Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will not bore

you with lengthy testimony. With your permission, I will just put

it into the record. Thank you.

I just want to make a few comments. First of all, to echo what

Mr. Biden said in your absence. Your op-ed piece in the L.A. Times

was spot on as far as I can see. When Mr. Reagan used to say

about the Russians, ‘‘trust but verify,’’ this is beyond that now. I

think we ought to be skeptical and verify, and that is the burden

of your super inspections regime. I want to tell you that we all took

careful note of it.

I actually lived in Iran during a time which was considered the

good old days back during the Shah. I worked with the Defense Department

at the time. I was struck at the time with a number of

ironies or contradictions that existed in Iranian society and with

Iranians. As I was preparing for this testimony just this morning,

I was writing down some of these ironies. I will just go through

them because they just occurred to me this morning.

The first is that I do not think you could find more charming,

hospitable people, individually, than Iranians, and yet as a group,

they can be unbelievably ethnocentric. It is one of those ironies.

They had a revolution in 1979 which was brought about in very

large measure by women. And yet it is women who now suffer the

most under that very revolution from repressive practices.

You have a nation that is awash in natural resources, and yet

the official rate of unemployment is 16 percent, and we all know

it is much higher than that, particularly when you consider underemployment.

The poverty rate is 40 percent.

You have a nation which is the second largest in terms of gas

reserves, and yet they are a net importer of gas because they can-

not or will not make the necessary decisions regarding infrastructure.

You have got a country which has a bit of a democratic process,

but the neck of that democratic process is being throttled by

unelected theocracies. This leads to an almost unbelievable cynicism

if you look at the turnout for the most recent municipal elections

which was about 30 percent.

You have got a country now which is speaking openly about the

problems in their own society, drug abuse, prostitution, domestic

violence, and yet still has those repressive policies against women

and denies basic human rights to many of their citizens.

You have got a country which has been, I think, widely known

as the leading state supporter of terrorism and a government

which has a hunger for weapons of mass destruction. And in that

regard, they act as a—pardon the term—rogue state. Yet it appears

that it was fear of being seen in the international community in

rogue terms that actually made them try to reach out in a recent

visit of the three EU ministers and try to come, at least verbally,

to some sort of open declaration about the length and breadth of their programs.

You have got a country that used to be called Persia, with 69

million people. Yet Persians are on the verge of becoming a minority

in their own country as Azeris and Turks and Kurds and others

increase their own percentage of the population. Persians are now

51 percent. You have a country as old as time, and yet of those 69

million people, about 70 percent of them are under 30.

Finally, you have the most recent irony, and it was referred to

by you and by Senator Biden, a woman who thrived under the

monarchy, was imprisoned under the present regime, and just recently

was awarded the 2003 Nobel Peace Prize, Shirin Ebadi. A

woman who is now giving hope and sustenance, I think, to the aspirations

of the Iranian people.

So in sum, I very much appreciate the opportunity to be here.

This is a fascinating, troubled, and troubling country. It is full of

political and intellectual ferment and schizophrenia.

So I am delighted to be here, sir. Thanks.

Well, my crystal ball is as muddy as yours, Mr.

Chairman. And I want to apply our standards to this. We have not

lived with that regime since 1979, and I am not sure I am competent

of understanding all the hopes and aspirations, but I think

there are some things we can say. Unless the regime comes to grips

with becoming more transparent, less corrupt, and more open in

terms of giving people a voice, over time then, this will lead to gigantic

dissatisfaction. But I do not think we can put a time period on that.

Second, I agree with the characterization, if poll data is to be believed,

that people like the United States. I think what they like

about us is what they lack now, the openness of our country. They

like the ability to freely express their minds on things that peoples

in all societies I think, for the most part, admire.

I would not say, however, they want to be like us. I think it

would be a mistake to say they want to be like us. This was not

the case during the ‘‘good old days’’ of the Shah. But we do share

some basic characteristics.

Finally, there are some questions out there that if there were a

different regime—that I think we need to come to grips with. I do

not know how quite to do it. It is something that perhaps my colleagues

here, who will follow me, who are much more enlightened

on these matters, can say. Even if you have a different regime, I

would ask two fundamental questions.

