

Moderator: The dish we are serving up is bitter sweet. Bitter sweet if I may riddle of Iran. And as the British foreign secretary wrote today in my own international tribune there are many Irans. When I say a riddle, I say it because there are many Irans. I had the privilege last year in June on seeing one Iran the sweet Iran, if you like, rise up an extraordinary display of civic protest against what the three million Iranians on the streets on June 15 perceived as the theft of their votes. So on the one side you have this Iran of sophistication, of engagement, youthful, 65 percent are under 35, they want contact with the west. You have the largest people power movement in the Middle East. In many ways, this is one of the most hopeful societies in the Middle East. On the other hand, you have this fear and brutal repression since June 15th, beating show trials, imprisonment, execution you have this own going nuclear program. Deeply ambiguous nuclear program. You have Iran support for Hamas. You have a country that seems to go out of its way to destabilize the region. And to not accept the outreach from President Obama. Fortunately to navigate this riddle we have a broad panel representing many different parts of the world.

We have Yossi Kuperwasser from Israel.

from Germany, we have Ruprecht Polenz from Poland.

We have from Washington Senator Bob Casey.

We have ambassador Mr. Vladimir Chizho.

Last but not least from China, we have Professor Wang Jisi.

Senator Casey if I may, I think I'd like to begin with you. We just had the second (inaudible) from President Obama there was no mention in it of sharp sanctions let alone of military force. And yet from the hill where you are, we have often had a different tone over the past year petroleum sanctions crippling sanctions. So I guess my question has the effectiveness of the US message to Iran been diluted by a distance between the when you say and the hill. And why is Congress so enthusiastic about sanctions which in the past have not worked?

The Hon. Robert Casey: Roger, I think when you line up as you began to dine your introduction, the case against the Iranian regime, the case is very compelling over and over again, we see the regime defying the -- not just the wishes but the law international law with regard to what their obligations are under the NPT. What they have not done when it comes to compliance and notice to the IEEA. Their constant effort to mislead.

So I'm going to go down to list, not to mention the other major topic here which is the brutal repression that we have seen displayed so often. Even apart from that just on the nuclear question there is a real defiance and a I think a long record of fractions or actions that are contrary to international law as it relates to their obligations under a number of accords. So I think the case is very strong and I believe it is very important for the Congress of the United States to make it very clear what the will of the American people is even if at times it might be at a different level of emphasis than this administration or any administration. But I think we have taken the right action so far. We don't have legislation that is new sanctions, legislation that has gotten through the Congress. It has been, it is through the Senate. And we are working on a Congress with the house.

Moderator: Do you believe sanctions could believe a change to Iran? It is the revolutionary guard that profit from the networks that prevent sanctions. So with in effect most sanctions we are reinforcing the people we want to weaken.

The Hon. Robert Casey: I know those arguments have been made. But I do believe if, as we have in past targeted sanctions, sometimes you have to do it

progressively. But I don't think it is any question when you line up as a prosecutor might, a bill of particulars a set of charges. I don't think there is any question that summary of what the Iranian regime has been up to the last couple of years leads to one conclusion which is impose sanctions. The concern though, over time is that you, what you don't want to do is take action so you are bringing together the regime and the Iranian people who have been oppressed. You don't want sanctions that has an adverse impact on people who are trying to live in freedom and trying to express themselves against what the regime has been all about.

Moderator: In regard to the people that want to live in freedom, given the United States and the history with Iran and the perception of Iran, and U.S. medaling, what do you think the United States could do to help those seeking democracy? And they have been seeking it since 1905 in Iraq without provoking this charge of medaling.

The Hon. Robert Casey: I don't know under estimate the difficult. Part of it is taking a positive force as it relates to pathways for the Iranian people just to communicate. The wonders of technology whether it is Internet or Facebook or twitter, just go down the list

of technological advancements that a lot people to communicate. Our government has had a strong bipartisan not just on sanctions in moving that forward but in particular on measures that will advance what as you pointed out a real fervor for people to organize, meet and communicate and express themselves in freedom. We have a new caucus in the United States Senate which is bipartisan, which is pointed in that direction. Thinking of new and better ways we can help unleash the voice and freedom of speech and freedom of assembly rights that we take for granite in the United States and across Europe.

