



## Senate Briefing

# Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options

Tuesday, May 15, 2012

11am - 1:00 pm

106 Dirksen Senate Office Building



**Senator Roy Blunt (Missouri)**, member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and Senate Appropriations Committee opens discussion.

**Panelists** (from left to Right):

- **Lt. Gen. David Deptula (ret.)**, former Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance
- **Hon. Linda Chavez**, former Assistant to the President for Public Liaison
- **Prof. Alan Dershowitz**, Professor of Law, Harvard University
- **Hon. Patrick Kennedy**, former Member of the House of Representatives
- **Hon. Michael Mukasey**, former Attorney General of the United States
- **Hon. Bill Richardson**, former Governor of New Mexico, Secretary of Energy
- **Brig. Gen. David Phillips (ret.)**, former commandant of the Army Military Police School, commander of all police operations in Iraq, including the protection of Camp Ashraf
- **Hon. John Sano**, former National Clandestine Service's Deputy President and member of directorate of U.S. Central Intelligence Agency

**Sponsor:**

Iranian-American Cultural Association of Missouri





## Senate Briefing

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

**Senator Roy Blunt (Missouri),**  
member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence  
and Senate Appropriations Committee

Let me welcome you all this morning. I'm Roy Blunt. I'm the Senator from Missouri and pleased to work with the committee that put this together, the Iranian-American Cultural Association of Missouri.

I will say as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I think I can say without disclosing anything that would be a surprise to anybody, there is no topic we spend more time on than the topic of Iran.

I'd also say as a member of the House and Senate, for some time now I can't think of a time when if you ask where are the two places in the world that you're most concerned about today, that Iran wouldn't have been on that list of one of the one or two places in the world most concerned today.

Whether we're talking about MeK and Camp Ashraf. Whether we're talking about people in Iran who have a tremendous desire for freedom and democracy. Or of course whether we're talking about Iran as it looks at nuclear efforts that many of us believe clearly are headed in a bad direction. I think the fact that this great panel would come together this morning and, frankly, that this room would have this many people in it indicates that the level of people that are in this room, indicates the concern and interest of many families, the agony of this ongoing discussion of what can we do to help make this problem better.

I'm going to let the panel introduce themselves. I'm going to stay for a few minutes and let my good friend from the House, Patrick Kennedy, we served together in the House for a dozen years. And we were able to do several things together there, even though we were in different parties, we found a number of things to work on. This was one of the issues that we're able to work on.

Patrick, I'm glad you're here to take the responsibility of the master of ceremonies. The person who is going to be sure the panel gets a chance to express the views that this panel uniquely brings together.

As you look at who's here on this panel and the breadth of knowledge about foreign policy and the law in Iran that they bring to this discussion today, it's truly extraordinary. I'm honored just to have been able to be part of walking over here and coming in with this group that knows so much about a topic that is going to affect America and the world and those who love Iran and have family members in Iran and understand the great heritage of Iran as many of you do so well.

Thank you all for being here.

Patrick, I'm going to return the rest of the discussion over to you and the great panel.







## Senate Briefing

### Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options

**Hon. Patrick Kennedy**, former Member of the House of Representatives

If you had told me two years ago that after I retired from Congress that I would be chairing a Senate committee hearing, I would have never thought that I would ever hear the day when and, in fact, if my father were still alive today and he stumbled in this room and looked around and he saw me up here chairing this hearing he'd say, what are you doing here? I want to say it's hard for me to be in the United States Senate and not to think of my late father who spent his life in this Senate chamber advocating on behalf of human rights, civil rights and the expansion of social justice not only in the United States but around the world.

I'm honored to be here with the distinguished panel that I will be introducing shortly. But before I do, I'd like to introduce today's hearing by beginning to talk about what Senator Blunt mentioned in his opening remarks. Senator Blunt is on the Select Committee on Intelligence. I think that should say something to everyone in this room. And the fact that he started his remarks by saying that there is no subject that is brought up more on the Select Committee on Intelligence than Iran. Why is that?

It's because Iran is the biggest state supporter of terrorism in the world. It poses the biggest national security risk to the United States and to the rest of the world. So that is what brings us here today is to talk about U.S. policy towards Iran at this critical time. I suppose that it isn't a small coincidence that helps draw our attention to why we're here today than in today's New York Times and Wall Street Journal there are leading articles about the U.S. policy towards Iran. The first story I picked up was the New York Times and in it the headline reads, "With Enrichment Program A Reality, Iranians Claim Success In Stalling." In the second article in the Wall Street Journal it starts about, "Iranian Exile Group Nears U.S. Rebirth. Washington Moves towards Taking The MeK Off The Terrorist List."

So perhaps it's good to ask, how are these two articles related? How is taking on the threat that Tehran poses with the development of a nuclear weapon and what that will do to em bold in it to continue to be the largest state sponsored supporter of terrorism around the world. What that has to do with de-listing the main opposition group to the Mullahs in Tehran, the MeK, the largest organized effort of any opposition group to the current regime in Iran.

