone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Apr-1965</td>
<td>30-Jun-1966</td>
<td>William F. Raborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jun-1966</td>
<td>2-Feb-1973</td>
<td>Richard Helms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Feb-1973</td>
<td>2-Jul-1973</td>
<td>James R. Schlesinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Sep-1973</td>
<td>30-Jan-1976</td>
<td>William Colby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Jan-1981</td>
<td>29-Jan-1987</td>
<td>William Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Feb-1993</td>
<td>10-Jan-1995</td>
<td>James Woolsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jul-1997</td>
<td>11-Jul-2004</td>
<td>George Tenet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Jul-2004</td>
<td>22-Sep-2004</td>
<td>John E. McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Sep-2004</td>
<td>5-May-2006</td>
<td>Porter Goss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-May-2006</td>
<td>12-Feb-2009</td>
<td>Michael V. Hayden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Feb-2009</td>
<td>1-Jul-2011</td>
<td>Leon Panetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Sep-2011</td>
<td>9-Nov-2012</td>
<td>David Petraeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Mar-2013</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>John O. Brennan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you know something we don't?
Citigroup

COMPANY

Formed by the merger of Citicorp with Travelers Group in 1998.

Official Website:
http://www.citigroup.com/

Industry:
Banking

Ticker:
NYSE:C

Corporate headquarters:
New York City

Sales:
$3.6B (2007)

Employees:
350000 (2008)

EXECUTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Known for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaukat Aziz</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>6-Mar-1949</td>
<td>Prime Minister of Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajay Banga</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1960</td>
<td>CEO of Citibank Asia/Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winfried Bischoff</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Chairman of Citigroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Burnett</td>
<td>TV Personality</td>
<td>3-May-1976</td>
<td>Squawk on the Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa M. Caputo</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>EVP at The Travelers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet M. Clarke</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1952</td>
<td>Clarke Littlefield LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Dawkins</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>8-Mar-1938</td>
<td>Winner, 1958 Heisman Trophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Denham</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>27-Aug-1945</td>
<td>Partner, Munger, Tolles &amp; Olson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinyar S. Devitre</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1946</td>
<td>CFO of Altria, 2002-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Druskin</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1947</td>
<td>CFO of Shearson Lehman Brothers, 1984-91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay S. Fishman</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4-Nov-1952</td>
<td>CEO of Travelers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven J. Freiberg</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1957</td>
<td>Global Consumer Group, Citigroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda J. Gaines</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1949</td>
<td>CEO of Diners Club NA, 2002-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith W. Hughes</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1946</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of Citigroup, 2000-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajive Johri</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>First National Bank of Omaha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas W. Jones</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>President of TIAA-CREF, 1993-97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Known for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Katis</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Founder, Triple Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallie L. Krawcheck</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFO of Citigroup, 2004-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob J. Lew</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>29-Aug-1955</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obama's White House Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert I. Lipp</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1938</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of Travelers Property Casualty, 2001-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Magner</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Citibank executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond J. McGuire</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citigroup M&amp;A executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi G. Miller</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1954</td>
<td></td>
<td>EVP at JP Morgan Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Moreno</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman of Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy S. Newcomb</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1946</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Citigroup executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter R. Orszag</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16-Dec-1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beltway economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikram Pandit</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of Citigroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles O. Prince</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>13-Jan-1950</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of Citigroup, 2003-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. Reed</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of Citibank, 1984-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. Rhodes</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15-Aug-1935</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chairman of Citigroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell W. Robinson</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1949</td>
<td></td>
<td>COO of MIVA, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renato Ruggiero</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>9-Apr-1930</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director-General of the WTO, 1995-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David S. Schechter</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>Icahn Capital LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis B. Susman</td>
<td>Diplomat</td>
<td>19-Nov-1937</td>
<td></td>
<td>US Ambassador to the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen R. Volk</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chairman of Citigroup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Board Members or Directors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Known for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alain J. P. Belda</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>23-Jun-1943</td>
<td>CEO of Alcoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winfried Bischoff</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Chairman of Citigroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy C. Collins</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1956</td>
<td>Private equity, Ripplewood Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George David</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7-Apr-1942</td>
<td>CEO of United Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Deutch</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>27-Jul-1938</td>
<td>CIA Director, 1995-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Joss</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>c. 1941</td>
<td>Dean, Stanford Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew N. Liveris</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CEO of Dow Chemical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne M. Mulcahy</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>21-Oct-1952</td>
<td>CEO of Xerox, 2001-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikram Pandit</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>CEO of Citigroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Parsons</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4-Apr-1948</td>
<td>CEO of Time Warner, 2002-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Hernández Ramirez</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>CEO, Banco Nacional de Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence R. Ricciardi</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>14-Aug-1940</td>
<td>General Counsel for IBM, 1995-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Rodin</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>9-Sep-1944</td>
<td>President of UPenn, 1994-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Ryan</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1943</td>
<td>CFO of Medtronic, 1993-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Taylor</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1955</td>
<td>NY Superintendent of Banks, 2003-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PAST BOARD MEMBERS OR DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Known for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Bialkin</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>9-Sep-1929</td>
<td>c. 1977</td>
<td>Mergers &amp; Acquisitions lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith W. Hughes</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1946</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of Citigroup, 2000-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Dibble Jordan</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>c. 1939</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Professor, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Kleinfeld</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6-Nov-1957</td>
<td>c. 1990</td>
<td>President and COO of Alcoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley C. Mecum</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1935</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Capricorn Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. Reed</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>CEO of Citibank, 1984-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Known for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas C. Foley</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>9-Jan-1952</td>
<td>c. 1999</td>
<td>US Ambassador to Ireland, 2006-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul F. Walsh</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CEO of eFunds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXTRANEOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Known for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mukesh Ambani</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>19-Apr-1957</td>
<td>26-Dec-2006</td>
<td>India's richest man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>14-Jul-1913</td>
<td>26-Dec-2006</td>
<td>38th US President, 1974-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Harrington</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>c. 1947</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of Thomson Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M. Kilts</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10-Feb-1948</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CEO of Gillette, 2001-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Tabaksblat</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman of Reed Elsevier, 1999-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wolfensohn</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1-Dec-1933</td>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank president, 1995-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo H. Zambrano</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of Cemex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Presence on this list implies merely that, to the best of our knowledge, charges were filed against the people in question, or in some cases, a civil suit. It is not meant to imply guilt, and in fact many of the individuals listed may have been found innocent of said charges or claims. Some details of the charge in question can often be found inside the specific profiles linked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Known for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Berger</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>28-Oct-1945</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Security Advisor for Bill Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Deutch</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>27-Jul-1938</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIA Director, 1995-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Ho Lee</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>21-Dec-1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allegedly spied for China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Manning</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>17-Dec-1987</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pled guilty to releasing classified documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Known for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elliott Abrams</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>24-Jan-1948</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Secy. of State involved in Iran-Contra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehmet Ali Agca</td>
<td>Assassin</td>
<td>9-Jan-1958</td>
<td></td>
<td>In 1981, shot Pope John Paul II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arius</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>256 AD</td>
<td>336 AD</td>
<td>Founder of the Christian doctrine of Arianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Athanasius</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>298 AD</td>
<td>2-May-373 AD</td>
<td>Patriarch of Alexandria, 328-373 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kofi Awoonor</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>13-Mar-1935</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rediscovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Bacon</td>
<td>Philosopher</td>
<td>22-Jan-1561</td>
<td>9-Apr-1626</td>
<td>Novum Organum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Bacon</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>2-Jan-1647</td>
<td>26-Oct-1676</td>
<td>Bacon's Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy Barr</td>
<td>Performance Artist</td>
<td>6-Jul-1935</td>
<td>30-Dec-2005</td>
<td>Exotic dancer from the 1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belisarius</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>505 AD</td>
<td>565 AD</td>
<td>Byzantine general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbeard</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>c. 1680</td>
<td>22-Nov-1718</td>
<td>Infamous pirate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenny Bruce</td>
<td>Comic</td>
<td>13-Oct-1925</td>
<td>3-Aug-1966</td>
<td>Multiply obscene comic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert de Burgh</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>Chief Justiciar of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Cabot</td>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>16th century Italian/English explorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>13-Jul-100 BC</td>
<td>15-Mar-44 BC</td>
<td>Roman Dictator 45 BC until 44 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis de Camões</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>c. 1524</td>
<td>10-Jun-1580</td>
<td>Os Lusiasdas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Posada Carriles</td>
<td>Terrorist</td>
<td>c. 1928</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuban terrorist in US custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidel Castro</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>13-Aug-1926</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dictator of Cuba for almost fifty years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Chavez</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>28-Jul-1954</td>
<td>5-Mar-2013</td>
<td>President of Venezuela, 1998-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Cisneros</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>11-Jun-1947</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of HUD, 1993-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Clinton</td>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>25-Jul-1956</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black sheep in Clinton family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cochrane</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>14-Dec-1775</td>
<td>31-Oct-1860</td>
<td>Rear Admiral, invented the smoke screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Collazo</td>
<td>Assassin</td>
<td>20-Feb-1914</td>
<td>21-Feb-1994</td>
<td>Attempted assassin of Truman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Cowell</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>11-Mar-1897</td>
<td>10-Dec-1965</td>
<td>New Musical Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dangerfield</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>English conspirator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene V. Debs</td>
<td>Labor Leader</td>
<td>5-Nov-1855</td>
<td>20-Oct-1926</td>
<td>Labor leader ran for President five times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin R. Delany</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>6-May-1812</td>
<td>24-Jan-1885</td>
<td>Black nationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Deutch</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>27-Jul-1938</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIA Director, 1995-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Dreyfus</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>9-Oct-1859</td>
<td>12-Jul-1935</td>
<td>Dreyfus Affair scapegoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubal Early</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>3-Nov-1816</td>
<td>2-Mar-1894</td>
<td>Confederate General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Atheling</td>
<td>Royalty</td>
<td>c. 1051</td>
<td>c. 1126</td>
<td>King of England 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Birth/Death Dates</td>
<td>Notable Fact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Frank</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>17-Apr-1884/17-Aug-1915</td>
<td>Innocent man, lynched by mob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick the Great</td>
<td>Royalty</td>
<td>24-Jan-1712/17-Aug-1786</td>
<td>King of Prussia 1740-86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopoldo Galtieri</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>15-Jul-1926/12-Jan-2003</td>
<td>Invaded Falklands, ran death squads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuseppe Garibaldi</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>4-Jul-1807/2-Jun-1882</td>
<td>Privateer, Italian hero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakubu Gowon</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>19-Oct-1934</td>
<td>Dictator of Nigeria, 1966-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merle Haggard</td>
<td>Country Musician</td>
<td>6-Apr-1937</td>
<td>Okie From Muskogee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armand Hammer</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>21-May-1898/10-Dec-1990</td>
<td>Soviet agent of influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Hearst</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>20-Feb-1954</td>
<td>Kidnapped by SLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hersant</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>30-Jan-1920/21-Apr-1996</td>
<td>Le Papivore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Hoffa</td>
<td>Labor Leader</td>
<td>14-Feb-1913/30-Jul-1975</td>
<td>International Brotherhood of Teamsters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Guy Hunt</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>17-Jun-1933/30-Jan-2009</td>
<td>Governor of Alabama, 1987-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chun Doo Hwan</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>18-Jan-1931</td>
<td>President of South Korea, 1980-88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter H. Irons</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>11-Aug-1940</td>
<td>A People's History of the Supreme Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Kelley</td>
<td>Paranormal</td>
<td>1-Aug-1555/1-Nov-1597</td>
<td>Notorious forger and alchemist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Qadeer Khan</td>
<td>Physicist</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Father of Pakistani nuclear bomb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Heinrich Lammers</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>27-May-1879/4-Jan-1962</td>
<td>Chief of the Reich Chancellery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Laud</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>7-Oct-1573/10-Jan-1645</td>
<td>Archbishop of Canterbury, 1633-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Lee</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>19-Jan-1807/12-Oct-1870</td>
<td>Confederate General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Gordon Liddy</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>30-Nov-1930</td>
<td>Watergate criminal, talk-show-host</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan McDougal</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Whitewater scandal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud McFarlane</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>12-Jul-1937</td>
<td>Iran-Contra figure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Morrison</td>
<td>Singer/Songwriter</td>
<td>8-Dec-1943/3-Jul-1971</td>
<td>Lead singer and songwriter, The Doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Mudd</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>20-Dec-1833/10-Jan-1883</td>
<td>Physician who treated Lincoln's assassin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>7-May-1605/17-Aug-1681</td>
<td>Reformer Patriarch of Moscow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Oates</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>15-Sep-1649/12-Jul-1705</td>
<td>Popish Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felice Orsini</td>
<td>Assassin</td>
<td>1819/13-Mar-1858</td>
<td>Attempted assassin of Napoleon III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Penn</td>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>17-Aug-1960</td>
<td>Fast Times at Ridgemont High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Pike</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>29-Dec-1809/2-Apr-1891</td>
<td>Confederate general, Freemason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Rich</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>18-Dec-1934</td>
<td>Pardoned by Clinton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Richards</td>
<td>Guitarist</td>
<td>18-Dec-1943</td>
<td>The Rolling Stones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slick Rick</td>
<td>Rapper</td>
<td>14-Jan-1965</td>
<td>Eyepatch-sporting rapper on Def Jam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Rostenkowski</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>2-Jan-1928/11-Aug-2010</td>
<td>Congressman from Illinois, 1959-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio López de SantaAnna</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>21-Feb-1794/21-Jun-1876</td>
<td>Hero of Tampico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Smalls</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>5-Apr-1839/23-Feb-1915</td>
<td>Slave elected to Congress from South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Steinbrenner</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>4-Jul-1930/13-Jul-2010</td>
<td>Owner, New York Yankees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife Symington</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>12-Aug-1945</td>
<td>Governor of Arizona, 1991-97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Birth Date</td>
<td>Death Date</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Parnell Thomas</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16-Jan-1895</td>
<td>19-Nov-1970</td>
<td>HUAC chairman, took the Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iva Toguri</td>
<td>Radio Personality</td>
<td>4-Jul-1916</td>
<td>26-Sep-2006</td>
<td>Never actually was Tokyo Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Travis</td>
<td>Country Musician</td>
<td>4-May-1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country music artist, has 25 top ten hits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caspar Weinberger</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>18-Aug-1917</td>
<td>28-Mar-2006</td>
<td>Iran-Contra figure pardoned by Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip D. Winn</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>1-Feb-1925</td>
<td></td>
<td>HUD scandal figure pardoned by Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roh Tae Woo</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>4-Dec-1932</td>
<td></td>
<td>President of South Korea, 1988-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Wyat</td>
<td>Poet</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>6-Oct-1542</td>
<td>Introduced sonnet to England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Yarrow</td>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>31-May-1938</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Peter in <em>Peter, Paul, and Mary</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Why Did Former CIA Director John Deutch Endanger America’s Most Vital Secrets?

