Mr. Speaker, there are

key moments in the life of our country

in the course of this Congress when the

United States faces a path towards democracy

or towards war. That choice

may be approaching in the policies we

face regarding Iran’s development of

nuclear weapons.

I, for one, choose diplomacy over conflict;

and I believe that the United

States and our allies can achieve our

ends to the Iranian nuclear program

without a shot being fired in anger.

This should be our goal; and towards

that end I join with my Democratic

colleague, the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), to form the bipartisan

House Iran Study Group.

The mission of our group is to review

the situation in Iran, to measure the

potential threat, to examine our military

options, but most importantly to

find and promote diplomatic policies

that advance our security interests

without a resort to arms.

I could not have chosen a better partner

for this effort than my colleague

from New Jersey. He is, first and foremost,

not a Republican or a Democrat.

He is an American. We both agree with

Senator Arthur Vandenberg’s dictum,

who said that partisanship should end

at the water’s edge. We are also dedicated

to the ideal that, when acting

abroad, Republicans and Democrats are

joined together as Americans.

We formed the Iran Study Group last

year to carefully review the facts about

Iran, to make sure the U.S. government

is reviewing all of its policy options

and to push diplomacy towards a

successful conclusion. And I want to

recognize my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the

gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

When we review the situation in Iran,

we see a nation with a proud Persian

language and a culture that now is

under a religious regime that has a

very weak hold on the voters of its nation.

Time and again old revolutionary

leaders of Iran have lost elections to

reformers, but they keep power

through the religious Guardian Council,

Revolutionary Guards and the Iranian

Intelligence Service. These ruling

extremists have kept Iran as a pariah

nation, unable to build lasting ties to

the West.

While nearly everyone under 40 in

Iran favors good relations with the

West and even the United States, Iran’s

current Guardian Council maintains

her isolation.

Now, all U.S. Presidents, Republican

and Democrat, since 1979 have certified

that Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism,

that Hezbollah would collapse

in the Middle East without the direct

support of Iran’s intelligence service,

the MOIS. And under the Guardian

Council, Iran took a clear turn towards

nuclear weapons despite her status as a

signatory to the nuclear non-proliferation

treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. Speaker, I would

agree. Iran had grand ambitions under

the Shah who planned to build 29 nuclear

reactors. His plans and those of

his successors are ironic given Iran’s

location atop one of the largest reserves

of oil that emerged from the

ground at less than a cost of $2 a barrel.

With the fall of the Shah, Iran’s

nuclear ambitions were cut back but

then revived with the help of Russia.

Based at Bushehr, the Russian nuclear

reactor project gives Iran a clear path

to the production of plutonium despite

Russia’s assertions otherwise.

Until 2002, we had strong suspicions

about Iran, but no clear allegations

that she had violated her solemn commitment

to the United Nations under

the non-proliferation treaty; but then

an exile group, the National Council

For Resistance of Iran, exposed clear,

undeclared nuclear activities, indicating

uranium enrichment at that

task; and the Arak heavy water production

facility gives Iran a clear path

towards the refinement of products

which would become the center of a nuclear

weapon.

This was just not according to the

exile group. After 2 years of extensive

inspections by the United Nations

International Atomic Energy Agency,

they reported that Iran had undeclared

centrifuge atomic vapor, a laser isotope

separation, a molecular laser isotope

separation and plutonium separation

activities, all in direct violation of

Iran’s formal obligations under the nuclear

non-proliferation treaty and the

safeguards agreement.

I yield to my colleague on these

points.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my

friend and I want to emphasize his

point that the violations we are talking

about were not based on faulty intelligence

from the U.S. CIA. These

violations that we are talking about

are documented in formal, open reports

by the United Nations international

staff under Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei of

the IAEA. Inspections through June of

2003 showed many reporting failures by

Iran; and by mid-year, Iran admitted to

enriching uranium, purification, reprocessing

and later admitted to the

United Nations of losing nuclear material

that had been covered by her U.N.

safeguards agreement.

Iran built a centrifuge enrichment

plant at Natanz with 1,000 rotors and

started construction at another facility

with 50,000 rotors. Iran first

claimed that it had not enriched uranium

at all, and the IAEA reported

then that it had found contaminations

of enriched uranium at the Kalaye

Electric Company, at one place, of 36

percent enriched uranium; at another,

54 percent on imported components;

and at another, 70 percent enriched

uranium inside its workshop. Until

these discoveries by the U.N., Iran had

only admitted to enriching uranium

once to a level of 7 percent.

After the A.Q. Khan network was exposed

in Libya, Iran also admitted to

using advanced rotors of Pakistani design

to enrich uranium. It also admitted

in May 2004 that it had separated

plutonium in much larger amounts

than previously reported.

All of these actions point to a continuing

effort by Iran to develop nuclear

materials beyond an enrichment

level ever needed for civilian power,

giving us and the United Nations clear

and convincing evidence that it is dedicated

to the production of a nuclear

weapon in violation of its commitment

under the non-proliferation treaty at

the U.N.