Well, I'll tell you what it has to do with that. The fact is if the United States is to see its interest fulfilled where we see a new day in Iran, where we see a new government in Iran, then it only stands to reason we need to unleash the main opposition to the Tehranian regime, the Mullahs in Iran and that is the MeK. Now, what we will hear today is we will hear from a wide array of prominent U.S. officials who will speak to the many aspects of this issue. But most notably, I think it's worth acknowledging that in these stories the State Department and the Justice Department no longer talk about the MeK as a terrorist threat. They talk about the MeK as a political issue that they have to deal with.

That brings me to every opportunity I've had to speak on this issue. That is that post 911, the notion that the United States Government is keeping a group on the terrorist list for political reasons undermines the very integrity of our National Security as a nation. That we as a nation who cannot afford anymore 911's, cannot afford not to be clear on who our real enemy is, that we have decided to keep an organization on the terrorist list for political reasons rather than national security reasons. Because in these stories it talks about how the MeK has been de-listed from every one of our allies in Europe, including our great ally Great Britain, and the notion that we are in small company with those countries that still list the MeK as a terrorist organization.

And guess what the other country that stands with the United States on listing MeK as a terrorist organization is? Iran. Boy, that doesn't say very much about U.S. foreign policy that we're actually in the same boat as our chief opponent in the world that we share the same position with them. Why do they want the MeK on the terrorist list? Because the MeK opposes the greatest threat to existential threat to their very being. Why? Because the MeK supports a non-nuclear Iran.







## Senate Briefing

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

The MeK supports separation of church and state and equal rights for women. It's being led by a woman who cannot come to this country because of the label of the organization being a terrorist organization. What we will hear from our panel today is what the consequences are of listing the MeK as a terrorist organization are on human rights policy and on National Security issues.

I will conclude by saying, I believe it is in our National Security interest to unleash the power to organize an overthrow of Tehran from within as opposed to thinking that the United States or the western world can do this alone or should only have a nuclear option on the table.

I, for one, do not want American boots on the ground in Iran if we can help it. And if there is a domestic opposition group to the Mullahs in Tehran that are willing to organize and work to see the day that we have a new government, that is a democratic government in Iran, then I think we ought to let the Iranian organizations that are doing this work let them do their work and do the work for all of us in the world who want to see a free Iran.

I'm going to start today a little out of order because the government, the Justice Department, the State Department says that there is a potential stumbling block to the U.S. lifting the terrorist label and that is that there could be weapons in Camp Ashraf. So I find this, such an insult to our American men and women and who stood by and certified to General Odierao (phonetic) that there weren't any weapons. But I think we should hear from someone who was on the ground, who was in charge and wearing the uniform of the United States military, General Phillips, who was there when Ashraf was de-armed. And I think it's important to hear from him, rather than hear from anybody else who may say something but don't know what's really going on. So General Phillips, would you please speak to the fact that there are no weapons on the ground.

**Brig. Gen. David Phillips (ret.),** *former commandant of the Army Military Police School, commander of all police operations in Iraq, including the protection of Camp Ashraf*

Distinguished guests, thank you for the opportunity to come here today and address this group. I'd also like to thank those freedom loving people who believe in a democratic Iran. And the Mujahedin-e Khalq, the 3,400 members that are spread out between Camp Ashraf or confined at Camp Liberty. You've endured much during the nine years of captivity, but I want to take you back a little bit. I want to go to those days following the ground invasion in 2003.

The MeK, Mujahedin-e Khalq, were dispersed over dozens of locations. Many of you know they were not just at Camp Ashraf. They were at Basra, Thalill, Fallujah, and Baghdad. Camp Ashraf happened to be the facility that we consolidated them at because it was north of Baghdad in the desert area of Diyala. It was a tactical decision. Get them all at one location to where we can go through a disarming process.

As they abandoned their other bases and facility, which they put a lot of work into, overnight they were looted and vandalized. I personally went down to the Baghdad facility, which was a six-story office building, pretty much administrative. Within 24 hours of us removing the Mujahedin from that location it was a vacant, total wrecked facility. Even the windows were ripped out of their borders.

I can only imagine how the Mullahs laughed as we forced the MeK to consolidate at Camp Ashraf, along with all their armored vehicles, their artillery pieces, their large arms, their automatic weapons and their small arms. We did what the Mullah regime could not do. We eliminated the military threat of the Iranian resistance. They, the MeK, voluntarily, turned over all of their offensive and defensive weapons. Leaving them vulnerable to the insurgents -- yes, there were insurgents in Iraq -- and infiltrators from the current Iranian regime.

Once we had them there, I was showing several of the seniors leaders what Camp Ashraf was because it was an anomaly. It was separate from the rest of what was going on in Iran. Probably why they pushed it over to the military police. Let them handle it. They'll handle anything. Well, I took an Air Force general officer around and he pointed out to me, those look like high frequency antennas. So we checked and sure enough they were.

The MeK were broadcasting into Iran. I had my Farsi speaking linguist listen in. It was much like the voice of America. It broadcast the news, radio shows and music. It was a cultural-type station. But, no, I had to shut it down. I had to not only shut it down, I had to seize the equipment so it could not go back on the air. It was unfortunate. Because what the Iranian jammers couldn't do, we did for them. We shut down that voice of hope.