By Andrew I. Killgore

“...CIA Director George Tenet told Congress he could not be sure the information on Deutch’s computer had been secure... CBS News reported
John Deutch, born in Belgium in 1938, was brought to the United States as a young boy. He studied chemistry, earned a doctorate in his specialty at M.I.T., became a professor there and eventually won the chair of the department of chemistry.

Obviously a brilliant professor, Deutch did not come to public notice, as measured in mainline media attention, until 1994, when then-Secretary of Defense William Perry elevated Deutch from assistant secretary—to which he had been appointed in 1993—to deputy secretary of defense. In May 1995 Dr. Deutch moved from his number-two job at the Department of Defense to the top position of director of the Central Intelligence Agency, America’s spy agency. He held the directorship until he resigned in December 1996.

Deutch’s brilliance of mind did not enhance his reputation as CIA director. John Millis, a former CIA operations officer and chief staffer at the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, was quoted in the Feb. 18, 2000 issue of The Washington Post as saying Deutch was “the worst CIA director ever.” Millis thought the miscast Deutch also had earned the second-worst and third-worst rankings.

But it is the unloved John Deutch’s unfathomable side that excites the most compelling interest. Both at the Department of Defense and at the Central Intelligence Agency, he grossly violated rules for the protection of America’s secrets, including “special access programs” so secret that officials privy to them are authorized to lie to keep them from becoming public. Most such programs are kept secret from the CIA and only disclosed to the Pentagon’s top three or four officials. Deutch was briefed on many of these programs both when he was at the Defense Department and at the CIA, according to the Washington Times of Feb. 17, 2000.

Deutch’s open computer—loaded with the most carefully protected secrets—was a target for any computer hacker. That explains CIA Director George Tenet’s statement to Congress, quoted above, that he could not be sure that information on Deutch’s computer was secure.

U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee chairman Richard Shelby, also quoted above, was deeply suspicious of Deutch’s motives in leaving U.S. secrets open for grabbing. Shelby wanted Deutch before his committee, but whether Deutch ever appeared is doubtful. If he did, the session was in camera and the proceedings have not been published.

Deutch may have been so blindly arrogant that he treated the laws on...
security protection as applying to others, but not to himself. This is the view of a retired CIA officer who is a friend of the writer.

Or, his gross defiance of the rules may have stemmed from some tangle of perversities that even Deutch did not understand.

Finally, he may have been a quiet but passionate Zionist seeking to help Israel, where he has relatives. His sophisticated excuse, if he had ever had to answer questions under oath, was that he was simply careless.

Deutch may well have been tried for his transgressions, and some cracking of the Deutch enigma might have been possible. But former President Bill Clinton took away that possibility when he pardoned Deutch on the last day of his presidency.

Why?

Andrew I. Killgore is the publisher of the Washington Report on Middle East Affairs.
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Robert4787  4 months ago
And Hillary was First Lady through all this. Then, years later, she risks foreign spy agencies hacking into her unsecured personal computer that received classified data? She doesn't seem to learn much from experience. Robert at OSINT News:

www.osintdaily.blogspot.com

Richard Lee  2 years ago
Why? Maybe because he had no choice. As DCIA Deutch had full knowledge of every Clinton screw-up and illegal operation.
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Clinton's final day includes pardons, new monument and note for his successor

January 20, 2001  
Web posted at: 5:03 p.m. EST (2203 GMT)  

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- President Clinton, just hours before leaving office, pardoned more than 130 people, including Whitewater figure Susan McDougal, former Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros, ex-CIA chief John Deutch and publishing heiress Patty Hearst.

The president pardoned his brother, Roger Clinton, who had been convicted on a cocaine charge in the 1980s after cooperating with authorities, and former Gov. Fife Symington of Arizona, a Republican whose conviction for bank and wire fraud was overturned on appeal. Prosecutors had sought a rehearing in the case.

Deutch had been under investigation by the Justice Department for mishandling secrets on a home computer. Hearst was kidnapped in the 1970's and then went to prison for bank robbery.

Cisneros entered a plea agreement as part of an investigation into payments to his ex-mistress. McDougal, the Clinton's business partner in the Whitewater land venture, was convicted of loan fraud and spent almost two years in prison for refusing to testify against Clinton before a federal grand jury empanelled by Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr.

Another Whitewater figure and former law partner of Hillary Rodham Clinton, Webster Hubbell, was not pardoned. Hubbell, who served in a top Justice Department position in Clinton's first term, had to resign and spent 15 months in prison for tax evasion and mail fraud.

No pardons for Milken or Peltier

The president also denied a pardon for financier Michael Milken, the 1980s "junk bond" king who served 22 months for swindling investors of $1 billion, and Leonard Peltier, convicted in the deaths of two FBI agents in 1975.

Federal law enforcement and security enforcement officials urged the president to deny a pardon for Milken, an outspoken cancer survivor and generous philanthropist. FBI agents had protested the possibility of pardoning Peltier after learning his name was on a list of those being considered.

Cisneros, former San Antonio mayor, Clinton's closest friend among his early Cabinet appointees and a rising political star when his career was unhinged by scandal, was convicted in a cover-up controversy involving payments he
made to his ex-mistress.

Deutch, who stepped down as CIA director in 1996, had been considering a deal with the Justice Department in which he would plead guilty to a misdemeanor charge of keeping classified data on his home computers.

Hearst was kidnapped in the 1970s in Los Angeles by a domestic terrorist group known as the Symbionese Liberation Army and was convicted of later participating in a bank robbery with her abductors. She served part of her prison sentence before it was commuted by President Jimmy Carter.