Now, Iran also has backed up its public

statements with policy and announced

just last month enacting legislation

requiring the Iranian Government

to develop nuclear technology,

including enrichment of uranium, but

this is not just the only part of the

threat.

Iran not only has a nuclear program;

it also has an aggressive missile development

program, based on a North Korean

missile, the No Dong, which the

Iranians call the Shahab 3.

Iran’s missile program brings many

key U.S. facilities and friends into

range, especially Israel. This is a picture

of the latest Shahab 3 missile, almost

98 percent North Korean; and

when you look at the range of these

systems, you see that U.S. facilities

like the Fifth Fleet, or our allies in

Israel, come clearly into range.

When we look at this, we have a real

danger now, nuclear weapons and missiles

to promptly deliver them that

represent a long-term threat to the

Jewish State.

I yield to my colleague from New

Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I point out

the record of Iran is already clear in

the late 1980s and early 1990s when she

used chemical weapons and fired several

hundred missiles in her war with

Iraq.

Now, the U.S. and Israel, they are already

spending hundreds of millions of

dollars building a defense system

against incoming Iranian missiles. If

Iran’s nuclear and missile programs go

further, then the United States and

Israel will have to commit hundreds of

millions of more dollars to make sure

that our allies in the Jewish State are

able to resist incoming Iranian weapons.

I will note that a missile fired

from Iran, aimed, for example, at Tel-

Aviv would arrive just 11 minutes after

lift off, putting the Middle East on a

hair trigger.

Given all of this, the United Nations’

reports of violations, Iran’s record of

terror, nuclear and missile developments,

all reported not by the CIA or

MI6, but by the United Nations, what

should we do?

Some say that we should let Iran

have nuclear weapons, that we cannot

stop technology, that we should not be

able to classify the laws of physics, and

so Iran will get nuclear weapons; but if

we acquiesce to this, then this policy

would commit us to a vast and expensive

course of building missile defenses

to protect our allies. While the Middle

East would descend into a tense hair

trigger peace, one irrational leader,

one miscalculation and millions could

die in a nuclear Jihad.

It would also put nuclear weapons in

the hands of the Guardian Council, the

same council that Presidents Carter

and Reagan and Bush and Clinton and

Bush all certified were the number one

supporters of state terror, the men and

women who funded operations like the

gentleman said who would put a suitcase

or a car bomb in a Western city.

I think we can do better. Some might

say if this is so bad, then let Israel remove

this threat by military means. In

fact, in 1981 Israel destroyed Iraq’s

path to plutonium when it bombed the

Osiraq reactor; but when we look at

Israel and a potential attack on Iran,

we see a vastly complicated operation

of great cost and a chance of failure. At

best, such an operation could set back

Iran for a few years. At worst, it would

enrage an enemy who would then use

all of the means at her disposal to attack

the Jewish homeland.

An attack by Israel on Iran would

also destroy what is our greatest longterm

asset in Iran, her young people,

her young people who overwhelmingly

report that they support better relations

with America.

I think we can do better. We can

stand between appeasement under an

Iranian nuclear trigger or an attack

against Iran. What could America do?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague

from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS)

and I support diplomacy with

teeth. Over the last 18 months, the Iran

Study Group has met with our allies,

the U.K., Germany and France, and

they have formed the EU–3 group to

bring Iran back from the brink of an

unstable and expensive nuclear arms

race.

The essence of the EU–3 offer is to

provide Iran with a set of carrots, spare

parts for civilian aircraft, membership

in the WTO, access to loans, all if Iran

provides international guarantees and

inspections to end the development of

nuclear weapons. The EU–3’s goal is

not quite as idealistic as it may sound.

South Africa, Argentina, Brazil and

Ukraine all gave up nuclear weapons

programs, and recently so did Libya.

Iran can, too, if we can find the right

mix of diplomatic incentives and disincentives

for them.

I find the current U.S. policy debate

on Iran is too simplistic. It is just twodimensional:

Either let Iran have the

bomb, putting the Middle East under a

nuclear hair trigger, or let Israel do it

and have another war.

President Kennedy faced a similar dilemma

looking at Cuba, but he broke

out of the intellectual box that some

would have him in to either let the Cubans

have nuclear weapons or invade.

He thought of a new policy, a quarantine,

which allowed us to resolve the

Cuban missile crisis without a shot

being fired.

Are there policies which we can employ

which will help the European

Union succeed? I think there are. We

all know this matter could be referred

to the United Nations Security Council.

We know, using its broad powers

under Chapter 7 of the U.N. charter,

the Security Council could impose

sanctions, putting enormous pressure

on Iran and isolate her completely.

What could those sanctions look

like? We could do small things like

outlaw Iran’s participation in the

Football Soccer World Cup. We could

also ban airline flights in and out of

Iran. We could block travel of anyone

in the Iranian government outside her

borders. We could impose comprehensive

sanctions that would shrink Iran’s

economy. All of these means have been

authorized by the U.N. Security Council

against other countries and could be

authorized by the United Nations

against Iran if she says no to the European

Union.