And, simultaneously, in November of '03 when we supposedly never searched Camp Ashraf in its entirety, we started Phase I of an operation. During this phase, we systematically searched every square kilometer of that 36-square kilometer facility, simultaneously while we were taking the 3,400 members, including many Iranian-Americans. And I actually have the list of what countries they came from: America, Canada, Denmark, Norway, and Israel. Yes. While we were doing that and searching the facility, the MeK loaned us their buses so that we could transport their people off of Camp Ashraf to a facility up north to where we could do bio-metrics on them.

This phase ended on the 13th of January where we had DNA, retinal scans and some of the most cutting edge technology, technological ways of identifying them. Phase II of the operation, which apparently some people don't know ever took place, commenced on the 2nd of March. It was completed on the 4th of May where each and every member was individually interviewed off of the Camp Ashraf grounds by the FBI and multiple other U.S. agencies, including our intelligence agencies. During this phase, I was physically walking the ground of Camp Ashraf. We offered each member the opportunity to leave. And a few did. There was no barring them. They could leave. They were provided also their personal property and given some funds by a leadership of the MeK.

Well on the 10th of May 2004, we started the MeK review board. It concluded on the 4th of June. Yes, I have all these dates because I have all of the reports. Each individual was reviewed and an adjudication was made that there were no terrorists, not even wanted criminals among the 3,400 individuals. So the other governmental agencies departed. Leaving it to the U.S. Army, specifically a reserve unit out of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the 336 MP battalion that worked for me. I was the commander at 89th MP brigade.





## Senate Briefing

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

This job was passed from MP unit to MP unit culminating with the departure of U.S. forces in 2009 from Camp Ashraf. During that time the military police are proud to report there were no deaths or serious injuries of any member of the MeK.

They were turned over to the Iraqis for protection. Their tally is a little bit different. Almost 50 deaths and hundreds wounded. Interesting figures for a protection mission.

Okay, anyway. That's not the real focus of what I want to talk about. That's what keeps me up at night. The most troublesome current issue is the factually incorrect assertions made by the government attorney last week at the court hearing on the Writ of Mandamus.

The attorney stated in court that we, referring to the U.S., have never completely searched the entirety of Camp Ashraf, therefore they may still have a means to harm the United States. Have you ever been in the middle of Diyala?

It is a long ways from the middle of the United States. Also he added that the MeK never gave us open access to the entire camp. I take great offense to those comments because of the dedication and hard work done over a year long period from 2003 to the end of 2004 where my forces conducted operations, inspections, raids to find any contraband, looking for weapons, explosives, other armaments possibly hidden someplace on the facility and around the facility. We didn't stay confined to the facility.

First, we had open access everywhere at any time, any place. Look at it. If somebody would have prevented us access, it would have been a very bad day for them. We asserted ourselves. We chose locations and went to them. No place was off limits. And the reason that we never had an altercation is because no doors were closed or locked to us. We went where we wanted to go. We saw what we wanted to see. Now, for the attorney's assertion that there may be still weapons hidden someplace on the camp because we never fully searched because it's a big area. To that I say, what do you mean we didn't search?

I personally went to every single facility on that 36-square kilometer facility. This is my aerial photography (indicating) that has every building and it is a detailed shot to where I could even see tracks in the dirt when I blow it up. So if there was any movement on the ground, we would inspect it to make sure weapons had not been buried there the night before. I went to the morgue and inspected there, to the hospitals, to the latrines. Every place was inspected on that camp. There's also an assertion that the camp is not fenced in. I don't know, could have fooled me. 12-foot fence all the way around. Six kilometers by six kilometers. Constantine wire on top. Sounds like a fence to me. We used high tech methods looking for weapons. And we used some good old-fashioned boots on the ground.

We did find bayonets. In the female billets in their wall lockers next to their personal clothing was a bayonet. I let them keep the bayonets. We did clear the housings of deadly bomblets. We demilitarized over 100 bunkers filled with ammunition and thoroughly checked every squaremeter of the 36-square kilometer facility. I didn't read a report about this. I didn't look at an Intel action about it. I did it. I walked the ground. I've been to the facility. I inspected every structure on the camp. It's not hearsay. Firsthand I was there. I can tell you no rock was unturned. We did have open access to the entirety of that camp and never did we find a single weapon. No, there's another side to this, too. I wanted to find weapons.

Remember? I'm a soldier. I was given a mission to guard 3,400 detainees who were terrorists. I believed they were terrorists when I took over that mission. So by God, I was going to find the smoking gun. I was going to prove why we were in the middle of Diyala desert in 45 degrees Celsius, add that up, it's pretty hot over there in the summer, looking for contraband. Soldiers have a unique perspective on the world and if you listen to them, it's amazing what you can learn.