Also denied a pardon was Jonathan Pollard, an American serving a long prison term for spying for Israel.

Former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu personally appealed to Clinton for clemency in that case.

**Governors Island declared a national monument**

Before leaving office, Clinton also designated another monument, the Governors Island National Monument, in New York City, and announced the release of $100 million to fund 1,400 more police officers.

In keeping with tradition, the former president left a hand-written note for his successor, Jake Siewert, former White House press secretary told CNN.

Siewert and John Podesta, former White House chief of staff, both left notes for the men who will hold their jobs in the Bush administration, Ari Fleischer, the new White House press secretary, and Andrew Card, President Bush's chief of staff.

The outgoing president also made a decision about an ongoing domestic matter, whether or not the differences between Socks the cat, and Buddy the dog, could be resolved.

Apparently, Clinton could not negotiate a peace deal, so Socks will be given to Betty Currie, the president's long-time assistant, and Buddy will be going with the former first family to Chappaqua.

---

**MORE STORIES:**

**Saturday, January 20, 2001**

- 'We got some dancing to do,' Bush says!
- Senate confirms Powell, Rumsfeld, O'Neill for Bush Cabinet
- Despite January wind, inaugural parade aims to 'celebrate America's spirit'
- Clinton's final day includes pardons, new monument and note for his successor
- Protesters line inaugural parade route
- Bush gets keys to White House, flexes first presidential muscles
- Clintons depart Washington after emotional farewell ceremony
- List of presidential pardons
- Chris Black: Bush faces tough task with Washington Democrats
- Jamie McIntyre: Administration to reassess national security strategies
- Kelly Wallace: Bush now gets down to business
• Bush address calls for unity in 'a nation of character'
• Election reform rally held in Tallahassee, without Jesse Jackson
• In one of his last acts as president, Clinton grants more than 100 pardons
• Lott indicates confirmations likely this afternoon
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and that if the bill has not been reported by that time, it be automatically discharged and placed on the Senate Calendar; provided further, that if and when the Senate Commerce Committee reports H.R. 1139, it be sequentially referred to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works for a period not to exceed 20 session days of the Senate; and that if the bill is not reported by that time, it be automatically discharged and placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY BY SENATE EMPLOYEE AND REPRESENTATION BY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 119, submitted earlier today by Senators DOLE and DASCHLE, authorizing representation by Senate legal counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 119) to authorize testimony by Senate employee and representation by Senate legal counsel.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered and agreed to, the preamble be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the resolution (S. Res. 119) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288(a) and 288(c)(a)(2) (1994), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent committees, Members, officers and employees of the Senate with respect to subpoenas or orders issued to them in their official capacity: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That Darin Schroeder and any other employees in Senator FEINGOLD's office from whom testimony may be necessary are authorized to testify and to produce records in the case of United States v. George C. Matthews, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

Sec. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is directed to represent Darin Schroeder and any other employee in connection with the testimony authorized under section 1.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the United States has issued a subpoena for Darin Schroeder, an employee on the staff of Senator Feingold, to testify at the trial of a defendant who was indicted last January for threatening to bring a bomb to a post office building in Milwaukee to kill or injure individuals and to damage or destroy the building. The defendant is alleged to have made the threat in a telephone conversation with Mr. Schroeder, who handles postal service constituent casework for Senator Feingold.

This resolution would authorize Mr. Schroeder, as well as any other employees on Senator Feingold's staff from whom testimony may be required, to testify and to produce records at trial, and to be represented by the Senate Legal Counsel.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1995

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 10, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and the Senate then immediately resume consideration of H.R. 956, the product liability bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
been crying out for solution for all of these years. I hope the process will untangle itself. I am now confident it will—there was a moment there when we were not sure, but I think it will and I think it has—and we will then be able to give Senators on both sides a chance to vote for good product liability reform.

This is not a product of the Contract With America. It is not a product of the Democratic Party. It is a product of people who want reform on both sides. I am working within the Senate, within our ways, within our beliefs to achieve compromise. That is the way the Senate works.

After all, the President of the United States will have to sign the bill and put it into law. This is what has always struck me when people say that the conference process will ruin everything. I have never felt that. I know the Senator from Washington agrees with me on that, and I suspect the majority leader does. I now do. Because the President, if he does not want to sign the bill, if it does not meet his criteria, which he has laid out to us, will simply veto it and that will be that. So there is a discipline that works there in conference process, which is good.

I remind my colleagues and the leadership in the other body of what I have just said. We have tended to push aside expansionism here and focus on product liability reform. We do that in the agreement between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from West Virginia. So, let the leadership on the other side understand that we are firm in our resolution, and that the President is, too. He will not sign anything other than what stands within his parameters of acceptability.

So I conclude simply by saying that the sidebar of the day was that there was a certain amount of confusion during the process at the end. But the story is that the two sides have reached agreement—Democrats who favor reform and the Republicans who favor reform. I have been through this reform with most of my colleagues on my side and have met with a very good reaction, and I assume the same is true on the Republican side.

So, Mr. President, I simply wanted to say that, because there was a certain amount of confusion, but that pales in comparison to the good news of the agreement.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Deutch, of Massachusetts, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

The Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The debate on the nomination is limited to 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there have been requests only from Senator MOYNIHAN, who was on the floor, for 15 minutes and from Senator HUTCHISON for 10 minutes, in addition to statements which will be made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the vice chairman, Senator KERREY, and a brief opening statement which I will make. So, in the event that there are any other Senators who wish to be heard on the subject, they ought to come to the floor now or at least let the managers know of their interest in speaking.

Mr. President, the nomination of John M. Deutch to be Director of Central Intelligence was reported to the Senate last week, pursuant to a unanimous vote in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence with a recommendation that he be confirmed. It was a unanimous vote.

The committee held hearings on April 26 and then proceeded to that vote last week on May 3. There is a need to move expeditiously, as I see it, to have a strong Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In consideration of Mr. John Deutch to be Director, we took up a wide variety of issues. We examined Mr. Deutch’s background and qualifications. He has an extraordinary academic record. He has an extraordinary professional record. He has been a distinguished professor at MIT. He has been the head of the department there. He has been the provost there. He has worked in the Energy Department. He has worked in the Department of Defense. He currently serves as the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Defense.

It is my thought, and I believe with the concurrence of the committee members, that he has the kind of strength and leadership as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

He comes to this position at a time of substantial difficulty. He comes to this position at a time when the agency is with substantial problems of morale. In the wake of the Aldrich Ames case, where the agency had a spy within the Central Intelligence Agency which they could not ferret out and eliminate themselves; hardly a recommendation for an agency which is charged with worldwide responsibility to gather intelligence.

There is, in my opinion, Mr. President, the need for intelligence gathering worldwide for the security of the United States.

During the course of the hearings, we explored with Mr. Deutch whether there ought to be a reorganization. His confirmation hearings came in the wake of extraordinary success by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with the Oklahoma City bombing case. We explored with Mr. Deutch whether perhaps the Federal Bureau of Investigation ought to take over on worldwide intelligence gathering. That has been suggested in some.

It would be an extraordinary change for the United States to do that. It would vest enormous authority in the FBI, perhaps more than is wise, in a country where we prize limitations on authority, where we prize separation of powers.

The FBI, though, is right now engaged in very extensive operations overseas in work on terrorism as it relates to prosecution, work on drug trafficking, work on organized crime, many of those activities being overseen by the CIA as well. But those were some of the subjects discussed.

I expressed at the hearings considerable concern about the Director of CIA being a member of the President’s Cabinet. We have had the experience with Cabinet officers before of the CIA, specifically William Casey, where we had problems on Iran-Contra, and there has been a concern that the policymakers ought to be separated from the intelligence gatherers to the extent there be the motivation to shield intelligence gathering to support policy, to sort of cook the evidence.

The Iran-Contra Joint Committee made a strong recommendation against that kind of a concern and that kind of activity. But in the final analysis, there is a need to move ahead with the confirmation of the CIA Director, so that it is my judgment, and I think the judgment of others on the committee who were concerned about having the Director in the Cabinet, that we should not hold up his confirmation in that respect.

Mr. Deutch has addressed that question very forcefully and directly, saying that he will be very mindful of those policy considerations and will comport himself so that intelligence gathering is separate from any matters of policy.

Mr. Deutch has made a very forceful statement on taking strong action. If there were those in the CIA, as there were in the Aldrich Ames case, who failed to act when there were lots of indications that Aldrich Ames was in fact not doing his job—when he was intoxicated on the job, when there were unexplained visits to foreign embassies, where he lost his files—Mr. Deutch was emphatic that if anybody was in a position of supervision over another Aldrich Ames and did not take forceful action, that person would be fired peremptorily.
Then the question was raised with Mr. Deutch about somebody who was in a supervisory capacity who did not know but should have known, and Mr. Deutch answered very forcefully that that person would be fired.

Mr. Deutch gave many people in the CIA who have long, distinguished careers, and there are many able men and women in the Agency who can carry on. It is my hope, I think the hope of the committee, that the recent events restored by a very firm and forceful Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

We have recently had hearings on Guatemala which, again, were disturbing, with the Deputy Director of the CIA conceding flatly that the CIA failed in its duty to notify both the House Intelligence Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee of what was going on in Guatemala.

In sum and substance, Mr. President, it is my view, and I think the view of the committee, that John Deutch is well qualified to take on a very, very tough job at this time.

Mr. President, the nomination of John M. Deutch to be Director of Central Intelligence was reported by the Senate last week pursuant to a unanimous vote of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, with a recommendation that he be confirmed. On behalf of myself and Senator Kerry, in our capacities as chairman and vice chairman of the committee, we urge the Senate to act favorably on this nomination.

The committee made a complete and thorough inquiry of the nominee's qualifications as well as his views on issues of mutual concern, and concluded that he is qualified by both experience and temperament to hold this sensitive and critical position.

The Senate has moved expeditiously in nomination. Nevertheless, the intelligence community has been without a confirmed director since last December—a delay that is particularly costly when the community so urgently needs a strong sense of direction, of mission, and of management. It is a critical time for the intelligence community. If Mr. Deutch is confirmed as DCI, he will come to the job at a time of exceptional promise and peril.