Moderator: Thank you. Yossi, if I might turn to you. President Obama clearly has no enthusiasm for military action Iran. That has been clear pretty much from the outset of the administration.

Given that, is there a realistic military auction for Israel given the threat from Iran's nuclear program anymore how seriously right now is that military option being entertained?

Yossi Kuperwasser: Nobody very happy about the military option. Neither is Israel. That said, I think community option is viable. Free world has enough power in order to force Iran to give up the program. It's a problem of being ready to pay the price that might go

along with it. Basically what we see in the last seven years since this was on the table, that the Iranian understand it this way. The free world is not ready to pay this price. That enables it to move forward with the program. And today they are very close to a situation where they believe military option would become less relevant. Main medal right now is (inaudible). That is the medal right now. They believe that you have the capability to enrich uranium in a facility that is well protected. That's an issue. They have recently asked them not to do so. They ignored this. And we have to understand that the clock is ticking. On different clocks on different paces. What is happening the program itself is ticking faster than any other clock that is ticking simultaneously.

Moderator: So you think this option is viable even without a U.S. green light Joe.

Yossi Kuperwasser: I'm talking about free --

Moderator: That's what it might come down to.

Yossi Kuperwasser: I don't think this is something anybody wants to happen. Since the Americans are repeatedly saying that the nuclear Iran is unacceptable, and the nuclear program is ticking the way it ticks. The question will come back to the Americans sooner than they expect. Because what do you mean by

say figure is unacceptable. Three ways to handle it to make it not happen. One, is the one you mentioned before. Change of the regime. Clock is working for that is ticking very slowly. You have seen on February 11th indicates this is not something that is going to happen in the relevant timetable. Other clock is the clock of sanctions. We were expecting sanctions by February. We are today, at the end of March. People are talking about June. And saying the sanctions are going to be less than binding. The Iranians are listening. They understand we can move forward. Sanctions are weakened by the Chinese position, are not frightening them. Sad option. Is aggressive option if the uranium across a certain line that will make the Americans think this is unacceptable. Then that is going to be an interesting situation. That can happen much sooner than some expect.

Moderator: You mentioned the cost the price of an eventual military action by Israel or by Israel and the United States. Among those prices as I see it. It would place a small country with the Persians as well the Arabs which it has never been before. Ignite Hamas, cause destabilization in Iraq and Afghanistan, outrage throughout the Muslim world. Nothing left of President Obama outreach to the Muslim world because the United

States would be at war, in three wars stretching from the western border of Iraq all the way to the eastern border of Afghanistan and into Pakistan and seven Muslim of the 1.5 billion Muslims in the world would distinguish between Israel and the United States if something like that happened. All this she say in the view of secretary Gates, to may be set the program back by two years. And thereafter causing probably around ripple, EA membership. By what calculation is that a positive step for Israel or the world?

Yossi Kuperwasser: The way you put it, everything -- half of the glass. Also some things are fuller half. You know, once you do something like that, you never know how long the end is going to be. Once has to physical part and the systemic part. Solutions are going to look totally different. United States the free world, and Israel might lose much more if they don't stop the Iranian war. Because what the Iranians are after changing the world order. That's what they want to achieve. First change the equation of the Middle East get rid of Israel and then change the world order. They say it out loud. So, if we, if the free world really wants to protect its value to protect humanistic, values that it stands for. It has to take several risks for it. No free lunch.

Moderator: You think containment is an option.

Yossi Kuperwasser: The problem with nuclear weapon, even if they don't have the weapon, just potential of producing it, they will have a lot of this impact taking place. The stability of the Persian gulf area is going to happen even like that. It is not about them using it. Containing them is not a problem. It is about force projection that they are going to be able to do once they have the weapon.

Moderator: Containing them is not a problem?