In my case, I traveled with a 12-soldier security detail of 4 up armored Humvees. We traveled the entire country rebuilding the Iraqi police, keeping the high value detainees, and yes, governing Saddam Hussein. That was our job. We had another job of detaining and protecting the 3,400 people at Camp Ashraf. Well, my soldiers would ask, real subtly, "Sir, when we going back to Ashraf?" You know why they asked that? Because on Ashraf, in the midst of 3,400 terrorists, they felt safe. In fact, it was the safest place my soldiers were in that country. I walked, talked, spent time with usually unarmed with the so-called "hard core," the government attorney's term, not mine, "hard core" members of the MeK. I don't call them "hard core" members. I called them Madam Parsaei, Commander Zhoreh, Miss Giidy, Mr. Davari. I knew them, the people. Few people know these "hard core" members better than me. So did they have weapons hidden on Camp Ashraf? No. And think about it. I staked my life on it. Ashraf was the safest place in Iraq.

Thank you.







## Senate Briefing

### Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options

**Hon. Michael Mukasey**, *former Attorney General of the United States*

Before I begin my remarks, I just want to tell Patrick Kennedy that if his late father walked in and asked the question that he joked about him asking, what are you doing here? I think that all of us, you and we who are on the panel, could respond, not only based on what you've heard today, but on what we have heard before, that his clarity of expression and his passion warrant the answer, he belongs here.

And your dad would be proud as I am to appear on the same program with you. Turning to the question that Patrick Kennedy just raised. What is the Justice Department doing in court taking the position that it took? I have to tell you, folks, as a bit of kind of inside baseball. A lawyer is not just a technician. A lawyer is referred to by a kind of antique term, officer of the court. A lawyer is supposed to consider himself or herself as having a higher responsibility than just getting up and winning a case.

There are things a lawyer is allowed to do to win a case and there are things a lawyer is not allowed to do to win a case. And principle, principle among the things the lawyer is not allowed to do to win a case is to misrepresent facts or law to the court. That's commandment number one.

That's sin number one. With that in mind, let me read to you from some portions of the transcript and, mercifully, we have a transcript being taken down today because it would be a great education for a court to match the transcript of General Phillips' remarks with the transcript of the government lawyer's remarks, I'm not going to mention his name because I don't want to shame him in public, to match those two sets of remarks and see whether there is any way they can match up.

Their intent, speaking of the intent of the MeK, this is from page 35 of the transcript. "It is shown by the cooperation. Their capacity can be shown by what we find in the camp which we have not been able to inspect all these years, Your Honor. The U.S. military had an agreement with them, cease fire or a truce that they would not engage one another and the U.S. military confiscated the major, the tanks, the major equipment and vehicles. But as the RAN report says -- he's referring to a 2009 report from -- somebody who had never visited Ashraf and has alluded to in the Ambassador's testimony, the MeK did not permit an inspection.

This is a 15 square mile village, not a little camp. They did not permit a sort of door-to-door inspection of looking for caches of weapons or to actually disarm them door-to-door. So many years later now, they again and again say we have turned over a new leaf. We have disarmed. But that has never actually been verified by the U.S. military." A lawyer has an obligation not to do that. And if he does it, he has an obligation to report to the court that he did it and to take it back.

Ladies and gentlemen, there's an exchange of letters between the lawyers representing MeK and this appeal on the government. And apparently the government at this point is not of the mind to retract those statements. I would suggest to you that if that transcript ever gets to the court, they will be of a mind to do that and a whole lot more and should be.

The Secretary has said in testimony before Congress that the decision to de-list, and this is again borne out I suppose by this morning's Wall Street Journal, the decision will be based in part of degree of cooperation that MeK gives in moving to what has been ironically Camp Liberty

Ladies and gentlemen, that has nothing to do with the law. The law doesn't allow for political decisions. It doesn't allow for decisions based on how cooperative somebody has been. The law allows for decisions based on somebody, whether somebody represents a threat to the National Security of the United States and if MeK doesn't, they don't belong on the list. It's that simple. And they don't.

To say that this decision is going to await the last transport and the last person and then maybe will be announced 60 days later, I would suggest to you is to give the Iranians and the Iraqis an opportunity that we don't want to see them given. What we should all hope for now is that at the very least our government makes it clear that we have the means and the inclination to remove those people from Ashraf and from Camp Liberty if it is necessary to do so. And it may well be necessary when you consider this morning's stories about the fact that we are at least considering de-listing.

They put them in a way, the worst possible position. How do we know there are no weapons? We have heard it from the U.S. military. We have heard it from the people of Ashraf. I would suggest to you that you saw it. Those of you who saw those horrible videos from a year ago. Did you see the Iraqi troops shooting at unarmed people? They knew those people were unarmed.

How do we know that? Because the one thing you'll notice about the people doing the shooting, they were not wearing helmets. They knew very well that the people they were aiming at were unarmed. Don't you think they would have been dressed in battle gear rather than in flimsy uniforms with no helmets if they thought they were shooting at armed people? You bet they would.

Nobody, except the government lawyer, would be willing to get up and say what that lawyer said in court, that there is some suspicion that there were arms there. It's time to drop the mask. It's time to drop the pretense. It's time to do the right thing which is to de-list and it is important to do the right thing, which is to de-list. The 18th century philosopher Edwin Burke said, all that is necessary to assure the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.

I think what we have come here to say is it's about time for good people, men and women, and women, to do something. And that is the right thing; that is de-list and get those people out of there.

Thank you very much.