The peril is clear. It is now conventional wisdom that the euphoria which erupted after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the Soviet Empire was premature. While nostalgia for the balance of terror between the United States and the Soviet Union is not in order, it is apparent that the post-cold-war world is not any less dangerous or unstable—as the bombing in Oklahoma City, the World Trade Center bombing, and the gas attack in the Tokyo subway have made clear. Global threats from international terrorism and narcotics smuggling, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and expanding organized crime networks present the intelligence community with targets far more dispersed and complicated than the traditional focus on Soviet military power. The role and the priorities of the intelligence community in the Government's efforts against these threats have never been clearer. At the same time, significant diplomatic, economic, and law enforcement implications— especially in Central America, there is the sense of incompetence and lack of accountability that characterized the Aldrich Ames debacle, to charges of widespread sex discrimination, to the latest questions about policies and practices that resulted, at the very least, an impression of culpability in murders in Central America, there is the sense of an intelligence bureaucracy that is not only incapable of meeting our national security needs, but presents a continuing threat to our Nation's credibility and legitimacy overseas through its frequent missteps, miscalculation, and mismanagement.

The American people are looking for a Director of Intelligence who will provide strong leadership, accountability, and a clearly defined mission. And therein lies the promise. There is growing support within the intelligence community, the Congress, and the public for significant change in the way we conduct intelligence. The end of the bipolar superpower conflict that dominated the cold war provides new opportunities to build coalitions and achieve consensus on international threats. And though thought of as a resurgent or continuing threat to our Nation's credibility and legitimacy overseas through its frequent missteps, misperception, and mismanagement. This committee, along with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and a congressionally mandated commission chaired by Les Aspin and Warren Rudman, will be taking a hard look at the intelligence community—what its mission should be in the post-cold-war world and how it should be organized to accomplish that task. The committee will summarize for my colleagues the nature of the committee's inquiry, and highlight the key features of Mr. Deutch's testimony to the committee.

As you know, the former DCI, James Woolsey, resigned last December. In February, the administration announced that it planned to nominate retired Air Force General Michael C.P. Carns to replace Woolsey as DCI. One month later, General Carns withdrew his name, citing immigration issues.

On April 5, 1995, the committee received a letter from the Director of the Office of Government Ethics transmitting a copy of the financial disclosure statement submitted by Mr. Deutch. The Director advised the committee that is disclosed no real or potential conflict-of-interest.

The chairman and vice chairman also reviewed the FBI investigation done for the White House on Mr. Deutch.

The committee held a confirmation hearing on Mr. Deutch on April 26, 1995, at which time the nominee was questioned on a variety of topics. Subsequent written questions were submitted to the nominee for additional responses.

Based upon this examination, the committee reported the nomination to the Senate on May 3, 1995, by a unanimous vote, with a recommendation that Mr. Deutch be confirmed.

HIGHLIGHTS OF TESTIMONY

The committee held a confirmation hearing on Mr. Deutch on April 26, 1995, at which time the nominee was questioned on a variety of topics. Subsequent written questions were submitted to the nominee for additional responses.

In his opening remarks to the committee, Mr. Deutch described as the primary duty of the DCI “to provide objective, unvarnished, and timely assessments about issues involving foreign events to the President and other senior policymakers.” He emphasized that “with the exception of policy that bears on
the Intelligence Community, the Director of Central Intelligence should have no foreign policy making role." Speaking directly to the issue of making the DCI a member of the Cabinet, the nominee explained his belief that the President and DCI must work together to further develop the intelligence community. This is of paramount importance he places on Intelligence and the confidence the President has in Mr. Deutch. The nominee went on to present his view that this status is important to ensure that the DCI will be present at the Policy Planning Council and the National Security Council meetings so that he can present objective assessments of alternative courses of action and take away from those meetings a better understanding of policymaker needs.

I questioned Mr. Deutch on this issue in meetings prior to the confirmation hearing and again, for the record, in open session. I noted my own view that if you are in the Cabinet, you are much more likely to get involved in making policy that is related to national security than if you are not in the Cabinet. I referred to the congressional report on Iran-Contra and Secretary Shultz's assertion, as reported therein, that the President was getting faulty intelligence about terrorism because there was a lack of need to keep intelligence separated from policy. The committee concluded in that report that "the gathering, analysis, and recording of intelligence should be done in a way that there can be no question that actual facts, not policy assertions, are driven by the actual facts rather than by what a policy advocate hopes these facts will be." This need to separate policymaking from intelligence gathering and analysis is reflected in the statute defining the National Security Council. The National Security Act of 1947 sets forth the members of the NSC and then designates others, including the DCI and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as officials who are not members but who participate in meetings of the President's Directs. It is my strong sense that this is the appropriate status for the DCI with respect to the Cabinet as well.

Mr. Deutch has assured the committee that he will adhere to the proper standard of conduct and that he would "not allow policy to influence intelligence judgments and, not allow intelligence to interfere in the policy process." I believe that Mr. Deutch has the best of intentions in this regard and that he is certainly capable of recognizing the line between intelligence and policy. The committee will be sensitive to any indication that this standard is not being met. Ultimately, however, the makeup of the Cabinet by title is a Presidential prerogative and is not statutorily defined.

Given the delay already experienced in naming Mr. Deutch, and given his strong qualifications in every other regard, I do not think this issue should stand in the way of his confirmation by the Senate.

With respect to DCI authorities, the nominee noted in response to questions at the hearing and those submitted later for the record, that in his view, the DCI could more effectively manage the intelligence community if he or she had budget execution authority over key segments of the community. In further response, Mr. Deutch agreed that this was a propitious time to consider establishing a Director of National Intelligence—who would serve at the pleasure of the President and manage the entire intelligence community—and a separate head of the CIA who would have a 10-year tenure.

VIEWS ON THE MISSION OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Mr. Deutch's prepared statement outlined some of the significant dangers to our national security today: Regional conflicts; the spread of weapons of mass destruction; international terrorism; international crime, international drug trafficking, and their interconnection; instability in the former Soviet Union; and China—a threat to its neighbors and supplier of missiles.

He then described four principal purposes to which the intelligence community (IC) should direct its efforts: First, policymakers have the best information available before making decisions; second, support to military operations; third, addressing international terrorism, crime, and drugs, particularly im- plying law enforcement; and fourth, counterintelligence (CI) that rigorously adheres to high security standards, accords priority to defensive CI and counterespionage, and includes full and early cooperation within the IC community.

He emphasized that the national priorities for intelligence collection established by the recent Presidential Decision Directive need to be implemented.

VIEWS ON MANAGEMENT

I applaud Mr. Deutch for his unusually candid and forthright opening statement. In it, he outlined for the committee the significant actions he would take immediately upon confirmation to begin the process of change that is so long overdue in the intelligence community, or "IC." First, he indicated he would bring in several new people to fill upper management positions. In doing so, he will emphasize joint operations in the IC agencies because "we can no longer afford redundant capabilities in several different agencies." Second, he plans to review and encourage changes in the culture and operation of the Director of Operations. Third, he will move to consolidate the management of all imagery collection, analysis, and distribution in a manner similar to the NSA's for signals intelligence. Fourth, he wants to manage military and intelligence activities at the right level: to "achieve an integrated war." Fifth, he will put in place a planning process for meeting the priorities and goals established by the Presidential Decision Directive.

Sixth, what he described as his most important challenge is to "improve the management—and thereby the morale—of the dedicated men and women who make up the IC."

RESPONSE TO AMES

The issue of management is particularly critical in the case of Ames. I questioned Mr. Deutch on how he would ensure that he knew what was going on within the CIA so that he could exert the proper management. I cited former Director Gates' admission that by 1987, he had only been advised of about 4 or 5 compromises of U.S. agents, at a time when there were in fact 40 or more compromised operations. Director Gates complained that "nobody bothered to share that information with Judge Webster, my predecessor, or with me," when Gates was his Deputy.

I wanted to know what action Mr. Deutch would take if he identified a problem that had a pretty good idea that Aldrich Ames was a mole but failed to pass that information on up the chain of command to the Director. Mr. Deutch said he would terminate that individual. Moreover, when asked what about reports that the supervisor of Ames, who knew that Ames had an alcohol dependency and had observed the negative consequences of this dependency, had not only failed to fire Ames, but had, instead, written a highly complimentary letter to the FBI, Mr. Deutch indicated that supervisor should be fired. When questioned further, he conceded that if the supervisor's supervisor should have known about this improper conduct, that supervisor should also be fired.

The key in this exchange, as emphasized by the nominee, is the notion of accountability. It is a sense of accountability that was absent under the last DCI and that is an essential ingredient of any plan to revitalize our foreign intelligence apparatus.

Mr. Deutch has told the committee that if confirmed, he will review the Ames case and will consider the committee's report on Ames in connection with any personnel action affecting the individuals involved.

VIEWS ON CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

On the issue of congressional oversight, Mr. Deutch emphasized in his opening statement that he could not accomplish the significant change that is needed in the intelligence community without the strong support of Congress. "I consider you my board of directors", he said. "I realize this means I must keep you fully and currently informed about the activities for which I would be responsible—both the good news and the bad news. I understand that I am accountable to you, and I expect you to hold me to a high standard of performance."

Mr. Deutch conceded, when questioned, that while he would not imagine it happening, if the President ever told him not to inform the committee he, Mr. Deutch, would "happily back to Massachusetts."
Moreover, the nominee assured the committee that he interprets the requirement for timely notification of a covert action finding, in the absence of prior notification, to mean within 48 hours. Specifically, Mr. Deutch said, “I think that in all situations there should be prior notification. There may be remote instances where that is not possible, in a very, very tiny percentage of the cases. Then 48-hours is what I see as the measure of timely notification.”

Commitments for prompt action

At the conclusion of the hearing, I asked for, and received, a commitment from Mr. Deutch to report back to the committee as promptly as possible if confirmed—preferably within 30 days of confirmation—regarding several issues of particular importance:

First, report on any needed changes to DCI authorities;

Second, improving the intelligence community’s fulfillment of its obligation to keep Congress fully and currently informed;

Third, the need for reorganization within the intelligence community;

Fourth, changes in personnel;

Fifth, proposal for how to achieve down sizing in a way which creates headroom, weeds out poor performers, and leaves the intelligence community with the mix of skills required to accomplish its mission;

Sixth, intelligence reassessment of the possibility that U.S. forces were exposed to chemical or biological agents during Desert Storm; and

Seventh, actions taken in response to events in Guatemala; and

Eighth, improving coordination with law enforcement.