One, is would that bunch, even if democratically elected, eschew

forever weapons of mass destruction? I do not know the answer to

that because there is a sense of a sort of destiny in what used to be Persia.

And the second question has to do with our ally Israel. This is

the thing that you do not hear very often. You hear bad news, and

we certainly know about the support of Hezbollah, Hamas,

PFLPGC, PIJ from Iran, but you do not hear generally the socalled

reformists talking in more moderate terms about the right

of Israel to exist. These are open questions even under a different

society, and I do not have the answer to them.

Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, on the question of terrorism,

I think we are the one who is leading the charge on that

without question. The closer and more involved you are to the Middle

East, the more concerned you are geographically. Our European

friends have become much more concerned about terrorism and

what can emanate from a state sponsor of the same.

On the question of WMD, I am quite heartened for two reasons.

We had an interesting discussion and diplomatic challenge going

into the 12 September IAEA Board of Governors meeting. There

were those in the international community who were more accepting

of the word of Iran. I am proud that our nation hung tough and

ultimately got a unanimous verdict out of the Board of Governors,

which I think was a shocking signal to the Iranians.

Moreover, recently during the trip of the three European ministers,

which we were involved in from the beginning—it was their

idea, but they were staying in very close touch with Secretary Powell

as they moved forward. There were some fears on our side that

perhaps, wanting to have a successful trip, the ministers might settle

for 80 percent rather than 100. But we voiced those fears with

our colleagues. They hung tough, and they got at least what appears

to be on the face of it a good declaration, one that President

Bush called a positive step in the right direction.

Finally, right now in advance of a full understanding of the over

200 pages of documents which the Iranians turned over, we have

got my colleague, Mr. Bolton, in Madrid working with the Spanish.

We have got some of the people who used to work for Bob Einhorn

out in Japan and other places trying to build a coalition, a common

understanding, as we approach the 20 and 21 November Board of

Governors meeting, Mr. Chairman.

Well, this is one of those several alternatives

that—certainly if progress is not satisfactory, that is right. But

there are questions—you raised them in your op-ed piece; we raised

them in our internal discussions—about noncompliance more generally.

And there are many options that we could have considered.

Clearly Iran has been in noncompliance. They should be found

that way. But whether you would take the noncompliance and

move them toward to the U.N. Security Council and possibly sanctions

or put them on probation or give them an ankle bracelet, as

they do to people under house arrest, those are things that we have

to consider and consider with our colleagues in Europe and the

nonaligned movement. I think it is the most important thing, having

gotten solidarity thus far, we have to maintain it.

President Bush and Mr. Putin had a very good

discussion at Camp David. The end result, that is, an Iran free of

nuclear weapons, is something that our Russian friends sign up to.

They are not as enamored of the tactics we use. They have worked

hard to try to make Bushehr more attractive, in that they have

made an apparent agreement with the Iranians that they would

provide the fuel and then take back the spent fuel so there will not

be the possibility of any sort of reprocessing. That is a step in the

right direction. But our affection for Bushehr is still very much

under control because it seems to me the Iranians have a lot of

work to do to prove their bona fides in the NPT arena.

But I will not subject you to it again, sir. No, sir.

Our policy is to try to eliminate the ability of Iran

to carry forward with disruptive policies such as the development

of WMD, such as the abandonment of human rights, such as repression

against minorities, such as religious repression against

the Baha’is and to try to get them to eschew their state sponsorship

of terrorism. In this regard, our policy is to continue to support

openly and publicly the aspirations of the people of Iran for

transparency, anti-corruption, and democracy.

Let me say that we have had some dialog, generally

under the U.N. auspices. Of course, we carry on a continued

exchange of information through the Swiss who are the protecting power for us.

Certainly the three things that come to mind immediately are

continued efforts in Afghanistan where, to some extent, we share

some common interests. The second is obviously in Iraq where, as

we have seen—and I will be glad to go into it later—they are somewhat

schizophrenic about our activities. And third, one that we I

think share an almost absolute commonality of views, is on the

question of narcotics. They have a large and growing product. They

are the transportation route from Afghanistan, or one of them, up

through to Central Europe, and it is something that at the proper

time, when we feel it is in our interests, we could engage them.

