Yes, thank you very much. Pardon me for

being late. I, as you know, run in and out of different meetings at

the same time. And I know that some questions have already been

raised, but I would like to be a little more specific on first of all

the massacre that took place in Camp Ashraf in April.

What have you done to—I mean you are human rights here. You

are the guy at the State Department who is supposed to be concerned

about human rights. What have we done to prevent another

massacre since then? Whoever?

So what have we done to prevent another

massacre?

Security arrangements? What security arrangements?

What specifically? What security arrangements

are you talking about?

Correct.

Right.

Well, right, well okay.

Okay. Got it, got it, so we are talking. We are

talking. We are talking and we haven’t reached a decision yet.

There was a massacre of 35 people who were intentionally killed

by Iraqi troops. This is not an unknown bomber. This is an act of

a sovereign government deciding that it will kill unarmed civilians

in order to achieve an objective.

We are now working with them or talking with them. We have,

what, 50,000 troops still in Iraq?

Okay. And up until this time, up until the

time before the massacre we had made a pledge to the people of

Camp Ashraf that we were going to protect them from such things

as massacres from the Iraqis. Is that correct?

Yes. But we have 50,000 troops in Iraq, and

if there is—and I would hope that this isn’t like the Dutch did

down in the Balkans when—well, you know, this really isn’t our jurisdiction

so we are going to let these guys come in and massacre

unarmed people right in front of us.

Yes, well, okay——

Okay, one of the—look. One of the options,

of course, is taking the people of Camp Ashraf to a third country.

That is one option that we need to talk to them about. But no third

country is going to take them as long as we designate this group

as a terrorist organization. And the State Department has been

dragging its feet for years on redesignating this group.

We have designated them a terrorist organization in order to

curry favor with the Mullah dictatorship in Iran and it has resulted

in a massacre of 35 innocent people who were unarmed and

the wounding of hundreds of others. At the very least the State Department

should be working overnight and tomorrow to issue the

fact that they are no longer on the terrorist list because that is the

problem.

Well, are the European governments the only

ones that have options of where we might be able to take these

people?

Right.

It applies for a lot of other countries when

the United States designates a group as terrorists, on a terrorist

list, and we are asking them to take people into their country who

are on a terrorist list. Now, if you want to do your duty in terms

of responsible overseeing of a human rights standard, we should

start with taking actions like this that would be easy to take that

action which would prevent future massacres.

And I am watching and I don’t see that for whatever reason it

is. It is still this politics of leaving these people on the terrorist list

that is keeping them at risk of another major disaster where

maybe this time hundreds will be killed rather than just 35.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Well, I would just like to note that I am as

frustrated by this interview as Mr. Ackerman. Let me just—I am

just hearing these words, ‘‘We are looking and we are talking.’’ I

just hear that repeated over and over again. ‘‘We are looking and

we are talking.’’

And let me note there is a difference between being proactive

and being reactive, and especially if reactive means that you are

looking and talking that doesn’t come up with of the kind of movement

in the direction that I believe will make this a peaceful and

free world.

One thing, one note about our last discussion a few moments ago,

let me just state for the record that the representatives of the

United Nations High Commission on Refugees to the United

States, Vincent Cochetel was in my office 2 weeks ago and specifically

told me that the terrorist designation by the United States of

the people of Camp Ashraf was the major stumbling block in getting

these people relocated.

And so let me—that’s on the record for you now and you can try

to go around it each way. You are sitting on a solution. Now, I take

it that neither one of you gentlemen have made the decision, but

whoever has made the decision that we are not going to take them

off the terrorist list and probably, as I say, due to whoever that

person is wanting to curry some kind of favor with the mullah dictatorship,

is playing with the lives of unarmed people who have already

gone through a massacre.

And I hope you go back to the State Department and just let

them know if there is another massacre it is you guys who are responsible

for the death of these unarmed people because we are

not—something as easy as taking them off of the—I mean it is

easier to take them off the terrorist list than it is to freeze all the

assets of Syrians in the United States for Pete’s sakes.

This is something you can do and you are not doing it.

Unknown. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Posner, are you—do you believe in a

moral equivalency between the United States and, let’s say, Communist

China?

Right. I found that during the Cold War that

when we were discussing the very things you are talking about——

That it undermined our progress

when we tried to find something that we could hold up as an example

of where we are actually just as bad over in this area. And I

have a quote from you in a briefing that says that you have

brought up the Arizona immigration law early and often. You said

it was brought up early and often with the Chinese and that there

was a troubling trend in our society that it was an indication of

discrimination and potential discrimination.

Do you—by the way, do the Chinese just permit to come into

their society illegally and don’t kick them out?

Yes.

Well, you designated it as a troubling trend

of our society and it deals with issues of discrimination and potential

discrimination. You think that trying to maintain border controls

and if we don’t preventing people from pouring into our country

is a violation of their human rights?

Well, it wasn’t one discussion. Apparently

you suggested that you had brought it up ‘‘early and often,’’ so we

are not talking about one discussion.

that is correct.

Right.

But that does not include——

But you weren’t putting——

I would ask for 1 additional minute?

In that and by the way, obviously I agree

with that statement and obviously that is something we all agree

on, but are you putting the right to go into another country illegally

and reside there and receive all the benefits of the citizens

of that country, is that a human right?

Yes, yeah, we are not talking about immigrants

now. We are talking about illegal immigrants.

That is a big difference. Thank you very

much, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly. I have 20 seconds—15.

I request another 1 minute.

I certainly do.

I would suggest that in both cases you have

a situation, and I recognize there is no disagreement that I have

with these gentlemen that Iraq has a right to control their territory

with people in it. They do not have a right to shoot people down

and we do—are not shooting people down. And——

We do not prevent—designate

those people in our country with a specific designation that permits

them—prevents them from going home.

Well, he——

Thank you.

That would—that would facilitate——

That would facilitate them——

With a broader range of places

to go, yes.

Yes. Yes. Yes, I think that we have—that we

have in our history taken in people who are running from tyranny

and escaping injustice and that is different than having a mass migration

into our society

For people who are coming here

for economic reasons.