Conclusion

The foregoing summarizes only the highlights of the record before the committee, of course, available to all Members in its entirety at the Intelligence Committee.

Based upon the nominee’s statements to the committee, however, his record of distinguished service and the absence of any disqualifying information concerning him, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence voted to report his nomination to the Senate with a recommendation that he be confirmed by the full Senate as Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I want to commend my distinguished vice chairman, Senator KERREY, for his outstanding work generally with the committee and on this nomination.

The only other speaker who is to come to the floor on our side is Senator HUTCHISON, who has an allotment of 10 minutes, but I think there will be more time within the unanimous-consent agreement if Senator HUTCHISON wants more time. Or if any other Republican Senators wish to partake in the discussion, they can take time on our side.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise in enthusiastic support of the nomination of John M. Deutch to be Director of Central Intelligence. While I cannot predict a length in time that he will be in serious, I can predict with confidence, should he be confirmed, he will turn out to be one of the most effective and influential DCI’s in the history of this Agency.

The President of the United States, with John Deutch, is making a statement that he intends to send a man to take charge of Langley during what is obviously one of the most tumultuous periods ever experienced by Central Intelligence. The Aldrich Ames case and recent Guatemala revelations portray a troubled corporate culture at CIA.

In addition, many questions whether the intelligence community has come to grips with the post-cold-war world and whether new collection methods and technologies are required to target the new threats that emerge.

The twin threats of international and domestic terrorism lead many to question the intelligence community’s proper role in supporting law enforcement.

The very structure of the community is in question, as a joint Presidential-congressional commission and several private study groups ask whether intelligence is necessary at all.

Mr. President, we have been watching, once again, another 50-year celebration in the last couple of days. This time the celebration is the 50th anniversary of the day that victory in Europe was declared over Nazi forces. That victory is being celebrated in part because we are also celebrating the fact that over the last 47 or so years, the intelligence community’s intelligence efforts, a third world war. For a 75-year period, roughly from 1914, when the guns of August started World War I, until the fall of 1989 when the Berlin Wall itself collapsed and Eastern Europe began to liberate itself, during that 75-year period, it is, I believe, accurate to say we experienced the bloodiest 75 years in the history of mankind.

During that 75-year period, Mr. President, many things occurred, including the institution of a policy that had the United States of America leading an effort against a clearly identified enemy, and the celebration that takes place this year is not just a celebration of a victory over that enemy, but a sense that we have survived, as a human people, the forecast that we may annihilate ourselves through the use of nuclear weapons. It is a remarkable victory, and I dare not on this floor take a great deal of time describing it, but it is a profound change that the new threats that face us must be taken very seriously.

The fact that he is a teacher and can explain these complex systems to those of us nonscientists, who are charged with intelligence oversight, is that much better for the American people.

We will get the benefit of Dr. Deutch’s scientific expertise not a moment too soon. New threats, new collection priorities, and a rapidly changing collection environment mean that...
we cannot stand pat on our collection technologies. Just to maintain the edge we have now, we must fund research and development on new technologies and make hard decisions about which road we will go down. We also have to maintain the health of our intelligence industry, so that the private companies that produce these remarkable systems. There are uniquely talented people working for these companies, engineers and technicians who turn the requirements statement into reality. If we do not keep these people producing for us, the Government will never be able to afford new systems. That is why Senator WARNER and I, last year, urged the administration to permit U.S. companies to sell 1-meter space imagery and imaging equipment. We did not want to see remote sensing, a technology in which we lead the world, go the way of the space launch. We also wanted America to dominate this growing industry. The administration saw the same way, and J ohn Deutch is a leader of the administration policy. He knows that our industrial base is our true national treasure, and he will continue to watch over its health.

Intelligence technology routinely saves American lives, but we should be alert to opportunities to make it useful to Americans in other ways. For example, the National Information Display Laboratory in Princeton, N J., noticed that the technology that helped imagery analysts understand images better could also be helpful to radiologists scanning a mammogram for early signs of breast cancer. NIDL teamed with Massachusetts General Hospital to adapt the technology, and the outcome could be as many as 15,000 American lives saved each year.

Other opportunities abound for the dual-use intelligence technology. We have just begun to make public use of space images and other intelligence collected during the cold war. The declassification process has begun and we must push the process until we can fairly say that intelligence technology serves not just a handful of decisionmakers in Washington but the 250 million decisionmakers across our country.

Mr. President, when I was a young man operating in the U.S. Navy SEAL team, we had a piece of advice we tried to follow all of the time, which was that unless you had a need to know, you did not press the bet and try to acquire it. We did not disseminate in order to do it, we did not do it in order to spill the beans, not have a need to know. Mr. President, there are 250 million citizens of the United States of America who need to know increasingly a set of complex facts in order to make decisions about our foreign policy, in order to make decisions about our domestic policy, in order to make decisions about all sorts of things that are increasingly confusing our citizens.

Democracy cannot function unless citizens make the effort to understand those complexities and come to the table at election time and come to the table when it is time to influence their Senator or Representative or President with all of the information.

The Director of Central Intelligence is the President's national intelligence officer. J ohn Deutch's Government background is in defense, and his testimony before the Committee made clear that he understands the importance of intelligence support to the military. But he also understands the role of national intelligence, and he understands that not every problem facing the country is a military problem. He is aware, for example, of the intelligence community's contributions against international terrorism, against drug trafficking, against illegal trade practices. He knows how important intelligence is to this administration's international decisionmaking, and he knows that warning the President about the economic crisis in Mexico last year was at least as important as warning about a military crisis in some less important region of the world. With the end of the cold war, the Director of Central Intelligence has a broader national charter than ever. It is an irony which J ohn Deutch understands.

The intelligence community includes much more than the CIA. The National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, FBI, and the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research all play their largely unique roles. But no question, CIA, unfortunately, lately has been at the center of controversy and likely will continue to be. At least initially, the heart of J ohn Deutch's task will be to make the CIA more efficient and accountable to the American people. I am greatly encouraged by the candid assessment this Administration provided earlier, by his testimony on the sense of accountability and responsibility that he intends to bring to CIA's Directorate of Operations. I have visited CIA officers in the field, and I know the high quality of the men and women that Deutch will lead. These are clear-headed, positive, enthusiastic Americans. The current senior managers should get credit for recruiting and training and motivating a fine crop of younger officers. Now it is time, as Mr. Deutch put it, for those own managers for the seniors to let the younger officers take the reins. As they take over, they must recruit and retain more women and minorities, and they must be alert to gender discrimination in assignments and promotions. The Directorate of Operations has never been an easy place for women to get a fair opportunity to make their mark. Not only is gender discrimination illegal, it is also stupid because it denies the American people the brain power of more than 50 percent of our people. It also creates resentments which can dangerously weaken the agency. I have heard all the excuses for discrimination, and none of them wash.

I am confident that J ohn Deutch will not permit it. CIA’s human intelligence activities, which consist mainly in getting foreigners to secretly provide information, will always take place in the shadows. Human sources will have to be able to be publicly disclosed. But CIA, no less than any other agency of Government, must operate in accordance with American law and American values. One purpose of congressional oversight of intelligence is to ensure that is so. I believe Deutch will continue to work if CIA does not inform Congress, or answer Congress' questions. Failure to promptly inform is one of the most troubling aspects of both the Ames case and the Guatemala case. Bad news does not improve with age. The withholding of bad news— withholding information on an intelligence failure—jeopardizes the oversight system without which the United States cannot conduct foreign intelligence operations. J ohn Deutch clearly understands his reporting responsibilities, and that, coupled with his leadership, is why I support the appointment of J ohn Deutch to head the CIA.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank my gallant friend from Nebraska. I rise very much in support of the position he has taken and that of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I would say by way of introduction that in the 103d Congress and then on the first day of the 104th Congress, I offered legislation that would basically break up the existing Central Intelligence Agency and return its components to the Department of Defense and the Department of State in the manner that the OSS, the Office of Strategic Services, was divided and parceled out with the onset of peace in 1945 and 1946, to be followed, of course, by a cold war which has persisted almost all this time.

I had hoped to encourage a debate on the role of intelligence and of secrecy in the American society. That debate has taken place. Some of the results, I think, can be seen in the nomination of this distinguished scientist and public servant to this position.

I could not have been more clear than in his testimony in which he made a point, self-evident we would
Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, what we have is so much at variance with what was thought we would get.

Allen Dulles was very much part of the foundation of postwar intelligence, having been in the OSS, served with great distinction in Switzerland during World War II.

Peter Grose, in his new biography, "Gentleman Spy: The Life of Allen Dulles," recounts the testimony Dulles gave before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 25, 1947, as we are about to establish, passed the National Security Act of 1947 and created this small coordinating body, the Central Intelligence Agency.

Personnel for a central intelligence agency, he argued, "need not be very numerous ***. The operation of the service must be neither flamboyant nor overshadowed with the mystery and abracadabra which the amateur detective likes to assume." In a lecturing tone, he tried to tell the Senators how intelligence is actually assembled.

Because of its glamour and mystery, overemphasis is generally placed on what is called the intelligence that is obtained by secret means and by secret agents. . . . In time of peace the bulk of intelligence can be obtained through overt channels, through our diplomatic and consular missions, and our military, naval and air attachés in the normal and proper course of their work. It can also be obtained through the many thousands of Americans, business and professional men and American residents of foreign countries, who are naturally and normally in touch with what is going on in those countries.

A proper analysis of the intelligence obtainable by these overt, normal, and above-board means would supply us with over 80 percent, I should estimate, of the information required for the guidance of our national policy.

Mr. President, that could not happen, did not happen. We entered upon a five-decade mode of secret analysis, analysis withheld from the scrutiny, which is the only way we can verify the truth of a hypothesis in natural science or the social sciences.

The result was massive miscalculations. Nicholas Eberstadt in his wonderful new book, "The Tyranny of Numbers," writes "It is probably safe to say that the U.S. Government's attempt to describe the Soviet economy has been the largest single project in social science ever undertaken," and it was a calamity.

In the pattern that societies go through, it is said that organizations become like one other. To an extraordinary degree we emulate the Soviet model in our own intelligence service.

Unintentionally, naturally, it happens that way, but a very powerful analyses of this has just been written by Mancur Olson in the Washington Post under the headline "Understanding Oklahoma" in an article entitled "Department of Secrecy: The Invisible Bureaucracy That Unites Alienated America in Suspicion."