Yossi Kuperwasser: It is not the main problem. Main problem is to prevent them from having it that's what we need to focus is on.

Moderator: If I might turn to you, there's a Democratic clock if you like. Iran of today is not the Iran of June 11. It is hard to judge where the green movement is today. If I said, millions of Iranians, (inaudible) have moved into something much more like out right situations. That is the Democratic clock. Then the nuclear clock. Which we have been talking about. As a European who has taking a deep interest in Iran, how would you calibrate the approach, of the country and the light of those two factors and do you think right now that the alliance of United States and Europe have that balance about Right.

The Hon. Ruprecht Polenz: I think for quite a long time we have a lot of concerns with Iran. One is proliferation. The other is its position in the Middle East process, the only (inaudible) it is a human rights situation within Iran. And it is support for organizations like Hamas. I think we have to address all four of them. We are now looking for a new round in the security council which I believe is very important. I think it is important to send a clear message to the Iranians that it is not just about a dispute of Iran and the United States or dispute of Iran and the west, that the nuclear program has to be changed that it is a dispute between the Iran and the whole world community. This would have an impact if it would reach a unanimous decision in the security council because the explanation to their people, it is only about our conflict with the United States for different purposes. They are denying us our rights according to the NPT. But if, and we will have this discussion, if Russia and China joins us, and the resolution and tough on the Iranian refusal to comply with the EIO, then think this has an impact Iran doesn't want to be isolated. This is what they are really afraid of. Not so much afraid of sanctions from the west. We have seen in New York times an article that even the United States we are not able

to implement their sanctions that have been endorsed for many years. If you look to the balance of trade in the -- import and export you'll see exports going to Iran. It is obviously very often the same products.

Therefore with regard to the nuclear program, there's a strong needed signal needed because the MPT is at stage if Iran would become a nuclear country. On the other hand, favoring for a long time that the European union would treat Iran like they treated Russia (inaudible) peaceful demonstrators what did we do? We listed those police chiefs, presidents of universities who explained students, the one whose ran forefront of. This would have been a clear message that we don't care about human rights situation in Iran.

Third part, I don't think we should discuss regime change. Because this is seen as an inference and we need for instance (inaudible)to get to a situation in the nuclear field. We should urge a change of behavior of the regime but not regime change.

Moderator: President Obama referred again in the second message, which was -- that was the first reference. You are talking of sanctions but Germany's history of respecting sanctions is not --

The Hon. Ruprecht Polenz: We respect every sanction. You have to be very precise. If the European union made

the decision about sanctions or the UN security of course we implemented it. Because Germany in the past had a very well-developed economic relationship with Iran, sometimes we are urged to do more on the bilateral basis. Sanctions have not only to be tough they have to be 11. It is not 11 if Germany with draws and China jumps in.

Moderator: That brings me to China. China has been irritated by President Obama meeting with and now President Obama the alliance in general is looking to China to support sanctions in the security council. While Iran is the source of 13 percent or so of oil imported into China. When I was in Tiran last year I was amazed how it is washed in Chinese products and biggest single trading partner of Iran. So for China to make a decision to adopt sanctions, might be, seems to be rather painful option. Is it realistic in your view to think that China will pay more than lip service to sanctions. Should we expect Chinese extension when may be in June this does finally come to vote in the security council. Where is China with respect to Iran?

Dr. Wang Jisi: You listed several reason why China is hesitating in joining other countries in sanctioning against Iran. Economics and China's traditional relationship with Iran. And also very fond issue of

some ethnic tensions.

AUDIENCE: That might have some influence from Iran. And that is also a consideration. And also in China's deal with other countries. Not simply western countries. But with Saudi Arabia and Turkey, and Russia. They have attitudes that we find difficult to explain. Sometimes. So there's.

Moderator: Which attitudes?