I think this is an unsatisfactory answer, Mr.

Hagel. I think it is probably something that will be decided at the

time and the place, certainly in consultation with the President. He

is going to want to be involved in this decision.

I think initially my own view is that it should be somewhat multilateral.

We have, I think, recently found the effectiveness of that

approach, and I think we would continue that at some point in

time. We should deal with them, but that is a decision the Secretary

and the President will make. I was trying to make the point

in my opening statement that we are not opposed to that. We are

not saying no. We realize that there are areas in which our interests can be served by dialog.

Yes, sir. On Iraq, it is a mixed picture. On the

plus side of the ledger I think would be the almost immediate acknowledgement

and welcoming of the Governing Council of Iraq.

They have good relations with many of them. Twelve, of course, of

the Governing Council are Shia. They pledged money in Madrid. It

is a little confusing how much because it looks like a bit of tax

credits for their businessmen and maybe some swaps in Iraq, but that is not a bad thing.

They share with us one absolute common view; they do not want

a bordering state to be one of Sunni extremism. And that is one

that we absolutely share as well.

They have done some other positive things at our urging. They

dismantled some Iranian guard posts, for lack of a better term,

that were on the Iraqi side of the border and moved them back to Iran.

On the negative side of things, they continue to have some of

their intelligence officers and others come across the border from

Iran into Iraq. We believe that they are intent on liaising with

their own favorite Shia group, the SCIRI, and they have activities

with the Badr Corps, which we frown upon. Ambassador Bremer

from time to time has publicly called for Iran to cease and desist

that type of activity. So it is very mixed there.

In Afghanistan, it is also quite mixed. On the question of narcotics,

they are dead-on with us. They are suffering a lot, and they

share that view. They did almost immediately, in the wake of our

attack, disavow the Taliban, and at that time they disavowed al-

Qaeda. But we have seen over time that al-Qaeda has been able

to weasel their way back in a bit with the Iranians for reasons best known only to the Iranians.

The question of the Iranian interference in Harat is a real one,

and the jury is still out on that. I know it is of some concern to

Mr. Karzai and his colleagues.

Senator Hagel, I do not think we are at that

stage because you used the term ‘‘long range’’ and at least the way

I have lived for the past 3 years, that is about 4 days.

I must say those who want to be in these jobs have the time to figure out the long range.

But we do have exchange programs, small ones, with Iran. We

do allow students—about 300 of them last year—to come here. We

issued about 7,000 visas last year, some work-related, some family

related, to come here. We do intend to use MEPI on discrete

projects, and we do broadcast quite a bit both via VOA with TV

and radio, and we have got Radio Farda, which is 24 hours a day.

We are quite proud in the Department of State that we have a

Persian Web site. It gets about 3,000 hits a day. Now, that is not

the end of the world, but it is not bad. That is 3,000 people who

are interested in what we are having to say. And we are not propagandizing.

We are just putting out what the President says or what

you say at this hearing, those kind of things, without any editorial

comment. And people are getting a view that there is a lot going on in the world.

Thank you, Senator.

We have nothing in front of us but the Road Map.

But I think anybody would have to acknowledge that is a very rutted

and bumpy map at present. We are waiting for the government

of Abu Ala to be totally formed. I do not know if it will be. November

3 is the date it has to be done. Until that happens and until

Mr. Arafat empowers that government to actually move meaningfully

in the security area, then I do not think we have much reason for optimism.

We stay involved. We have John Wolf’s colleagues. Mr. Wolf is

back here consulting with us, but his colleagues are still active and

present for duty, hoping that things will get a little better. We continue

our discussions with the quartet. This is of enormous interest

not only to our President but also, of course, to our friends in Europe.

Yes, we are involved in fairly intense discussions

with Israel, with the Prime Minister and his colleagues, both with

the Secretary, who is in very often contact with his Foreign Minister

colleague, as well as Dr. Condoleeza Rice, who is involved, as

you would know, with her counterparts and colleagues.

We find some of these activities, such as provision of services to

outposts and the development of the so-called fence, to be very

problematic, and it is making it somewhat more difficult. Having

said that, Israel in 21⁄2 years of living frightened, and the very real

specter of deaths and horrible maimings of women and children, I

think it is understandable why they are so neuralgic on the issue.