Or by Douglas Turner, in an article this weekend in the Buffalo News. I spoke of these concerns in an earlier statement on the Senate floor entitled "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the Record along with the articles by Douglas Turner and J. Ferguson Morley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That concern that the administration will not be helpful to economic difficulty ourselves.

I would like to close with a letter written in me in 1991 by Dale W. Jorgenson, professor of economics at the Kennedy School of Government, in which he said:

I believe that the importance of economic intelligence is increasing greatly with the much-discussed globalization of the U.S. economy. However, the cloak-and-dagger model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successfully prosecuted Cold War that has just concluded. The lessons for the future seem to me to be rather transparent. The U.S. government needs to invest a lot more in international economic assessments. *** (I) should reject the CIA monopoly model and try to create the kind of intellectual competition that now prevails between CBO on domestic policy, OMB on domestic policy, aided by Brookings, AEI, Kennedy School, the Urban Institute, the Kennedy School, and many others.

I ask unanimous consent the entire letter be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Those are the remarks I would like to make, sir. I have the confidence that John Deutch, as a scientist, will follow them. I have the concern that the administration will not.

We do know some things in social science. Mancur Olson, in his great book, "The Rise and Decline of Nations," on this day, V-E Day—I was a sailor on V-E Day, so I can remember that—I can remember the Boston Common, actually—Mancur Olson asked:

Why has it come about that the two nations whose institutions were destroyed in World War II, Germany and Japan, have had the most economic success since? Whereas Britain—not really much success at all; the United States—yes. Unfortunately, we came up with a simple answer. The defeat wiped out all those choke points, all those rents, all
One night early in March, 1854, a group of Know-Nothingers broke into the storage sheds on the monument grounds and dragged the Pope's marble off towards the Potomac. Save for the fact that anyone who has come to call such phenomena, it has never to be located since.

Work on the monument stopped. Years later, in 1876, Congress appropriated funds to complete the job, which the Corps of Engineers, under the leadership of Lieutenant Colonel Thomas I. Casey did with great flourish in time for the centennial observances of 1888.

Dread of Catholicism ran its course, if slowly. (Edward M. Stanton, then Secretary of War and the first Catholic to be appointed as President Lincoln was the result of a Catholic plot.) Other manias followed, all brilliantly describe in Richard Hofstadter's revelatory lecture "the Paranoic Style in American Politics" which he delivered as the Herbert Spencer Lecture at Oxford University within days of the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Which to this day remains a fertile source of conspiracy mongering. George Will cited Hofstadter's essay this past weekend on the television program "This Week with Dan Rather," and deals with the same subject matter in a superb column in this morning's Washington Post which has this bracing conclusion:

"It is reassuring to remember that paranoiacs have always been with us, but have never defined us."

I hope, Mr. President, as we proceed to consider legislation, if that is necessary, in response to the bombing, we would be mindful of a history in which we have often overreached, to our cost, and try to avoid such an overreaction. We have seen superb performance of the FBI. What more any nation could ask of an agency than to say to the world, "This is the FBI.

"We have seen superb performance of the Secret Service. The standard is ridiculous in terms of paranoia and propagate it."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as we think and, indeed, pray our way through the aftermath of this City bombing, to remember just how such a horror might have come about, and how others might be prevented, Senators could do well to step outside the chamber and look down the mall at the Washington Monument. It honors the Revolutionary general who once victorious, turned his army over to the Continental Congress and retired to his estates. Later, recalled to the highest office in the land, he served dutifully one term, then a second but then on principle not a day longer. Thus was founded the republic, the first democracy since the age of Greece and Rome.

There is no a more serene, confident, untroubled symbol of the nation in all the capital. Yet a brief glance will show that the color of the marble blocks of which the monument is constructed changes about a quarter of the way up. Thereby hangs a tale of another kind of invasion. Not our first, just as surely, this will not be our last.

As befitted a republic, the monument was started by a private charitable group, as we would say today. The Washington National Monument Society. Contributions came in cash, but also in blocks of marble, many with interior inscriptions which visitors will find a delight when the steps can see to this day. A quarter of the way up, that is. For in 1852, Pope Plus IX donated a block of marble from the temple of Concord in Rome. In fact, the American Party, or the Know-Nothings ("I know nothing," was their standard reply to queries about their platform) divined a Papist Plot. An installation of the Pope's marble would mark the Catholic Uprising. A fevered agitation began. As recorded by Ray Allen Billington in The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860.

"One pamphlet, The Pope's Strategem: "Rome to America!" An Address to the Protestants of the United States, against placing the Pope's block of marble in the Washington Monument (1852), urged Protestants to hold indignation meetings and contribute another block to be placed next to the Pope's 'bearing an inscription by which all mankind may know that we are awake to the hypocrisy and schemes of that designing, crafty, subtle, far seeing and far reaching Power, which is ever grasping after the whole earth, and its spoils. He has used stained hands, over the millions of its inhabitants.'"

He speaks of official Washington's "enormous secrecy system... which just expands, if anything, which we're in on and everyone out there is, is out of, and easily its culture that breather put on the government's role in creating fear by going after the mountain of official secrets generated annually.

To that end, on Jan. 22, 1993, Moyhni introduced a bill creating a bipartisan commission on reducing and protecting government secrets. A Democracy Act. It passed him and President Clinton made it law.

The commission had its first meeting in January and elected Moynihan chairman. Other members include Sen. J. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., who was appointed by Sen. Majority Leader Bob Dole, R-Kansas, Ellen Hume of Ammenberg Washington Program, who was nominated by the president's predecessor, and Clinton's nominee to head the CIA, J. Deutch.

It has an office in an old Navy Building with view of the Potomac, and a staff director, Eric Biel, formerly a senior Senate staffer. It has had a couple of organizational meetings, and public hearings. The first real working session on may be on May 17.

Moyhni in a television interview joked "we've managed to conceal our activities so far by holding public hearings. Nobody goes to public hearings."

On the 17th, the commission will hear about official secrets from officials of the National Security Council, operating as a result of an executive order issued by President Clinton three weeks ago.

Government files harbor nearly a billion official secrets.

It generates about 7 million of them a year. But the secret, Moynihan wrote, is that the government "only counts (secrets) up to the level of Top Secret.

"All the real secrets are higher than that with code names I am not at liberty to reveal, having taken a kind of vow of secrecy with code names I am not at liberty to reveal, having taken a kind of vow of secrecy."

It generates about 7 million of them a year. But the secret, Moynihan wrote, is that the government "only counts (secrets) up to the level of Top Secret.

"All the real secrets are higher than that with code names I am not at liberty to reveal, having taken a kind of vow of secrecy with code names I am not at liberty to reveal, having taken a kind of vow of secrecy."

They can see it, but you can't.

There are the active classified files of the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms, the Secret Service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Border Patrol, the Department of Energy, and even the Department of Agriculture.

Official secrecy, endemic to big government, dies hard. As in corporate life, and in the highest circles of journalism, secrets are not just the key to power. They are power. Official infatuation with secrecy is reflected in the forbearance in President Clinton's executive order. Existing secrets must be declassified after 25 years; he said. Future ones, 30 years.

This would matter in an age when breechload rifles were on the cutting edge of military science. The standard is ridiculous in terms of paranoia and propagate it.

"They" can see it, but you can't.

Then there are the active classified files of the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms, the Secret Service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Border Patrol, the Department of Energy, and even the Department of Agriculture.

Official secrecy, endemic to big government, dies hard. As in corporate life, and in the highest circles of journalism, secrets are not just the key to power. They are power. Official infatuation with secrecy is reflected in the forbearance in President Clinton's executive order. Existing secrets must be declassified after 25 years; he said. Future ones, 30 years.

This would matter in an age when breechload rifles were on the cutting edge of military science. The standard is ridiculous in terms of paranoia and propagate it.

"They" can see it, but you can't.
see or evaluate—on Soviet weaponry and the economy, this country went on a military spending binge beginning with the Vietnam war and ending only three years ago. But the theories were used to justify quantum leaps in spending on the American defense establishment, and of course covert CIA. We will be paying for that build-up for the rest of our lives.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1995]

DEPARTMENT OF SECRECY

THE INVISIBLE BUREAUCRACY THAT UNITES ALIENATED AMERICA IN SUSPICION

(By Jefferson Morley)

Scapegoating is a time-honored spring sport in Washington. Professionals of the pastime are already in fine midsummer form on Topic A: Who is responsible for the Oklahoma City bombing? Skilful soundbites indict various culprits: Right-wing talk radio, the NRA, lone nuts (and the ever-reliable) '60s counterculture.

But while the theories fly, the All-Stars of the Washington blame game somehow overlook one of the leading suspects in the minds of the American people: the Department of Secrecy.

There is no official department of secrecy, complete with Cabinet officer and official seal. But there is the functional equivalent: the federal bureaucracy that keeps the government's secrets. It consists of the offices and archives in the Pentagon, the intelligence agencies, the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and other federal agencies that classify and guard all sorts of information considered too sensitive to be shared with the American public. The connection and the conspiracy of information and the Oklahoma City bombing is not obvious but it is real.

First, the Department of Secrecy is a significant actor in American society and politics. Viewed on an organizational chart, the federal secrecy system is bigger than many Cabinet agencies. According to a Washington Post report last year, the secrecy system keeps an estimated 32,400 people employed full-time—more than the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy combined. According to the Office of Management and Budget, the bureaucracy of secrets may cost as much as $16 billion a year to run.

Second, the Department of Secrecy is the center of the American defense establishment, and of course covert CIA. We will be paying for that build-up for the rest of our lives.

"The pathology of public attitudes toward government are due in large part to excessive and unnecessary secrecy," says Steven Aftergood, director of the Federation of Scientists, a leading advocate of government openness in Washington.

The State Department, for example, retains that there are "classified" cables that would "seriously and demonstrably undermine ongoing diplomatic activities of the United States." Under this standard the CIA-in-Guatemala story would almost certainly still be secret. So would women who would still be wondering who murdered their husbands.