## Senate Briefing

# Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options

**Prof. Alan Dershowitz**, *Professor of Law, Harvard University*

I, too, can never come to the Senate building without my mind going back to the great Senator Kennedy, perhaps the greatest Senator ever to serve in this building in terms of human rights and so many other things that we cared deeply about. One of the great privileges of my only personal life was to work closely with the Senator on the widest variety of human rights issues.

Senator Kennedy sent me to China in 1979 when that country was still a repressive regime, well still a repressive regime, even more so a closed regime, and asked me to bring back reports to him about democracy wall, what was going on in the prisons, the death penalties in China and I did so. He then asked me to go on his behalf to the Soviet Union where I traveled representing Soviet Dissidents, Jewish refugees and others, great musicians and philosophers.

And I came back and I reported -- and I'll never forget the day that Senator Kennedy and I went to the airport together and the plane load of refuseniks came to the United States and Senator Kennedy hugged every one of them. Then just shortly before his death we had a reunion with the people who he saved from the Soviet Union, little children at the time, college graduates now, and the smile on Senator Kennedy's face was all the thank you that he ever needed.

We worked together on so many other human rights issues. I would venture to say if we were alive today, not only would he be so thrilled that his son is carrying on his work he would be in this room today. Iran is the interesting place in the world today in many ways. It is the most dangerous country in the world. But it also is a country with the greatest promise in the world. Imagine the peace dividend if Iran were to have true democratic leadership today. It could become a model in the Middle East, a model for the Muslim world.

It could bring about not only formalistic democracy, which we're seeing in some parts of the Middle East, but real democracy. Democracy that values quality for women. Democracy that values the right of free speech, the right of dissent. The other thing about Iran that I think many underestimate, both in this country and other parts of the Middle East, is even the current leadership. Rational or they're irrational. Are they rational for doing some of the things they're doing. Nobody can explain killing gays and putting people in jail and torturing them as rational. But they are shrewd. They understand how to manipulate public opinion.

They understand how to use various international for delay. They understand how to widen the differences between America and some of its allies about what the appropriate point of no return is in developing nuclear weapons. No one should ever, ever underestimate the shrewdness of the Iranian regime. Shrewdness combined with evil purpose poses the greatest danger that the world faces. Shrewdness combined with evil purpose with a nuclear weapon, nothing could be more dangerous.

I know that many of you here today are proud of the fact that some of the information that the world has obtained about Iran's nuclear potential comes from colleagues and friends within Iran who have provided that information to the atomic energy commission, to the United States and to American allies. But I'm not here today to speak on behalf of any group or any political party. I'm here today to speak as an American who cares deeply about our institution, who cares deeply about our promises and our commitments.

I'm here to speak today on behalf of our constitutional right to petition government for redress of grievances. To petition government to keep its promise. To allow us full and complete free speech. We here today disagree with the government's policy when it comes to Camp Ashraf, when it comes to listing the MeK. And we have a complete right, a greater right than the government itself. As Jefferson once said, given a choice between a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government he would not hesitate to pick the latter. Our right of free speech is even more important than the government's power.

And the government is trying to take that away from us. They're trying to threaten those of us who disagree with their policy. As the Supreme Court said in its most recent First Amendment case, if the First Amendment has any force it prohibits Congress from finding or jailing citizens or associations of citizens for simply engaging in political speech. We are here engaging in political speech and we are being threatened by our government for doing the right thing. For speaking up on behalf of human rights. How dare the government try to repress the truth and they are trying to repress it in more ways than one.

As we heard today, I was just shocked listening to the General describe in detail, it just shocked me. I teach legal ethics at Harvard Law School. I been teaching legal ethics for a quarter of a century and the idea that the government of the United States would stand before a court and misrepresent facts and then when they're called on it, write a letter to the court -- you can often understand a lawyer in the heat of combat answering a question that he was not prepared for and overstating it or making a mistake. I can excuse that. I can understand that. But then when the lawyers write a letter and say, now you have a chance to correct the record. Here's the response of the United States Government: "With respect to you and your clients you have a particular view of the facts but we disagree with that view.

The government stands by the statements made by the attorney on behalf of the Secretary of State in the D.C. Circuit on May 8th." Stands by those statements. Would I love to be a fly on the wall if General Phillips and other generals who were there sat opposite to Hillary Clinton, on whose behalf these statements were being made, and were able to listen to the specific factual allegation, show the photographs and ask Senator, sorry, Secretary Clinton whether or not these views represent her views. I suspect the answer would be no. And we'd be getting a very quick apology from the United States Government. But we're not getting an apology. The government is standing by its erroneous statements.

I've been practicing law for 48 years. I have opposed the government in many, many cases. I have never personally experienced a misrepresentation of this kind by a government lawyer like the one presented to the United States Court of Appeals. For shame for shame. And I think that General Mukasey was right not mentioning the name of the lawyer. It's not that lawyer. That lawyer may have made a mistake. It's the United States Government that wrote the letter reaffirming the statement of the lawyer. Yes, they have some nuanced responses that maybe this investigation didn't occur or that investigation didn't occur; that's a half truth at best.