But what if one member of the Security

Council vetoes action against

Iran? Russia could veto action against

Iran. She is, in fact, building a reactor

in Iran. China also has extensive and

growing relations with Iran. They

could also veto action.

Some have talked about an oil quarantine

against Iran. In fact, 20 percent

of Iran’s income is dependent on oil

sales. An oil quarantine would implode

Iran’s economy, but it would also hurt

our economy. The mullahs have threatened,

if their sales were stopped, oil on

the world market could hit $100 a barrel.

That would hurt us. It would also

hurt our allies in Japan and in Europe.

Are there other options available? In

our bipartisan work in the Congressional

Iran Study Group, we found that

Iran has a unique vulnerability, one

that opens a new window of diplomacy

that could help us achieve all of our objectives

without a shot being fired, and

here is the vulnerability she has. Despite

being a leading member of OPEC

and one of the largest oil producers in

the world, Iran is heavily dependent on

foreign gasoline for her economic

progress. In fact, one-third of all Iranian

gasoline must be imported from

overseas.

Iran’s director of planning at the National

Iranian Oil Derivative Distribution

Company reported that Iran uses

67 million liters of gasoline. Only 39

million liters can be produced in Iran.

Policies to expand oil refining capacity

in Iran could in no way meet the demand;

and in fact in Tehran they regularly

debate rationing gasoline, ironically

in a country that is a leading

OPEC nation.

So we have this lever, a potential

gasoline quarantine on Iran, a quarantine

which would not affect international

oil markets but would heavily

affect just Iran alone. And if this policy

was discussed, it could give a huge

impetus to the European Union effort

which my colleague, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and I

both think offers the best chance for

working our way out of this threat

without anyone being hurt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

When we look at Iran, we

have got an election coming up, not

only just six candidates, they just

added two more, but there is a key

choice for the Iranian nation and the

government to make, whether to pursue

this nuclear weapons program,

against the wishes of France, against

the wishes of the United Kingdom,

against the wishes of Germany and the

United Nations, the IAEA and the formal

commitments of Iran under the

nuclear nonproliferation path, or to

join the community of nations and

build a growing economy in Central

Asia, at peace with her neighbors, offering

economic opportunity to her

families.

But if she chooses the path of nuclear

weapons and confrontation with the

European Union, we do not have to resort,

in my judgment, to any military

means. We could impose a gasoline

quarantine on Iran that would quickly

implode her economy. This gasoline

quarantine on Iran could be imposed by

a coalition of the willing naval powers.

But when you look at the position of

anyone trying to import gasoline into

Iran under an order of quarantine, you

would find quickly that it would make

no economic sense to try to run that

quarantine. In fact, in my judgment,

working with our British allies,

Lloyd’s of London likely would pull the

insurance contracts for nearly all of

the tankers attempting to service the

Iranian market.

And working with our allies in the

gulf who largely supply Iran’s need for

gasoline, they could by bilateral action

simply abrogate contracts with Iran,

making this quarantine fairly simple

to operate and administer. The effect

of this would be heavily on Iran, would

put a number of people out of work,

and with those thousands unemployed,

then asking their government, why are

we embracing a policy of confrontation,

violating treaty commitments of

our government and throwing me and

my family out of work instead of going

the direction that most people under

the age of 40 would like to go in Iran,

and that is embracing the West and

having positive direction.

I think this is diplomacy with teeth.

This is a way to break out of the intellectual

box of either surrendering to an

Iranian nuclear program run by a government

who has the most extensive

terror connections in the world or having

some sort of war break out in the

Middle East between our Israeli allies

and Iran. I for one think that we should

embrace a creative diplomatic posture

that supports the European Union, that

increases their likelihood of success

and makes the Iranian government

want to embrace a verifiable inspection

regime that follows the path of

Ukraine, that follows the path of

Libya, that follows the path of Brazil

and Argentina and South Africa and

embraces a non-nuclear future.

For us, this is tense times ahead. My

colleague talked about reference to the

U.N. Security Council and any further

action. We think that Iran is quickly

moving towards a nuclear capability

and, if the Guardian Council gets their

way, could bring about a Middle East

on a nuclear hair trigger. I think we

can do much better. I think pitting our

strength against their weakness, we

can resolve this in a way that everyone

is much more secure.

I thank my colleague. I also want to

conclude by saying this, before I hand

it over to him. We have had this debate

on this floor as two colleagues from

different parties working together in a

bipartisan fashion. We have worked

through the problem. We have met

with ambassadors, with officials from

the State Department, with our Israeli

allies and reviewed carefully all of the

options. I think on a bipartisan level

when you work through all of these options

and you listen to our allies and

you listen to the experts, you will

come to about where we are, a chance

for a peaceful resolution of this that

enhances security on a bipartisan

basis. I think that represents the best

traditions of this House, especially in

our foreign policy where we set partisan

differences aside.

I yield to conclude to my colleague

from New Jersey.

Did you lose constituents

on September 11?

I thank the gentleman and

look forward to working with him and

advancing this. We will be introducing

our resolution next week.