For now, the effect of Clinton's order is expected to be modest. "I don't think it's going to make much difference," said retired Lt. Gen. William Odom, the former director of the National Security Agency and a skeptic of openness efforts. Odom recalled that a similar directive from President Carter in 1978 had little effect on how he, Odom, actually classified information for the government at the time. Aftergood praised Clinton's directive as a "distinct improvement over the old secret rules but added "I just hope we are at the beginning of a reform process, not the end."

That will depend, in part, on what the public, the president and Congress learn from Oklahoma City.

Is the bombing the work of isolated madmen with no connection to the larger political culture? Or is it a warning of the pathological polarizations that are emerging within the federal government? Is the government losing the faith of its people? These questions are especially pertinent for people working within the secrecy system. Most of them are working for the American people. The information they guard is often legitimately secret: military codes, the names of law enforcement informants, the U.S. position in international trade talks and the like.

But they shrug off the widespread mistrust of their work at their own peril. With the government generating so many secrets each year, estimated 6.3 million in 1989—and continuing revelations about government abuses of power, the line between the paranoia of a few and legitimate fears of the many gets much blurrier.

A few years ago, the notion that the U.S. government had, over the course of several decades, routinely conducted dangerous radiation experiments on thousands of unwitting Americans would have been regarded by most reasonable people as unfounded, if not ridiculous. Today, thanks to the aggressive release of long-secret documents by Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary, the radiation experiments are cold, disturbing historical fact.

O'Leary's leadership shows that full disclosure of embarrassing material is not political or institutional suicide. In fact, the Department of Energy, by all accounts, enjoys more credibility on Capitol Hill and with the public for coming clean. We do not lose respect for government power, if any, the secrecy system is hiding. But we do know that a citizenry without access to its own history has no guarantee of democratic accountability. And as long as democratic accountability is in doubt, the citizenry, not just government office buildings, will remain vulnerable.

EXHIBIT 2

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT,

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Pat: This is just a personal note of the Galbraithian view of economics as a failed profession, this has to be one of the great failures of economics—right up there with the inability of economists (along with everyone else) to find a remedy for the Great Depression of the 1930's.

On your specific arguments: In 1985 Paul Samuelson was relying on the CIA estimates, so that this is not an independent piece of evidence. For every quotation you can give from people like Lawrence Klein, you can find a counter-argument in the writings of Friedman, Hayek, Stigler and many others. All three have been rewarded for their efforts with the Nobel Prize, the National Medal of Science, and the esteem of their colleagues (with the conspicuous exception of the New Yorker neighbor's cat). They deserve a lot of credit for the positions they took in the 1930's all the way up to the 1980's and they are getting it.

It seems to me that it is easier to address the failure of international economic assessments within your framework of post-Cold War recovery that Galbaith's entertaining but wrong-headed view of economics as a failed profession. Given the success of economic assessments of the Soviet Union, it is almost incredible that the U.S. government established an in-house monopoly on economic intelligence centers for research in this area at Columbia and Harvard were allowed to wither away. Over the past decade, Frank Holzman of Tufts and the Russian Research Center at Harvard has been a lone voice in opposition to the CIA view.

I believe that the importance of economic intelligence is increasing greatly with the increasing role of the U.S. economy. However, the cloak-and-dagger model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that Galbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War thatGalbaith's entertaining model is even more inappropriate to our new economic situation than it was to the successful prosecution of the Cold War that

An important subsidiary lesson we can learn from the failure of the CIA Soviet assessments is the importance of "sunshine". Although economic intelligence is always going to be sensitive to somebody, it should be carried out in full sight of the public, including the professional peers of the intelligence analysts. I hope that the new National Research Council Board can contribute to the post-Cold War re-creation of our economic intelligence system in a positive way. As I see it, this is a daunting task. To use a medical analogy, this will require something more like a "life style" change than a simple remedy for a chronic disease.

I hope that you can find the time to present your perspective on this issue to the
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policy community, say in the form of an article for Public Interest. This would be an interesting opportunity to bring your ideas about post-Cold War conversion to a specific problem of great importance to the national interest.

With best regards,
Yours sincerely,

DALE W. JORGENSEN.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am addressing this message to yield to the senior Senator from New York, because I always enjoy hearing what he has to say.

Mr. President, the importance of intelligence gathering for our Nation is at a critical juncture. Never has it been as important as it is today that we have foreign intelligence gathering capabilities, particularly because we are now facing a time when weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological, are being made in different parts of the world. Even worse, the weapons that transport those weapons are also being developed in different parts of the world. There is an urgent need for us to know where these weapons are and where the capabilities are to transport those weapons, either within their own theater or over to our country.

So, there is no question in my mind that we must have a strong foreign intelligence gathering capability. We also have a problem. That is we need a leader and we need a focus and we need a mission for the people who are in our intelligence gathering operations right now. We have had several mishaps. The Aldrich Ames case is one that has been talked about on this floor and it is one that is very troubling to us, even today. Many people feel this traitor was not dealt with in a way that will show there is an accountability when a drastic mistake happens.

The checks and balances we have put in place demonstrate, by recent events in Guatemala, the lack of information that the oversight committees had about the situation in Guatemala. The escalation of terrorism all over the world is causing an ongoing need for us to have intelligence-gathering capabilities.

So, we do need a person who can take control of our national intelligence-gathering operations, lift the morale of the people who work for the CIA and put an accountability into the system. We also need someone who can make it more efficient. As we are downsizing our budget we need to make sure that we have a mission, that we are using our assets in the most efficient way.

So we need someone to come in and show that leadership. I believe John Deutch is that person. I think the President has made a good decision.

Those are the issues that we need to deal with. First, I must say I disagree with the President giving Cabinet rank to the Director of Central Intelligence. The National Security Act of 1947 sets forth the members of the National Security Council and then designates others, including the Director of Central Intelligence and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as officials who are not members but may attend and participate in National Security Council meetings. I believe that is also the appropriate role for the DCI with respect to the Cabinet.

Mr. Deutch was asked these questions in our Intelligence Committee hearing on confirmation regarding the Cabinet status of the Director of Central Intelligence. He assured the committee that he would hold to the proper standard of conduct and that he would not allow policy to influence intelligence judgments and not allow intelligence to interfere in the policy process. That is a very important distinction that the new Director has adopted and which I think is very important for us to keep—the separation between intelligence gathering and policymaking. The committee is going to be sensitive to any indication that this standard is not being met, but I believe the make-up of the Cabinet is the responsibility of the President and the one in the House, I think it is most important when you have a covert operation which, of course, intelligence gathering is, to have an even more strong relationship and communications network with the oversight committees that can assure the American people that are being made in these covert operations.

It is good for Congress and it is good for the intelligence gathering, as well. It is very important that we have an oversight and we have the ability to make judgments by the duly elected officials in the U.S. Congress when we are dealing with such sensitive intelligence matters.

So I talked to the new Director-designate about that. And he agreed totally that we needed to have that line—jurisdiction. I think it has been reiterated by every person who has spoken on the floor today, and most certainly every member of the committee.

The second issue that was very important to me was complete financial disclosure of every person who works at the CIA and every contractor who is working on CIA projects. I felt this was important because one of the obvious things that was missed in the Aldrich Ames case was a high-living lifestyle by Aldrich Ames and his family, clearly one that could not be shown to have been supported by a person on the salary of Aldrich Ames.

If we had the vehicle in place to have total financial disclosure, the CIA could immediately have begun to check on this lifestyle to see if there was something that was not right. Clearly, it was not right the way Aldrich Ames was living, but it was not an issue found out later it was because he was receiving millions of dollars from the Russian Government for secrets that he was giving to them from our CIA. So we need the basic information.

Mr. Deutch said, and promised, that he would make sure that every person who works for the CIA, who willingly comes to work for the CIA, will give basic financial disclosures. I think that is going to be a very important tool for us to show that there is an accountability in the CIA and that an Aldridge Ames case will not as easily be repeated and, if it is repeated, that we will have the ability to go in immediately and see what the assets are that have been disclosed and if something seems to be amiss.

So these are two areas that I am satisfied that Mr. Deutch is going to address, and he has already given me his word that there is going to be financial disclosures. Among the employees and people who are working for the CIA under contract.

So in conclusion, Mr. President, I support Secretary Deutch for the role of Director of Central Intelligence. This is one of the more important nominations that we will have before us this year, because this agency needs such direction. I believe Mr. Deutch can provide that direction. I have worked with him as a member of the Armed Services Committee in his capacity as Deputy Secretary of Defense. I find him to be a person of integrity. I respect his judgment, and I think he did a fine job as Deputy Secretary of Defense. I think he is the person to fulfill this mission that is so important to our country.

I think we must take our responsibility in confirming him, to do this in a swift and timely manner. We have had a few DCIs in the last 10 years. This agency needs leadership. We need some reorganization. We need a mission, and we need to make sure that we are using our assets efficiently and well so that everyone in our country is secure so that we have the information that we need to make important decisions, which I think is very important for us to keep.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues today to urge confirmation of John Deutch as Director of Central Intelligence. As a permanent resident of Belmont, MA, and having a lifelong involvement in
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the Massachusetts community. John Deutch is a neighbor and a man who has built a national and international reputation as a leader and as a forceful and effective professional. I described him publicly, not long ago, as "superb and forward-thinking."

Mr. President, John Deutch is un-doubtedly up to the challenge, and he is a leader for his time. There is no question about that. He understands the critical task that he will face, and the importance of facing it with resolve, strength, and a firm hand. He has proven that he knows the need and has the expertise to address what we all agree is an operational and administrative problem at the CIA. As Director of Central Intelligence he will face two daunting managerial tasks: First, he must try to restructure the U.S. intelligence community at a time when many believe there is no longer a need—or the funds—for the level of intelligence activity to which we became accustomed during the cold war. He will have to balance proper and appropriate intelligence activity with increasing congressional and public scrutiny of scarcer and scarcer tax dollars.

Second, in the wake of recent events at the CIA, he will have to look critically at internal operations and move quickly to rebuild morale, public trust, and enhance the maintenance of the integrity of America's intelligence capability. As far as restructuring the intelligence community, I believe John Deutch has one very important advantage over many who could have been chosen to serve. He is not an architect of either the current intelligence system or the processes that have been put into place. He is a fresh face, a new voice, a real leader with the talent and the foresight to succeed.

Now, as far as what Secretary Deutch will bring to the CIA, operationally and administratively, there is a need to act expeditiously to turn things around even if it means significant personnel changes, and I am confident that John Deutch has the necessary judgment and will to quickly act in the best interest of the Agency and the Nation.