If it were easy, it would have been solved quite a while ago.

If I might, I do not want to leave you with a misimpression. I

think of Iran not only as a present supporter of terrorism—on the

23rd of October we passed something that meant a lot to me and

that was the Beirut bombing, the Marine barracks bombing of

1983. People often forget. There are also embassy bombings that

Imad Mugniyah, sponsored by Iran, was involved in. There are

sanctions. There are prices to pay for that kind of behavior in my view, sir.

You know, sir, just a technical clarification. Mr.

Wolf is head of the monitoring mission. He is not the point person

for the Road Map, but that is, for better or worse, Secretary Powell.

I am not sure I understood the thrust of your question. If the Iranians

do not see any motion either—it is the Iranians who are disrupting

through terrorism the ability to have a meaningful dialog

between a government, the Palestinian Authority, and the Israelis.

So if they would cease their support for Hezbollah who lobbed 60

or 70 mortar rounds in yesterday, Hamas, PIJ, and PFLPGC, I

think that you would immediately see that a relative quiet would

descend on the area and perhaps we could have the dialog. At least

those who are so keen to have movement toward the Palestinians

would then have a much better leg on which to argue their point of view.

I would respectfully dispute the ‘‘nothing.’’ But I

think, as I have said, we have had some problematic actions by the

Government of Israel in the wake of no action and no ability to

have the Palestinian Authority unleashed, the security forces unleashed

against those who would conduct terror.

Yes, sir. But if I may, it is a state living side by

side in peace and security with Israel. So we are in favor, but there

are some obligations for that Palestinian state as well.

The nature of the debate, if I may—that is a

great question. I think you have to take each of the elements separately,

first of all. Then you come back to them.

On the question of WMD, I think many of us are informed. Personally

from my own experience, I served in Iran during the time

of the Shah when you were first coming up here, sir, or right after

that. Even at that time, as you correctly point out, not only were

they aspiring to have a nuclear weapon, but they were trying to

have an overwhelming conventional capability. And they were not

surrounded by threats. They were not. The Russians were working

in the north. They were not surrounded by threats to their society.

I believe that many us feel that there is sort of an innate grandeur

still in the dreams of Persepalis and all of that. So that informs

part of the debate. So the WMD question might be harder than it

seems because it might be more broad in their society.

Now, the question of terrorism is not. This is very, I believe, sui

generis to post-revolution. At the time I think the Iranian revolutionaries

started on this in Lebanon and through Syria. The Quds

force and the IRGC have just gained in power. In a way they are

almost on automatic pilot and very detrimental. But that is not innate,

I think, to Iran or to Persian society.

Then there is the question of human rights, which is very interesting,

because at the time of the Shah when many people would

say it was the golden era, there was something called SAVAK. And

it would be a very rare Senator, indeed, at the time who did not

vociferously criticize the activities and the violations of human

rights of SAVAK. So those are kind of the questions we wrestle with.

We find that there is nothing inherently contradictory about Shia

Islam and democracy, and that appears to be what the Nobel Prize

winner is saying as well. So that also informs the debate. So that

is where we are coming from.

The idea of a grand bargain I do not think that is on yet because

I think each one of these questions is answered in a different way.

really for your wisdom and your insightfulness and

your great knowledge over years of service. It is quite instructive.

Your answers really give us a lot of history and a lot of knowledge.

I also want to congratulate you. The President had a great trip

into Asia last week on the issues dealing with North Korea and

building that broad coalition on issues of proliferation. Hats off.

That is a tough issue to pull together, and you guys really seem

like you are getting it moving in nice fashion.

I would say, maybe contrary to some others, on Israel it looks to

me like you are doing what you can in a very difficult situation

where you have heightened terrorist attacks taking place on the

people of Israel that really seek to live in peace in the region. That

is just a very difficult situation.

I am not sure if this model of land for peace that we have been

on now for 10–15 years is the right model to move us toward peace,

but that is a discussion for another day.

I also want to congratulate you on the Sudan, what is taking

place there, where you are very close, it appears, to be to getting

peace on a war that has taken a couple million lives and has been

going on for more than 10 years, and where you have got religious

factions in each area, where you are pretty close to getting that

done, which would be a remarkable thing in the region and in the

world. So you have got a number of things taking place.