Dr. Wang Jisi: Saudi Arabia, when they try to explain their own position, it's obscure to the Chinese. Turkey is another example. So I mean, another factor is China only sees one Iran not many Iran as he tried to point out. I think there is a tendency against color revolution here and there. So there's -- also you listed the reason why China is hesitant, but that is temporary. The long term goal of China is to have a stabilize might say including Iran. So I think the Chinese officials are very much aware of the international pressure on China. But they also have to consider domestic concerns on this item. This is not on the list of China's foreign affairs. But it becomes more important when people try to understand. The -- why is Iran not permitted to own nuclear weapons since the United States and some other countries, Pakistan and India and Israel can obtain nuclear. Why not Iran? I

think the government is trying very hard to persuade Iranians to be more prudent. To be more (inaudible) I think China is faced with a difficult situation. I cannot predict what China will do in the forth coming vote. But I think Chinese position is to persuade other partners, diplomatic instruments have not been exhausted so we try again.

Moderator: Put there is a push to try impose sanctions coming not only from Washington but from European capitals. So I'm going to put you on the state. If you had to bet in the next three months where China will come down, what would you say?

Dr. Wang Jisi: I think they may be very careful in looking at other country's attitudes before it makes the final discussion.

Moderator: Interesting both China and Iran we see battles going on between open and closed systems. Particularly in the digital area, Internet. Does China support Iran's effort to repress it's population by denying them free online access to the digital world, because by doing that Iran (inaudible) the Chinese's approach?

Dr. Wang Jisi: This is a very sensitive issue I think China you have notice said the debate with Google. And coo Chinese are sensitive to Cyber

security, Internet control and so on and so forth. There is a suspicion in China that these technologies have been used for political purposes. So for -- China is reluctant to join other countries in condemning their domestic policies. So it supports the crack down?

Dr. Wang Jisi: I think the Chinese position we don't interfere in other country's domestic affairs but beyond that, I don't think the Chinese has position. Beijing's government has a position there.

Moderator: The reset button or the Obama globally seems to work. I would say better perhaps with rational and Moscow than almost anywhere. In the case of Iran, is the reset going to work in the sense that Russia will back the position of the U.S. administration which right now is to maintain the outreach but at the same time tighten the noose by imposing those sanctions and also reinforcing the defenses of gulf allies. Sometimes I have had the impression, while Russia clearly opposes nuclear proliferation it is not displeased to see the United States discomfited in Iran. Of course the absence of (inaudible) between Iran and the west does not mean Iranian gas goes to the west. Which leads the field open for Russia. There are interests in something like the status quo.

Given all that what is Russia going to do.

Mr. Vladimir Chizhov: Let me start on the critical note. I think our discussion was launched on the confused basis. I think that mixing two very important issues one, nuclear program of Iran and the nature of the regime and the break down is, and the circumstances wrong. But also, of all the demonstrators who participated in the June events, and subsequently nobody ever put up a slogan of terminating the nuclear program. This is one nation that unites Iran into one. That is my answer to your concept of many Irans.

Having said that of course, this is an issue of serious concern to all of us. Iran has behaved in a way that has been quite disappointing I would say. That includes the degree of -- with IEE and also includes the stalled cities of context by the six party format. You could name it. But it ends up to six.

Moderator: Was Russia particularly angered by the break down of the Geneva deal?

Mr. Vladimir Chizhov: We are, we are disappointing, we are sorry that has taken such a turn. We invested a lot of effort into that. Together with our colleagues from the United States and France, speaking of sanctions in particular, sanctions as such generally, is a dual of questionable effectiveness. Even in cases

where when international community was totally united on sanctions like the once that were introduced on Taliban. There was no descent in the international community on that. But I wouldn't say those sanctions were in huge (inaudible).

In case of Iran, indeed Iran is used to sanctions. So if we speak about sanctions, they should be focused. Focused on the goal that we put before ourselves. That goal to to preserve theory gentleman of nonproliferation. They should be targeted and there by not harming the general population and of course, not expanding beyond the sectors and individuals involved in the suspected proliferation activities. But also, when one decides, when one talks about sanctions and decides to proceed, there should be an exit strategy. The six party format embarked on a double flag approach. I think we should preserve that. And we certainly need to use all opportunities every opportunity that the diplomatic bark of that double tree dialogue offers. And finally, sanction weapon, weapon of sanctions is a very strong one I would say. It is very heavy one.