Mr. President, the American intelligence community will be well served by the experience and leadership of John Deutch who rightfully observed in his statement to the Intelligence Committee that "changing intelligence priorities, as well as intelligence failures, dictate that we carefully re-examine the need for, and specific mis-

sions of, intelligence." He added that he sees "four significant dangers to our national security and the social and economic well-being of our citizens." He cites major regional conflicts; the spread of weapons of mass destruction; international narcotics, crime, and drug trafficking; and the present nuclear danger that still exists in Russia and the Russian republics as they move toward democracy.

I also see the new Director of Central Intelligence moving, as he said he would, to improve the support that the intelligence community gives to law enforcement agencies in areas of narcotics trafficking, international crime, and terrorism. I agree with his assess-

ments and I am confident he will move expeditiously to address the continuing threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and particularly the emerging threat of terrorist attacks with these weapons. I see the new Director re-defining and establishing new standards for the proper role for the intelligence community in the areas of economic intelligence, and addressing the issue of making information, when appropriate, more readily available to our allies or through declassification. And I see the new Director, like every other director of a Federal agency, looking for ways to economize and streamline the operations at CIA to give us more for our tax dollars.

From all we've heard about John Deutch, I believe he has the experience, the expertise, the professionalism, the reputation, the perseverance, the qualifications and the integrity to do the job, and I urge my colleagues to con-

firm his nomination.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

THE NOMINATION OF JOHN DEUTCH TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. President, I would like to add my voice in support of the nomination of Dr. John Deutch to be Director of Central Intelligence. This nomination is extremely important, Mr. President, because the Central Intelligence Agency is at a crossroads and I believe John Deutch has what it's going to take to redirect the Agency's course during its next few crucial years.

There is no question that strong leadership is critical for the CIA to be able to accomplish its mission and to transform it into one that provides policymakers with timely, useful, and target-specific intelligence. CNN can cover the world; the CIA needs to bring greater attention and resources to bear on issues that represent a threat to our national security interests.

Dr. Deutch was brutally frank in his assessment of CIA successes and fail-

ures, and refreshingly candid about what he would like to accomplish as Director. His words were unusually straightforward as he outlined his priorities. He is known for his candor and willingness to go out on a limb to avoid categorical statements about what he will do. But he is also a leader for his time. There is no doubt that he is up to the challenge, and he has the necessary judgment and integrity of scarcer and scarcer tax dollars.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF JOHN M. DEUTCH TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the nomination of John M. Deutch to be the Director of Central Intelligence. The nomination is extremely important. I support the nomination of Dr. Deutch, who presently serves as the Deputy Secretary of Defense, has received the unanimous, bipartisan support of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. This strong support reflects Dr. Deutch's outstanding qualifications, including his first-rate performance as Deputy Secretary of Defense and Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition.

I have had the opportunity to work closely with Secretary Deutch, both in my prior capacity as chair of the Armed Services Committee and in my current role as ranking minority member. He has made an outstanding contribution at the Department of Defense, and is well-qualified to serve as the Director of Central Intelligence.

Secretary Deutch came to the Department of Defense following a long and distinguished academic and government career. His positions in aca-

demia included service as provost and interim director of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His prior Government experience included service on the staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense during the early
Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DeWINE). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, there are, I think, a number of other Senators who wish to speak on this nomination. I will offer a couple of closing comments and then yield time, alerting colleagues who are watching of the possibility that we may be yielding back, as they have not told us that they wanted to speak. They could rush over here and say a few words.

My statement, I indicated, and it is correct, that one of the problems we have with our intelligence effort is that as a consequence of needing to protect security, we are unable—the intelligence people are unable—to brag about successes, and thus not only is it difficult for us to give credit, but increasingly citizens are needing and asking for information that will enable them to judge whether or not their tax dollars are being well spent. I would argue that this condition of being unable to disclose sometimes puts us in a position to give citizens information or having them say, “Now I understand why we are doing this, and I believe we are in fact getting our money’s worth.”

I would like as a consequence to identify for citizens events that were publicly disclosed. And for the information of citizens, it is the President of the United States who has the controlling authority both to make a classification decision and to make a declassification decision. That decision is spelled out in statute. It is not a decision that can be made by either the Congress, in the absence of changing the law, or an individual Member of Congress. But two recent disclosures, by objective decision made by the President to make the disclosure, underscore the importance of this intelligence effort.

The first was that the United States of America presented to the U.N. Security Council, evidence that North Korea was engaged in a policy, a strategy, an active effort to acquire nuclear capacity. We could say that they were, and people did or did not believe it. They mostly said, “Well, North Korea has engaged in a hasty program, and the United States just sort of hung up again.” Because we had the intelligence capacity, we presented information—in this case, images—to the Security Council, and the Security Council sees clearly North Korea is building nuclear capability and the Security Council takes actions supportive of the United States’ effort to make certain that North Korea does not become a nuclear nation.

Again, with the use of images disclosed publicly by Ambassador Albright to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, at the direction of the President of the United States, at the time when the French and the Russians were weakening in their resolve in regard to sanctions on Iraq, buying into the Iraqis’ assertions that, “We are impoverished now; we don’t have very much money; and, no, we are not building chemical, biological or nuclear weapons to be used in a terrorist effort.

This is a very real and present problem. It requires the United States of America to lead. No other nation is going to do it. We saw recently, when the President put sanctions on Iran, our friends in Europe said, “Well, we think that’s a bad idea. We want to continue to engage with a country that’s involved with terrorism.”

I do not know what they are going to do; I suspect wait until something terrible were to happen. Only the United States of America can lead on that issue, lead trying to get Russia not to sell nuclear technology to Iran. Only the United States of America, I believe, is willing to make the kind of diplomatic overtures to continue to engage to make this world safe in the area of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the terrorism that comes from that.
There is a second problem, Mr. President, that our new, hopefully new Director of Central Intelligence is going to have to be dealing with. The distinguished Senator from New York in his comments referenced that, and that is not even toward Government but a precise suspicion that the CIA is involved in all sorts of things that are bad. That the CIA is possibly responsible for the assassination of John Kennedy is something that is actually fraudulently believed by some Americans who see a conspiracy in which the Central Intelligence Agency perhaps played some central role.

We are going to have to face an awful lot of that, Mr. President, and we are going to have to face it very squarely and very honestly. As I said earlier, I am very excited watching the accounts of the celebration of the victory in Europe 50 years ago, watching old men recall the stories of bravery and heroism and sacrifice, I say, with no interest in disparaging that success—thrilled in that success and am unable to measure truly the sacrifice and heroic behavior that was necessary, but it stands in stark contrast to an event that occurred, oh, I guess about a month or so ago when former Secretary of Defense McNamara published a mea culpa book saying that in 1966 the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America, with all the intelligence effort at its disposal, actually concluded that the war in Vietnam was unwinnable.

Well, I was there in 1969. I do not remember McNamara saying anything about it then. And that kind of a statement is the example of the sort of thing, unfortunately, that feeds this cynicism and this conspiracy theory and causes people to say that the Government really is against rather than trying to be on their side in making their lives not only safe but their lives secure as well. It means that we are going to have to press the envelope a bit on secrecy. By that I mean we are going to have to take great care that a secret is, indeed, necessary to protect the American people rather than protecting those who are operating, either the Director of Operations or other sorts of entities. It cannot be that we keep a secret from the American people because we are afraid of what they will do to us if we tell them the truth. It must be that a secret is being maintained, but we do not have to be concerned about our inability to carry out an important security mission if full disclosure were to occur.

As I indicated, there is a tremendous capacity in the intelligence community to help citizens in a very difficult time acquire the information needed to become informed. When you are born in the United States of America, you are given enormous freedoms at birth and should have been told at some point during your public education or upbringing by your parents or upbringing by others, you should have been told that freedom is not free; that a contribution has to be made back of some kind. And our citizens are increasingly aware of the contribution of time and effort that they have to make to become informed about what is going on in Chechnya, what is going on in the former Yugoslavia, what is going on in Mexico. There is going on in places where they have difficult time pronouncing the name let alone making decisions about what our foreign policy ought to be. I believe the technologies that we have at our disposal, if we press the envelope judiciously and not in a reckless fashion, can help our citizens make decisions and make it more likely that government of, by, and for the people works both in foreign as well as domestic policy.

Mr. President, no one has traipsed over to the floor to provide additional testimony, and I am prepared to yield back what time is remaining and yield the floor.

Mrs. Hutchison addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. Hutchison. We will also yield back our time, and I will go forward and close.  

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mrs. Hutchison. I ask unanimous consent that the Injunction of Secrecy be removed from the extradition treaty with Hungary (Treaty Document No. 104-S), transmitted to the Senate by the President today; and the treaty considered as having been read the first time; referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and ordered that the President’s message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Hungary on Extradition, signed at Budapest on December 1, 1994. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The Treaty is designed to update and standardize the conditions and procedures for extradition between the United States and Hungary. Most significantly, it substitutes a dual-criminality clause for the current list of extraditable offenses, thereby expanding the number of crimes for which extradition can be granted. The Treaty also provides a legal basis for temporarily surrendering prisoners to stand trial for crimes against the laws of the Requesting State.

The Treaty further represents an important step in combating terrorism by excluding from the scope of the political offense exception serious offenses typically committed by terrorists, e.g., crimes against a Head of State or first family member of either Party, aircraft hijacking, aircraft sabotage, crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomats, hostage-taking, narcotics-trafficking, and other offenses for which the United States and Hungary have an obligation to extradite or submit to prosecution by reason of a multilateral treaty, convention, or other international agreement. The United States and Hungary also agree to exclude from the political offense exception major common crimes, such as murder, kidnapping, and placing or using explosive devices.

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content or extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States. Upon entry into force, it will supersede the Convention for the Mutual Delivery of Criminals, Fugitives from Justice, in Certain Cases Between the Government of the United States of America and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, signed at Washington, July 3, 1856, with certain exceptions.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. Hutchison. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of the following nominations on the Executive Calendar en bloc: calendar Nos. 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, and 112; further, that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the Record, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action, and that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

Maxine M. Chesney, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

Eldon E. Fallon, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Curtis L. Collier, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Joseph Robert Goodwin, of West Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia.

THE JUDICIARY