## **Senate Briefing**

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

What we heard today from the general was the complete truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. What we are pledged to present to the court. So we have a real problem here today. We have a problem of timing. Justice delayed is justice denied. When justice delayed may cause the taking of human lives, it's more serious than just the theory of justice denied. We have every reason to believe and hope that the State Department will do the right thing and ultimately come to the decision to de-list the MeK.

Okay. They say they'll do 60 days after everybody has left the camp. After they had a chance to inspect, to see if there are weapons behind. There may well be weapons behind. Of course the Iraqis could easily plant weapons when everybody is out of the camp. What they have to do is now. I was informed this morning that not a single government has yet agreed to accept a single person from Camp Ashraf to move into their country. And I'm told when we speak sometimes to officials of the government, it's not because of the listing that involves other factors.

I don't believe that. I believe that when governments are asked by the United States to accept people as political refugees and out of one side of their mouth they say accept them, out of the other side of their mouth they say, but they're terrorists. They're speaking hypocrisy. You can't speak that kind of double speak. George Orwell would be proud of that. The United States has to speak with one voice. And that voice has to be clear. We have done all the investigations, we have done all the inspections, we can certify to you that if you accept these people they are not only not terrorists, they're going to do for you what the Iranian immigrants to the United States have done to America. Raise the educational level.

Raise the economic level. There have been very few more successful immigrant groups to the United States of America than groups from Iran. Many of them represented by people in this audience. Every country should be thrilled to take people from Camp Ashraf who have shown that they're able to build communities, keep the peace and reject terrorism even in the face of the worst provocations committed by the Iraqis and intended to be committed by the Iranians. So timing is imperative. We have to urge the State Department to do the right thing now, now, today.

As I said before from podiums like this one, those of us who devote our lives to human rights often have to come in after the tragedy has cured, after the humanitarian disasters have been completed and our job is to make sure we bring the perpetrators to justice. We have an opportunity to save lives, to prevent. Can you imagine what it would feel like for every one of us in this room if everyone in the United States, if because of the delay, if because of the needless politically motivated delay, diplomatically motivated delay lives are taken. Nobody in this room can say with certainty that we will not see a recurrence of what happens twice before.

Nobody can predict that. All we can predict is if the folks in Camp Ashraf are taken out of the country, that won't happen. When certainty is on one side of the equation and risk is on the other side of the equation, common sense requires that we follow the least risky path and we follow the path that we promised. The Constitution says the United States must comply with its contracts. We have a contract. I've said this before and it bears repeating.

Elie Wiesel who represents the failure of the world to stop the killing of isn't people, he, one of the few survivors, he says for him the greatest lesson of the Holocaust has always been, believe the threats of your enemies more than you believe the promises of your friends. We know the threats of the Iranians and the Iraqis are serious. Now it's time for the United States to keep its promise, to keep it now. The institution of the United States demands no less. Our commitment to liberty and justice commands no less. Our obligation to save life demands no less. The United States must act and it must act now.

Thank you very much.

MR. KENNEDY:

Professor Dershowitz said it very well and that was by keeping the listing of MeK as a terrorist organization we prevent the U.S. public policy, which is to see that the residents of Camp Ashraf are resettled not only in Camp Liberty but around the world. Because what country is going to want to take refugees if those refugees have been designated terrorists by the United States? That is the implication of de-listing, is allowing the process to go forward. That has been stated to be our policy and that's to see the resettlement.

And the treatment of the residents of Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty as refugees. But if the U.N. high Commissioner On Refugees and the work they've done under Martin Kobler and Camp Liberty have been any indication, we know they're not being treated as refugees, they're being treated as prisoners of war. They're being kept and confined in a camp that would not even stand up to the most basic tenants of the United Nations standards for treatment of human rights and human dignity.

So our next speaker, aside from being a former member of Congress who I served with, a governor here in this country and the state of New Mexico, cabinet secretary, was also Ambassador to the United Nations. And can talk about the implications of this listing on the lives and wherewithal and freedom of those who have currently been confined to something that is less than a prisoner of war camp. Ironically as was said before by General Mukasey, Camp Liberty, if there was ever a word that so far from the fact described what the people are, the conditions they're living in, it's Camp Liberty. So to speak on that, I give you none other than the Honorable Bill Richardson.





## Senate Briefing

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

**Hon. Bill Richardson**, *former Governor of New Mexico, Secretary of Energy*

You know, I was sitting here and about a year ago I remember being on a panel, same issue, with General Mukasey and I and several others. And I was thinking how far we have come in the last year and how gracious many of you are to give a standing ovation to everyone that comes up here to speak. What I'm thinking is if there's any way you can give yourself one because I have to tell you, this morning I was -- I probably come the farther away than anybody here -- so I was still on New Mexico time.

I woke up this morning, the buzz of my BlackBerry, the e-mail. And it was an e-mail from AliReza Jafarzadeh -- in the back -- he was telling me about the Wall Street Journal article. It was, like, can you believe this? And I read it and, you know, I know you don't -- the worst thing you want to do is take something for granted. But I said to myself, what if this article is true that the de-listing may happen soon? And I thought of the event a year ago. I think it was a hotel downtown and many of you were there. Mukasey and I were there. And a lot of these distinguished panelists obviously in the last year, if you look at who they are, military people, republicans, democrats, cabinet secretaries, this is not a partisan issue.