On Iran, I have tracked the Iranian activity on terrorist activity

for the period of time I have been in the Senate, traveled throughout

the Central Asia mid 1990s, late 1990s. The Iranians were very

active in spreading terrorist cells up in that region at that time

and continue to be. I would go into a number of countries coming

out from the former Soviet Union that had a significant Islamic

population, if not majority, and they were citing to the Iranians

and the Saudis as planting community centers, mosques there,

which were fine by them, but then out of that would come a radical

element that would be organized. They have been at this for some

period of time and continue to be.

There are a number of Iranian democracy advocates in this country

and around the world. I have worked with a good portion of

them. They would note very clearly to you Iran is not a democracy.

You have got a ruling Guardian Council that all the candidates

have to go through. You have, in essence, a religious ruler over the

country. They support a referendum on Iranian governance and

what is taking place within the Iranian society, and you are hearing

more and more calls for that within Iranian society.

I would hope that we could support as well that call for a referendum

within the Iranian society and note clearly Iran is not a

democracy. We believe in democracy and human rights. I would

hope you could speak to that on the support for a referendum internally

by the Iranian people on the future of Iranian governance.

Like I think most Americans, and certainly all of

my colleagues at the Department of State, we were mesmerized by

the vision of Shirin Ebadi receiving the Nobel Prize. We were fascinated

by the spontaneity of the demonstration that greeted herwhen she returned to Iran.

But I was even more interested in what she had to say. What

she had to say about developments in Iran and democracy—and I

am paraphrasing. I cannot do it with the eloquence—was basically

that if we are going to have meaningful change, it has to come from

within. I think she is on to something. It has to be something the

majority of the people who live under the system embrace and see

as a better way forward for them. If it is a referendum, then that

is fine. But I am not able from the outside to determine what the

proper path exactly is to transparency, elimination of corruption,

whether it is political corruption or fiscal corruption, et cetera.

I think our best path and our best policy is to be very forthright

in our views about transparency and governance and human

rights, et cetera, not to propagandize, but put out the information,

put it out, put it out constantly because we are finding, from what

I think I called in my testimony virtual embassies, Iranians who

travel around coming in and telling us they are getting the message.

They are hearing it. Rather than trying to pick winners or

losers in this, I do not think that is something we can do very well

from the outside. But I think our duty, as well as our right, is to

put the facts on the table and call things as we see them about the

need for civilized behavior in the world, et cetera.

But whether it is a referendum or not, I think if that is what the

majority of people want, I am all for it. But I do not know where

they are in their own development. We know there is intellectual

and political ferment. There has not been, other than those student

demonstrations of the summer which were so horribly and brutally

put down, a sort of political activism yet. I think they have got to

come a ways internally before we will know which direction they want to go.

The leading. Yes, sir.

My understanding is that—I will not go through

the complete laundry list of what we as a government broadcast,

but it is VOA. I saw some of the correspondents here. They have

got a roundtable with youth, all these kind of things that we send

in. Radio Farda, which is 24/7, a mixture of news, music, pop, to

kind of keep people interested.

The question of private groups broadcasting in, I think our preference

on that is on a case-by-case basis we will support under the

MEPI getting that information in. I am not expert in these matters,

but I know at one time years ago with VOA, we had to be very

careful about who was broadcasting into whatever country and who

might be broadcasting for the diaspora in our own country. There

were at least regulations and I believe rules about that.

So I got the message and I will look into it for you and respond.

I kind of look at this, Senator, as sort of who

needs to go first and who has been hiding the ball. As the chairman

indicated and Mr. Biden indicated, the Iranians have been

caught lying and hiding the ball several times and most recently

during a visit of the IAEA, when there were some traces of highly

enriched uranium found, that gave lie to many of the things that

the Iranians were saying.

So my own view is we are the United States. We are not like everybody

else, and we need to be very cautious and careful when we

make decisions about economic assistance, et cetera, because you

are sending a signal absent some rather basic agreement on other

elements of policy with Iran with which we have vehement objection,

such as the terrorism and things of that nature that Senator

Brownback was saying. So I think I would be pretty careful.

