Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate my friend Senator Corker’s concerns. I wish some of

those voices—he wasn’t here at the time—had been raised about

Iraq, where we have lost an enormous amount of United States

resources and lives, for a mission that I didn’t think was in our

national interests.

Foreign Minister Moussa Koussa is reportedly the expert on the

Qadhafi regime. But, his close affiliation with Qadhafi, at least to

me, implicates him in the terror perpetuated and supported by that

regime.

I have to leave after this, but will leave it

to Senator Shaheen.

As head of Libya’s intelligence

service, he is reportedly responsible, or at least knowledgeable,

about the kidnappings, torture, and murders committed by the regime,

including the bombing of Pan Am 103. This is a man who,

in 1980, was expelled from his position as Libya’s envoy in London

for calling, in a newspaper interview, for the killing of dissidents,

telling the Times that ‘‘the revolutionary committees have decided

last night to kill two more people in the United Kingdom, and I

approve of this.’’

So, in my opinion, this is a man that should be charged with

crimes against humanity. Instead, the U.S. Treasury has lifted the

freeze on Koussa’s assets, hoping the move will encourage other

Libyan officials to split from Qadhafi.

So, is the intelligence that we seek to collect from Koussa so

great, or is the example of having others defect so great, that we

should overlook his personal history, his crimes, and the deaths of

Pan Am 103 that killed 270 people, including 34 New Jerseyans?

Is what we seek to gain from him worth the price that we’ll have

to pay?

Dr. Haass, does it make sense to unfreeze

his assets? What do we gain from that?

Well, I think of it a little differently. I don’t

think of it simply as a tactic. I think it is to some degree, a policy.

Will your policy be one of unfreezing the assets of those who may

have had significantly violate human rights, who may have been in

the midst of killing people and ordering the execution of terrorist

acts? I don’t understand the standard that we set. To me, it’s more

than a tactic. It sends a message that even if you have committed

crimes they may be excused. I’m not sure that that’s the message

we want to send.

Yes. I appreciate that. The point is that he

already defected. So, if anything, he’s got to be worried about prosecution.

Unfreezing his assets doesn’t seem to me a tactic or a policy

that we want to pursue.

Let me ask you this. You know, Qadhafi clearly trained terrorists

in North Africa. And his reign of terror extended well beyond his

own national and regional borders. This is a man who referred, in

1985, to the slaughter of innocent travelers that included an 11-

year-old American child as a ‘‘noble act.’’ Is there any question, if

our diplomatic and other efforts were to fail in accomplishing

Qadhafi’s resignation, that he would, if in power, continue to support

terrorism or move in that direction, after everything he’s done?

Any other opinions on that? No. Thank you

very much.