

HOEKSTRA'S THREAT

I had a feeling there was something more—a lot more—to the Lichtblau-Shane story reporting a surveillance program that Peter Hoekstra hadn't been briefed on. Only I wasn't sharp enough to do what Texas dem did—look for the letter referenced in the article. Thanks to **texas dem**, we can see clearly that Hoekstra's complaints about undisclosed surveillance programs are nothing more than a threat leveled in response to the Administration's departure from previous efforts to gut the intelligence agencies.

The letter is a primarily a complaint about the nomination of General Hayden to be head of the CIA and—more important still—Hayden's determination to name Steven Kappes as Deputy Director of the CIA. Hoekstra describes Hayden's commitment to Kappes as a fundamental departure from previous collaboration between the White House and the House.

Regrettably, the appointment of Mr. Kappes sends a clear signal that the days of collaborative reform between the White House and this committee may be over. I am concerned that the strong objections – not just about this personal selection – are being dismissed completely, perhaps sending us back to the past, less cooperative relationship, at a time when so much more needs to be done. **Individuals both within and outside the Administration have let me and others know of their strong opposition to the choice for Deputy Director.** Yet, in my conversation with General Hayden it is clear that the decision on Mr. Kappes is final. Collaboration is what got us successful intelligence reform. Why would we want to eschew such a relationship and process that proved so successful? [my emphasis]

Note the reference to "individuals both within and outside of the Administration." Did Dick or Rummy put Hoekstra up to this complaint?