Regarding the apparent agreement, it appears that the Iranians

have agreed to all the elements of the September 12 Board of Governors’

resolution. It is not just an agreement with the three ministers,

though they were the ones who went to Tehran and received

it. The proof of that will be in the pudding, and we will see.

Dr. ElBaradei will issue a report after he has pored through the

pages, the voluminous documentation. Then we will be consulting

with the international community about the way forward as we go

to the 20th and the 21st of November Board of Governors meeting.

We approached the Government of Cuba about

some jamming that was emanating from Cuba. It was not the Government

of Cuba. It was another entity. And it has ceased.

First of all, there is no need on this issue for

someone to send a private message. Everybody from the U.S. Senate

to successive Presidents have been very clear from the time of

Ronald Reagan on about the Hezbollah-Iranian marriage.

We try to complicate and constrict the ability of Iran to provide

aid and comfort to Hezbollah. We try this by stopping overflights

or trying to jawbone countries into not allowing overflights when

weapons are going to be delivered through Syria or something of

that nature. We do it by trying to stop flows of money, which is

a much more difficult thing because it can go 360 degrees and still

find its way back to Hezbollah. We work with the terrorist financing

resolution at the U.N. to try to constrict and control Hezbollah’s

access to funds. It is a pretty difficult thing.

Thank you. You are making me feel like I have a lot of moss on my tusks.

Yes, sir.

Yes, it was.

And it has ceased.

The student riots to which you refer, Senator, as

I understand it, actually came about not in a search for democracy,

but they were demonstrating against the fact that the universities

were going to be privatized and the tuition would dramatically rise.

That developed over some time, a couple of days, into the need for

more openness in society and democracy, et cetera. Of course, as

we indicated, it was brutally crushed.

I think our job in this, we cannot force something on people who

want it less than we do. As I say, I was very moved by Ms. Shirin

Ebadi’s comments about meaningful change has to come from within.

The intellectual and political ferment I think has to be translated

into louder and more demands for freedoms.

We have heard—it is not a state secret—that recently the Parliament

has passed laws having to do with more judicial openness,

et cetera. Now, these laws were contravened by the unelected body,

the Council of Guardians. But that kind of expression I think

speaks to what is underlying most peoples in the world, that is, a

basic desire to run their own lives.

Our job in this I think is to make, first of all, the facts available.

The facts are both positive facts and negative facts, positive facts

about how countries around the world are developing their own democracies.

For instance, some of the countries of the former Soviet

Union who in relative terms have come quite far in 10 or 12 years.

Also, the negative facts, that is, how Iran is perceived in the world,

why Iranians have difficulty getting visas, those who are able to

travel, when we talk about corruption, just who is doing what to

whom, those kind of things. So I think that is our job right now,

and that would allow, I think, the political ferment to take hold.

My own view, it is a good lesson. It is something

that we need to keep our eyes on. I go into this saying our enthusiasm

for Bushehr, for instance, the so-called civil nuclear reactors,

is very much under control, because the Iranians have not demonstrated

their bona fides in terms of the NPT. The Iranians would

say to you that we have an inalienable right as an NPT signatory

to civilian nuclear use. Well, that is not quite right. They have an

inalienable right if they are living up to all the criteria in the Non-

Proliferation Treaty, which has to do with eschewing nuclear weapons

and enriched uranium and plutonium reprocessing for weapons,

et cetera. So I think we have got to spend some time calling

them, making them live up to their bona fides.

Second of all, I think unlike North Korea, this is a nation awash

in energy, the fourth largest reserves of petroleum, the second largest

in gas. So for them to say they need civilian nuclear reactors

seems to me to be a bit incredulous, and I think we need to point

that out. If there was some interest in developing the infrastructure

of oil and gas and terrorism had ceased and all that, then that

would be a different situation, and that ought to go ahead at some

point in time. But our enthusiasm for this whole civil nuclear thing

is very much under control for the reasons I mentioned. Thank you, sir.

I think we have in play several different things.

I think they are the leading state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

Their need for the hard currency might be slightly less than North

Korea, something we have discussed up here more. Some might

argue that would make North Korea more inclined to trade weapons for money.