And one has to keep in mind, the long term perspective.

If sanctions don't work then what? You force? I'm

sure my country will be against that.

Moderator: Opposed to military action not going to change?

Mr. Vladimir Chizhov: We believe that the chance for diplomatic solution is not lost. Things are not improving. Actually, the behavior of the Iranian side is not very promising to put it mildly. But we believe that all possibilities of diplomatic solution should be exhausted prior to proceeding to any sort of sanctions.

Moderator: Do you think Iran willing ever test a nuclear weapon, a deliverable nuclear weapon or will it remain in the area where it has been for a long time of call it nuclear ambiguity? Do you believe Iran would test a nuclear weapon one day?

Mr. Vladimir Chizhov: I would not want to speculate. But the Iranians are certainly quite good at brinkmanship in every sense of the word. It is a dangerous game of course. You can over play your hand. But so far this has been the case.

Moderator: Who here in the audience believes Iran will one day test a nuclear weapon. In the next five years? And who believes Iran will stay at break out or reach a break out capacity but stay there?

Thanks.

I think fairly evenly. Who expects a break through

between Iran and United States during some point of the Obama first term?

That's encouraging.

Moderator: I'm throwing this open very soon. So prepare your questions.

The Hon. Robert Casey: Did we just witnessed you resided a break through here? I'm only half serious. The Chinese might be undecided and I was encouraged of what the ambassador said, he said they are Iranians are good at brinkman ship. So far so good but what I think, I think what we are seeing though as we discuss this is at although there are some basic choices that a lot of folks have to make, when it confronts this question I still believe, and I think it is been part of all of our answers. I think we should continue to pursue a lot of options. I mean that in two bases. Number one, I think it is important what President Obama has done from day one to have a really robust outreach and diplomatic efforts. No question that is important. I think what we are talking about on sanctions is also another parallel are track. There may be other creative ways to do this that I have not thought of. In addition to that, it is very important that within our government that there are parallel tracks and even parts of pursue those tracks as well. I think we are

still at the early stages of this. I think the ambassador just talked about whether sanctions are effective or not. There are some debate about that. I don't think we have seen the full effect of the newer sanctions. The ones that have been in place have been focused on goods and services and directed at commerce. The ones that I think are in the Senate bill and have a broader impact. In particular, the ones that are focused on the revolutionary guard. That are very targeted. I still that has to play out a bit.

Moderator: Can I ask you a quick question? Do you think the Iran society has changed substantially over the past year. Where before you said Iran from the U.S. psyche would search the image of a mad mother with her finger twitching on a nuclear button. Now you may get.

AUDIENCE: Dying in the streets in June. Has there been a change of perception and how does that pay into the politics.

The Hon. Robert Casey: I don't think there is a question if there's a different perception. In a column the other day where in your column you were talking about the manifestation of those feelings in the hearts of the Uranian people, you had examples of that. In particular, because of television because of the coverage of what happened in June throughout the

summer, even when demonstrations weren't on the street, I believe and I know it is not going to lead to some momentous change, I think a lot of folks share this. In the hearts of tens of thousands hundreds of thousands if not millions because of what we saw this summer. I think Americans were able to see that up close through television.

Moderator: Then I'll take questions.

Yossi Kuperwasser: At least with regard to the enrichment issue the whole Iranian society is united they have the right to enrich. It is part of (inaudible) And it is unanimously agree greed. I think we should in our goals, we want objective guarantees that nuclear program remains peaceful. Of course not enriching is one possibility. But there might be others?

Moderator: We have almost conceded enrichment --

Yossi Kuperwasser: -- because it was in the previous ones the same point they should fulfill suspend enrich. And this will not work. It will not work this time either. If they would adjust this and say go back to additional protocol. Implement more transparency maybe we could offer a joint venture for fuel in Iran to make out of the enriched uranium. Then this Iran cannot be used for anything else. This also a possibility. You

get more -- to be more secure that it remains peaceful. Finally, if you don't address the whole situation politically, it is security and state us. Only the United States can (inaudible) With Iranians. But unfortunately, sense it is just a year that the United States, the administration of Obama tries to have these negotiations, but you mentioned it in the House and Senate, additional sanctions are prepared. It is at least a mixed signal.