I always was told if Alan Dershowitz were on my side, I'm on the side of the angels. I thought that would be funny, but I guess not. So I come to you today with, I guess, with this smile because I try to be an optimist. And I look at what has happened in the last year and I see the premise of many at the time when the Obama administration took office. I was very attracted to the fact that the president said, we negotiate with our enemies. We negotiate with North Korea. Of course not with Al-Qaeda and many others; but, you know, with Iran. Maybe it makes sense to open a dialogue.

I mean, that was the early posture. Look what has happened in the last three years. A dialogue was initiated by the United States but slapped down by the government of Iran consistently. Going to negotiations on nuclear enrichment and not being serious. Kidnapping Americans and many others. Making provocative statements about the Jewish Holocaust and not being part of the international community. So what happens was sanctions were brought on. The most powerful sanctions in many years because Europe and other nations joined us. They were banking sanctions, military sanctions, and some energy sanctions.

And the European Union said we still should talk about Iranian enrichment. Talks are going on but every time, the Iranian government either stalls or is not serious or is buying time. And I suspect what they're going to do now with this potential MeK de-listing is they're going to say, oh, we're now ready to negotiate. I can just tell fairly soon some statement coming out. But I don't think it justifies a recognition that Iran is serious. They're not. They're not serious. Look what they're doing in the Middle East. Look what they're doing propping up Syria, the most repressive government on earth today. Killing people. Look what they do with Hamas and Hezbollah.

Look what they do with the trafficking of weapons and uranium. Look what they do in disrupting what's happening all around the world in Afghanistan and the state leading sponsor of terrorism. So that justification that some threw out, oh, you know, we're in negotiations with Iran, should automatically, I believe, be discarded. But I like to focus on the positive. Why de-list the MeK? I think there are a lot of reasons, a lot of reasons that were given here by our military leaders, by the Attorney General, by institutional scholars, by many others that have expertise, a lot more than I do on Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty and what's happened in Iran and the reactions of the Maliki government.

But I like to list these decisions because I've been in those decision making capacities where you weigh the options and the answer is what is, in the National Security of the United States. And first, obviously the MeK is far from being a terrorist organization. They have helped us. They have given us valuable intelligence. They have worked hand-in-hand with our military leaders. So at the same time that we're saying this designation should remain, the valuable help they have given to America should not be discounted. Secondly, I mentioned the relationship with Iran. I want you all to know, I don't know if you agree with this, but I think these sanctions on Iran are working. They're not perfect. But they're squeezing them.







## **Senate Briefing**

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

You can tell by the way they are treating their oil, sort of stockpiling it. By the way they're a little more serious in their statements about negotiating. They're not doing it but it is obvious that these sanctions, because they're more widespread, they involve more countries, that somehow they are working and they should be given this chance to work. Iran represses its own people. That is another reason. America should always stand on behalf of those that support democracy. Iran, right now, their behavior in terms of dealing with their own people and their conduct in international foreign policy is something that does not warrant any kind of strong, strong working together.

Senior military officers have acknowledged on multiple occasions that the MeK's intelligence has played a positive and effective role in saving the lives of American soldiers by exposing the threats and dangers of Iran's terrorist interventions. The fact that our military leaders have said that. 2008, the United Kingdom, America's closest ally removed the MeK from the list of prescribed organizations and lifted all of the consequent restrictions.

In 2009, the Council Of Ministers of the European Union voted unanimously to remove the MeK from the European Union's list of terrorists organizations. Back to General Mukasey's point. In July 2010 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that the Department of State's designation of the MeK was faulty because it violated the due process rights of that group. And this designation of the MeK has been used by Iranian surrogates in Iraq as well as the Maliki government in Iraq to attack MeK members in Camp Ashraf or impose inhumane restrictions on them which has led to the loss of life. Now, there's one thing that the General said that I don't -- well, I won't say I don't agree with.

But I think he was more saying -- he said that politics should not enter a decision like this. Probably not. But have you ever heard of a decision in Washington made without politics? And the politics here, I don't know if it is politics, I heard the Secretary of State say that one of the factors in the decision was the conduct, the behavior of the MeK members as they were transferred. The behavior has been exemplar. There's been cooperation. There's been all kinds of assistance that the MeK organizations in Paris and others have given. By the way, I'm going to say something that you may not agree with.

I think that Ambassador Fried is sincere, I do, I talked to him. He's trying. This is not an easy issue. He's trying. I think the administration is trying to do the right thing. Look, they haven't made the wrong decision, the decision is imminent. So I think what we need to do is recognize that maybe there's a light at the end of the tunnel. And so what we do between now and then should be to continue these efforts, not just in the United States but all around the world. All around Europe. And also look at the longer range. The longer range is also, and I don't think anyone has brought this up. The relocation of these individuals, they deserve to be part of a family of nations. I don't know what nation, whether it's America or other European countries.

They deserve to be treated right. They deserve that free passage, that safe passage. And those European countries that are going to be watching that right now are saying, oh, you know, we're all for the Camp Ashraf individuals, but somehow when they're asked, were you going to take some of these individuals in your country? And they say, whoa, whoa, let's wait and see where this issue ends up. I think we have to have a continued effort. But I want to just say here and I, too, want to join in the praise that was given to Patrick Kennedy -- I love to be introduced with a guy with such hair and great Teeth.