Having said that, we have both the international regimes, the

NPT and other things, that we apply. We have got also the Proliferation

Security Initiative, in which 11 countries are now participating,

which is a regime that, following international law, would

try to block and stop shipments which we believe are suspicious in

nature or WMD or related materials. As I say, 11 countries have

signed up for that. We recently exercised it in the Coral Sea.

I think on the question of Iran, as I understand it, their ability

to acquire this weapon—their desire there was no question of. How

far along in their process, in terms of nuclear, sir, there were some

real questions about. I think we felt that there, first of all, was

more time. Second of all, we were able in the case of Iran to develop

an international consensus. In the case of Iraq, we had a limited

international consensus. But we have had much better luck

thus far, and that is why the President has moved to say that it

is not a one-size-fits-all. We are making some progress, he feels, in

multilateral diplomacy, and we will continue to do so.

Senator Feingold, thanks to a lot of hard effort

by my colleagues at the Department of State, United Nations, and

the President’s jawboning, we got 1511, U.N. Security Council resolution,

unanimously. I think in the first instance, that is a good

sign, that the past is the past and we are going to move forward.

On the question of Europe, it is quite interesting. I think many

of our European friends—and that is where the trouble was in the

Security Council—find that the prospect of Iran with a nuclear

weapon and, as we know, the delivery systems they are developing—

one, the Shahab, which I think on an unclassified basis has

about a 1,300 kilometer range—is something that makes the problem

theirs as well as ours. I think that is a good sign.

Now, I indicated earlier, Senator, that my colleague, John

Bolton, and some of his colleagues, Acting Assistant Secretary

Susan Burk and others, are right now out internationally. Mr.

Bolton is in Spain and Ms. Burk was meeting with the Japanese

to try to make sure we keep consensus as we move forward to the

20th and 21st Board of Governors meeting of the IAEA.

We should not have been signing a cease-fire with

a foreign terrorist organization. My understanding—and I think it

has been written about—is this was done tactically in the field by

a soldier who was faced with an immediate problem. Given the fact

that this is an FTO, we are in the business of disarming them from

their major weapons, which I am told has been done, containing

them in a rather large area, which takes a certain amount of person

power from the U.S. Army, and we are classifying them, going

through them person by person, to see those who may have terrorist

connections. In my understanding, a certain number of those

do, and we could talk about it in a closed session. That process is ongoing now.

They are contained, as I understand it, by the

U.S. military, primarily the Army, and they have been disarmed of

their major weapons. I do not think all of them have turned over

their sidearms. They are not allowed, as I understand it, free access

in and out of their own camp. There have been speculations

about making these swaps with Iran, et cetera. As you know, although

we may have some real complaints against terrorists, we

also have some real strong views about how people should be treated.

So I think that impedes any possibility of swaps, et cetera, with

Iran because we cannot be sure of the way they would be treated.

But if we find that people qualify as terrorists under our definition,

then they are going to have to be dealt with in a legal manner.

We were informed before the trip. When the political

directors went to Iran to sort of set the stage, Secretary Powell

had discussions with some of his colleagues. John Bolton and I met

separately with various German and French interlocutors—and

with the British, we are cheek by jowl anyway—to make our point

clear that we hoped the ministers would not settle for the 80 percent

solution, that they would settle for 100 percent solution because

we felt the only reason we were at the point where the Iranians

were willing to talk was because of unanimity of views on the

Board of Governors. So to that extent, we were informed. And immediately upon the

completion of the mission, Secretary Powell—his colleagues informed

him. Then laterally we got it through diplomatic communications

as well. We did not offer, to my knowledge, in any way any sort of security guarantee.

Not to my knowledge. We are, as I indicated,

however, reaching out to them as we develop our own understanding

of what is in those pages to give them the benefit of our views.

You had another question, Senator.

Well, we have got about 6 hours a day VOA and

a couple of hours a day TV that goes in. We have got a Web site

and we have got a 24/7 operation called Radio Farda, which we are

told is quite popular because it mixes popular and contemporary

U.S. and Iranian music with news broadcasts, et cetera. It is not

propaganda. It is straightforward.

I was asked even here today by the VOA would

I sit for a one-on-one discussion that just goes to the Iranian people

and just tell them what we think.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a

pleasure as always.