Moderator: I'd take the point that Iranian enrich is a point shared across the board.

But most during the campaign (inaudible) it is one thing to have a government running a nuclear program which at the same time is talking about the annihilation of Israel.

Moderator: I think there are distinctions. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: Two brief questions. First one, do you think that Iran's behavior is getting more or less predictable after what we have seen the last month? And second question is going to the panelists from China, do you think that your country feels threaten by Iranian bomb or nuclear problem? Your national security of your country?

Moderator: Why don't you take the second question.

Dr. Wang Jisi: I think China is indirectly threatened by a possible Iranian nuclearization. People are warning us that Iran goes nuclear then some Americans say 100 percent Israel will attack Iran. And that will result in a regional war. And that will result in disasters trade relations with Iran. And also transportation of oil. And natural gas would be effected. And another danger nuclear weapons -- well other countries like turkey and Egypt might also want to be get nuclear weapons. But, I don't think China is threatened by nuclear weapons per se. I think when we look around China North Korea nuclear weapon is more seriously a problem to China rather than Iran. Compared to North Korea Iran's problem is secondary.

Moderator: Why don't you take the other question whether behavior is getting worse?

Yossi Kuperwasser: Iranians are quite predictable. They move forward. Iran in my mind they, see no reason why they should obey the demands of the national community right now. If you listed to the debate, you'd draw the same conclusion as well. The effect of what we are seeing, their understanding, it is a free world. It is fake in the hands of consensus that can't be reached. And has given limit to have different interest the ability to have the fate of free world. If this is

a case, there is no reason for Iran to stop in moving forward. In my mind, you are going to see them moving on with the enrichment, moving in the direction that will eventually lead them to a place where they have to decide, I'm the first (inaudible) which is whether they stop there or they make the final move. We don't want them to reach this point. And then point, it is better to say about other members of the panel. The enrichment as long as we have a regime like the we have, it is unacceptable because the purpose of it is to have a nuclear weapon. The Chinese may think who cares. But some people have to care about it. And that's why I think the international community has to make it very clear that enrichment is not acceptable as long as you can verify then I fully accept. If you can verify this is strictful peaceful project no problem.

Moderator: With Iraq and Syria, Israel showed they wouldn't accept this kind of thing in its neighborhood. Is it right to presume that Iran wouldn't be an exception to that rule?

Yossi Kuperwasser: I think we have to be clear here. Iran and Syria wanted to have nuclear capabilities for different reasons than the ones that led -- that are leading Iran. That's why I think it is up to the international community to take care of this problem.

Not that Israel is not a target. Israel has to be very much worried about what it is happening. But it much wider.

Audience: My question goes to professor, I want to talk to you, first time European securities directed impacted by something China is doing or not doing. So far it is largely verbal. Whether we agree or disagree it doesn't make a difference at the end of the day. It is a big call for a common defense policy. Not going into the force option. If you say it's too expensive you won't do it. May be one day we'll be joining with the South Koreans to have.

AUDIENCE: How can China live with the fact because it's own reasons with Iran, it is having our concerns with other policies that effect China?

Dr. Wang Jisi: I think more knowledgeable people in China are very much aware of the problem you are describing. But this is still somewhat not directly effecting China's interest. More people are more concerned about U.S. arm sales. If you remind them there is a Uranian problem in central Asia or somewhere else, I think they say this is not China's problem because Iran is in contingent with United States. And to some extent with Europe.

Why do we have to involve ourself in this struggle

between Iran and the west as a whole. I think people like myself are very much aware of the danger. But I think, -- it is not to convince the bottom majority of the politicians to understand that.

