

Mr. Snider's commitment to agriculture and education has proved to affect and benefit not only the state of Pennsylvania, but the entire nation. The numerous organizations and boards that he selflessly served were all positively changed by his presence, and they will undoubtedly miss his spirit and direction. Obie Snider has left behind a legacy of dignity and merit that will not be forgotten.

FORMER BUSH INSIDERS NOW
FREE TO TELL THE TRUTH

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 2004

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a very interesting phenomenon in recent months that demands attention. A steady stream of former high-ranking Bush administration officials have conscientiously pointed out the inaccuracy of many of the claims the administration has made and continues to make about its policies.

In December, last year, I inserted into these pages a very interesting article by Richard Haass, former chief of the policy planning staff of the State Department, who confirmed what many of us have long argued—namely, that the war in Iraq was a war of choice and not of necessity. That is, Mr. Haass made it clear that the decision to go to war with Iraq was not driven by a fear that Iraq was any serious threat to the United States of a physical sort, but rather was part of an administration policy about how the world ought to be structured.

Most dramatically, former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill has been widely quoted as a result of the book by Ron Suskind not only essentially agreeing with Mr. Haass about the genesis of the Iraq war, but making clear the great gap that exists between the reality of Bush administration economic policies and the rhetoric they have used to describe them.

Recently, a third high-ranking Bush official has rebutted the administration's claims, and buttressed this with reference to actual events in which he participated as a member of the administration.

Flynt Leverett was a high-ranking official at the National Security Council from 2002 until 2003, serving as Senior Director for Middle Eastern Affairs. In a recent article published in the New York Times, he refutes the administration's argument that the decision by Libya to renounce nuclear weapons was a direct result of the administration's war in Iraq. His argument is a compelling one, combining very thoughtful analysis with a good history of the events that led up to this. It is impossible to do justice to this thoughtful essay by compressing it, so I ask that it be inserted here so that Members and others may read it and draw their own conclusions.

But I do believe that the conclusion of Mr. Leverett's article—remember he was a high-ranking National Security Council official appointed by the Bush administration—is worth underlining:

Until the Bush administration learns the real lessons of the Libyan precedent, policy toward other rogue regimes is likely to remain stuck in the mud of ideology.

[From the New York Times]

A LESSON IN DIPLOMACY
MORE THAN THREATS LED TO QADDAFI'S
REVERSAL

(By Flynt Leverett)

WASHINGTON.—As President George W. Bush made clear in his State of the Union address, he sees the striking developments in relations with Libya as the fruit of his strategy in the war on terrorism.

The idea is that Colonel Muammar el-Qaddafi's apparent decision to renounce weapons of mass destruction was largely a result of the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, which thus retroactively justifies the war in Iraq and holds out the prospect of similar progress with other states that support terrorists, seek weapons of mass destruction and brutalize their own people.

However, by linking shifts in Libya's behavior to the Iraq war, the president misrepresents the real lesson of the Libyan case. This confusion undermines America's chances of getting countries like Iran and Syria to follow Libya's lead.

The roots of the recent progress with Libya go back not to the eve of the Iraq war, but to the Bush administration's first year in office. Indeed, some credit should even be given to the second Clinton administration.

Tired of international isolation and economic sanctions, the Libyans decided in the late 1990's to seek normalized relations with the United States, and held secret discussions with Clinton administration officials to convey that message. The Clinton White House made clear that no movement toward better relations was possible until Libya met its responsibilities stemming from the downing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988.

These discussions, along with mediation by the Saudi ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar ibn Sultan, produced a breakthrough: Libya turned over two intelligence officers implicated in the Pan Am 103 attack to the Netherlands for trial by a Scottish court, and in 1999 Washington acquiesced to the suspension of UN sanctions against Libya.

Then, in the spring of 2001, when I was a member of the State Department's policy planning staff, the Bush administration picked up on those discussions and induced the Libyans to meet their remaining Lockerbie obligations.

With our British colleagues, we presented the Libyans with a "script" indicating what they needed to do and say to satisfy our requirements on compensating the families of Pan Am 103 victims and accepting responsibility for the actions of the Libyan intelligence officers implicated in the case.

We also put an explicit quid pro quo on the table: If Libya met the conditions we laid out, the United States and Britain would allow UN sanctions to be lifted permanently. This script became the basis for three-party negotiations to resolve the Lockerbie issue.

By early 2003, after a Scottish appeals court upheld the conviction of one of the Libyan intelligence officers, it was evident that our approach would bear fruit. Indeed, Washington allowed the UN sanctions against Libya to be removed last summer after Libya reached a compensation agreement with the Pan Am 103 families and accepted responsibility for its officials' actions.

But during these two years of talks, American negotiators consistently told the Libyans that resolving the Lockerbie situation would lead to no more than elimination of UN sanctions. To get out from under the separate U.S. sanctions, Libya would have to address other concerns, particularly regarding its programs in weapons of mass destruction.

This is the context in which Libyan officials approached the United States and Britain last spring to discuss dismantling Libya's weapons program. The Iraq war, which had not yet started, was not the driving force behind Libya's move. Rather, Libya was willing to deal because of credible diplomatic representations by the United States over the years, which convinced the Libyans that doing so was critical to achieving their strategic and domestic goals.

Just as with Lockerbie, an explicit quid pro quo was offered: American officials indicated that a verifiable dismantling of Libya's weapons projects would lead to the removal of American sanctions, perhaps by the end of this year.

The lesson is incontrovertible: To persuade a rogue regime to get out of the terrorism business and give up its weapons of mass destruction, the United States must not only apply pressure but also make clear the potential benefits of cooperation.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration has refused to take this approach with other rogue regimes, notably Iran and Syria. Until the president is willing to employ carrots as well as sticks, he will make little headway in changing Iranian or Syrian behavior.

The President's lack of initiative on this point is especially disappointing because, in the diplomatic aftermath of the Sept. 11 attacks, the administration had a singular opportunity to effect strategic realignments by both Iran and Syria.

Well-placed Iranians, including more pragmatic elements of Iran's conservative camp, have indicated through diplomatic channels and to former officials (including myself) their interest in a "grand bargain" with the United States. Basically, Tehran would trade off its ties to terrorist groups and pursuit of nuclear weapons for security guarantees, a lifting of sanctions and normalized relations with Washington.

Likewise, senior Syrian officials—including President Bashar Assad himself, in a conversation in Damascus last week—have told me that they want a better strategic understanding with the United States. To achieve this, however, Washington needs to be willing to spell out what Syria would get in return for giving up its ties to terrorists and its chemical weapons and ballistic missiles. As Assad told me, Syria is "a state, not a charity"—if it gives up something, it must know what it will gain in return.

One reason the Bush administration was able to take a more constructive course with Libya was that the White House, uncharacteristically, sidelined the administration's neoconservative wing—which strongly opposes any offer of carrots to state sponsors of terrorism, even when carrots could help end such problematic behavior—when crucial decisions were made.

The initial approach on the Lockerbie case was approved by an informal coalition made up of Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, and Secretary of State Colin Powell. Likewise, in the lead up to the negotiations involving Libyan weapons of mass destruction, the neoconservatives at the Pentagon and in the shop of Under Secretary of State John Bolton were left out of the loop.

Perhaps a coalition among members of the State Department's bureau of Near Eastern affairs and the National Security Council's more pragmatic elements can chart a similar course involving Iran and Syria.

However, until the Bush administration learns the real lessons of the Libyan precedent, policy toward other rogue regimes is likely to remain stuck in the mud of ideology.