Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I deeply apologize for missing your testimony and arriving

late. And if what I ask is redundant, you can just correctly correct

me or sanction me, and we’ll move forward. [Laughter.]

I think all of us really recognize that the

$64,000 question is the weaponization of nuclear materiel in Iran,

and that’s what has the clock running. Is there any timetable we’re

using as a date that we think they will actually have it weaponized?

The Iranians? Other than just guesswork?

Well, taking that general information, the fuse

is getting a lot shorter, which is why the sanctions issue is important,

to try and get the Iranians to come to the table.

Do you, in terms of the U.N. sanctions that recently passed the

Security Council, what is the resolve of the Europeans in terms of

being an enforcement mechanism, in terms of those sanctions? In

your opinion—I know that’s all that would be, would be your

opinion.

Mr. Levey.

There is some movement in Congress on the

sanctions bill, and one of the sanctions that I—it has always

seemed to me—would be the one that might hit it the hardest—

would be the one over the importation of refined petroleum. Is that

correct, or incorrect? In terms of the gravity of that sanction on the

Iranians?

Do we have any knowledge that they’re—in addition

to increasing their capacity—that they’re actually storing it

so they could ride out a ban?

Well, we obviously have learned there’s not

really a silver bullet in this issue, but there may be a critical mass

of weight that, when it finally all comes to bear, both U.N. sanctions

as well as things that Congress does, we get to that critical

point that they have to react, and that’s where I think we need to

be—if the window is 3 to 5 years that you were referring to in the

previous statement, if it is there, we need to be working now to get

that critical weight sooner rather than later, to get them to the

table, I think. Do you agree with that?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.