AUDIENCE: I have a question to Senator Casey. Sometimes being said so long as Israeli, Palestinian issue is not resolved one way or another it is very difficult to that can confront UN effectively.

Another part to the equation Israel is being asked to make serious concessions that impinge on its security. Most Israelis would be -- I'm not a supporter. Most Israelis would not be very willing to make serious concession of Palestinians so long as the Iran issue is not resolved one way or another. It is overshooting the debate. My question, how much is a Obama administration aware of the fact that whatever he is trying to do to push Israel is being undermined by the fact that there is the threat.

You mention the analogy. I think this is a very interesting point, you made a distinction between Iranian policy and the kind of language. My question is not with the regime or policy. But with individual head of state that is a Holocaust denier. If somebody like this in Europe or other country is a head of state would supervise those things he would be immediately

declared (inaudible). My question is coming from Germany would Germany be willing to lead in European movement declaring odd (inaudible) not because of policies. But because of Holocaust deniers.

Moderator: Why don't we start with You.

The Hon. Ruprecht Polenz: The German parliament passed immediately passed immediately after these speeches of (inaudible) and unanimous resolution condemning this and making clear this is unacceptable. I have not seen -- there was sometimes the idea you might remember, that during the football championship that he might consider watching soccer game in Germany. It was made clear for him not to come. I'm siding with you. As long as he not changing his speech. He should not visit European countries.

Moderator: Would Germany raise that at a summate or make that EU Policy?

The Hon. Ruprecht Polenz: I don't think there would be a special initiative on this. But we are very outspoken. You heard speeches of constant America. I think that there can be no doubt. Especially because we mostly concerned about this aspect of Iranian policy. For us the benchmark, the threats, as we both note they are discussed about this, huge efforts to bring other hest countries in to light because we need the this

unanimous decision.

We have not spoken about Brazil.

Moderator: Israel Palestine and the link.

The Hon. Robert Casey: I want to say I speak for myself, and these are my views. First of all, as in terms of premise of your question, I don't agree with it. I don't agree there's this inner-dependency between the issues that makes it irresolvable. We can debate that. My belief that even if the Middle East peace process had been completed. The threat by the Iranian regime with regard to nuclear capability and launch capability, would be an threat to the region and may be beyond the region. So I don't think we have the luxury our government or any government that cares about this, I don't think we have the luxury of sequencing. Solving one problem and then solving the other. We have to work on both. I think it was significant that President Obama his first day in office, first day called all the players in the Middle East to work on this challenge. I know we got a long way to go. He and Secretary Clinton have worked on that issue for a long time. I would say that one of the manifestations of their concerns about both would be in my judgment not only having the times president or vice president, all very skilled but by making in addition to the state department and other

players in the Middle East they have appointed George Mitchell to do nothing but the Middle East. And secondly, Dennis Ross has worked very hard on the Iranian question. I think they are both significant priorities they have to be worked on. On separate tracks. If there is overlap. I don't think there is inner-dependence at the core of your question.

Moderator: We are running out of time.

AUDIENCE: I don't mean to doubt the expressed of your concern for the nuclear program. Could it be the case that Russia and China relish the prospect of seeing American decline because of a nuclear Iran? That may explain why we have seen foot dragging for sanctions?

AUDIENCE:

My question to the panel, assuming that the united nations adopted your resolution, and Iran (inaudible) what would be the next step?

AUDIENCE: Can I pick up on your second question to? (inaudible) taking it to the point of break out. Precision on that. There is a view that is happening at the moment.

It is being runed to that point. And political realty will come into force in Iran.

Could I ask the panel, if it gets to the point of

break out potential, but not actually breaking out and political decision is taking out has a red line been crossed or not.

Moderator: Thank you.

AUDIENCE: It has been very easy I think to take a hard line against such a radical figure. As the Russian Ambassador pointed out, the people, would require a nuclear weapons capacity, that has been the case for a while. If sweet Iran should reveal at some miracle, what would the international response be? If Iran said why are we singled out to not have nuclear weapons when others who have violated international accords are allowed to hold them?

Moderator: Thank you.

If Iran arrives at this break out, but goes no further has a red line been crossed?

Yossi Kuperwasser: I want to avoid using the term red line. We have to wait for reaching that point. It up to the international community to make this happen. At that point, it might well be that even then militarily, opposition is not going to be enough, I think people don't understand how time is playing you. The time is really short. Iran is close. We are at the junction. We have to make decisions.

It is not that we have such a long time to see and

wait. And the question what happens if sanctions don't work? How much time do we wait to see if they work or not? We have waited 8 years now since this has all started. And the Iranians have covered so much ground on the way forward. If we wait more, they might reach a point where there is no point in doing something.

Moderator: Israel has predicted Iran with a nuclear weapon by 1999, 2003, by 2006. Israel. That is not true. We have in the past said the Iranians can cross a point in which they are going to have the coal and technology needed to produce nuclear weapons within a certain period of time. And we were quite reckoned. Basically, the Iranians did exactly that by adding 2007. And since then they have robust (inaudible) -- this was the main problem that the Iranian was facing. Since 2007 they know how to reach uranium robustly. And that is the problem. I want to say one word if I may. I gave you the last notice because my friend asked me to fill in. The reason I said yes to this strange request was that during the last week, I've been traveling around Europe with my son, around Poland moving from one concentration camp to another. And listening to the way the international community ignored signs the urgency of the need to do something about what happened then. I really think we should not

underestimate what these guys are saying. It is not enough to condemn. Steps should be taken. Because the prize is unbelievable.

Moderator: The question about Iranian bomb would be quite welcome because it would lead to a decline of America and that is essentially what Russia and China want. Is that what Russia's want (inaudible) simply not I believe that we share one common goal. That is to preserve and enhance the international proliferation regime. Be Iran. Be anyone else. It is not a 0 sum game. It is on this basis that we are working on the 6 market format. I'm sure my Chinese colleague will support that view.

Moderator: If these sanctions pass and Iran ignores them, the question what is the next step?

The Hon. Robert Casey: I'm not going to speak for the members of security counsel. I'm convinced we should move forward with sanctions and may be even do a better job implementing the ones that are on the table. I think despite the argument that is made, we can make a compelling case as the question was asked before, is Iran predictable. I think they are predictability misleading. That is one thing we are sure about. The Israelis are very diligent. A lot of people didn't want to believe them. Last September when we got the news

that rocketed around the world, if there is any doubt, as I think there was little doubt that this regime would continue to mislead the international community that was further evidence of that. They are very few examples of a nation that is not only violated a series of agreements but is also sponsoring terrorism. Roger made the point early, the impact they have in Iraq. Support for Hamas. So there's a lot of other elements to this that are at the foundation of just basic credibility that I think calls into question everything they do when it comes to the nuclear questions. I think it is a unique case.

Moderator: Bill's question. If we found ourselves with a president, by some miracle and sweet Iran had prevailed and he said, why are we singled out when we look to the west and we see nuclear armed Israel, look to the north and we see a nuclear armed Russia look to the east we see Pakistan and India. And we -- this is now a reasonable man talking. Who has not said crazy things. Why are we singled out?

The Hon. Ruprecht Polenz: They are not singled out. They are obliged to refrain from nuclear weapons. They are in the treaty of course we have an interest that we don't see any nuclear arms. Germany, a nonnuclear arm state. With many other. We are hopefully looking for

that the nuclear states are dissolving as we have now seen with Russia and United States. We hope this policy is continuing and the conference ask in Washington is successful that we are on a path with less nuclear weapons. Even if they are governed properly.

Moderator: Thank you very much. I was saying to my friend and colleague. The events in June, I witnessed in Iran, there are usually on two or three times when you feel you are witnessing history unfolding. What stays with me is the people, since the constitutional of 1905 have been looking for some form of represented government. I would just urge us all as we go forward to remember the Iranian people. They are noble, they are highly engaged. They have a deep shield of face. But an irrepressible -- we shouldn't do anything that puts that aspiration back in my hummable view. Thank you very much.