You know the Kennedy legacy here in the United States but, you know, we were introduced by a Senator, a conservative Senator from Missouri on the Intelligence Committee. 100 members of Congress have signed a resolution. 100 members of the House. That's a lot. I mean, we have come a long way in one year. And it's republicans and democrats, about 50/50, I don't know, maybe I'm wrong here; but, again, I just want to say to you the time to de-list is now. There's one thing that we need to do is keep that strong, positive pressure based on facts. And if a little politics place in the way, so be it.

Thank you.







## **Senate Briefing**

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

**Hon. Linda Chavez**, *former Assistant to the President for Public Liaison*

First of all, let me also give my thanks to Patrick Kennedy and I've had the privilege over the years. I've had a privilege a number of years ago in 1980 to actually write campaign literature for your father when I was with the American Federation of Teachers. When I was nominated by George W. Bush to be Secretary of labor he called me up to congratulate me and he said what would be most helpful, should I oppose you or should I support you? So we have been on both sides.

And I do think that it is interesting, that in Washington which has become so incredibly polarized politically over the last few years, it is really quite remarkable to have a panel of people who stretch across such a wide ideological and political spectrum. I think it is a testament to the fact that this is not a partisan issue. In the real sense this is not a political issue and should not be a political issue. This is a human rights issue. It is an issue about what the Constitution of the United States means, what due process means and what our judicial systems should mean.

So it is a privilege to come here and talk and as Patrick said, my work with the United Nation's Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities started in 1992. I was appointed by President George Herbert Walker Bush. I should say I was nominated by the U.S. Government under that administration. But I served also through the Clinton administration in that position because I was elected by the United Nations Human Rights Commission that was the first opportunity I had to meet anyone from the MeK.



And I have to tell you, when I was first approached, I was a little suspicious. Who are these people calling themselves the Mujahedin. Were these people our friends, are these people dangerous? got to know the people who worked at the United Nations and I found out that what they were interested in was the same thing I was interested in; and that is the protection of human rights and their focus was on the protection of human rights in Iran.

And they provided me over those four years valuable information about the human rights violations that were going on in Iran and particularly, because it was a focus of my interest, on the human rights violations that were going on against women. Because if you look at any society, if you want to judge a society -- is this a good society? Is this a bad society? One of the most effective and quickest ways to determine whether these people are friends or are they enemies is to look at how they treat their women.

I do not believe that there is any place practically in the world where women are more badly treated than they are in Iran. Women are denied the most basic rights. They're told how to dress. You could be a tourist in Iran and you could have the vice police pull you off the side because you are not dressed to their standards. Women are imprisoned. They are put in the most appalling conditions. They are sometimes tortured. They are sometimes raped.

And they are finally, some of them, executed in the most brutal inhumane ways. Women in Iran, as well as all of the Iranian people, have had to suffer under this regime for more than 30 years. Now, it's not just that Iran violates human rights within its own country. The regime is also a direct threat against the world. And by the way, we're talking about the MeK being terrorists, we know who the terrorists are. The terrorists are the regime in Iran. The whole idea of listing an organization on the foreign terrorist list is based on the premise that they pose a direct, credible threat to the United States.

Well, we know that there is American blood on the hands of the regime in Iran. They were behind the Beirut bombing, Embassy bombing, they were behind the bombing of the U.S. barracks. They have American Blood on their hands. So we know they are the threat. We also know that the delay, the sort of taking at face value that maybe they will talk to us, maybe they will let us inspect what's going on in Iran has allowed them the opportunity to enrich uranium to make nuclear bombs. This is something we know in press reports suggest that they already have enough to make enriched uranium to make at least four bombs, it may be more. I'm not an expert in this room. I don't know.

I do know that delay is not just as General Mukasey suggests or I guess it was Alan Dershowitz, it's not just a question of justice delayed, delayed is justice denied. When you're talking about delay in something as fundamental as trying to stop the production of nuclear weapons, you are talking about threatening human lives, not just the United States, but throughout the world. So we really do have a stake in making sure that the MeK in its listing on the terrorist list is not simply a bargaining chip in trying to get the Iranians to stop what they have been doing, and that is enriching uranium in order to be able to build bombs.

Now, I want to talk a minute about conditions for those who are living, the remaining people who are in Camp Ashraf. But also I think even more in parallel those who have been moved to Camp Liberty. We're about to enter the summer right now. And many of you, from that part of the world, are very familiar with what summers are like in Iran. We're talking about temperatures that can get brutally hot. And yet the people who are living in Camp Liberty do not even have an adequate water supply system. They have not been able to tap into the water system. Water has to be tanked in.

There is not sufficient water. It does not provide for proper hygiene. It does not provide for proper hydration of the number of people there. The women who are in those camps have to be confronted on a daily basis with the soldiers who -- by the way all are armed. We're all talking about whether or not the MeK is armed. We know who has arms. We know who has weapons. We know who has the rifles aimed at people. It is the Iraqi forces that are in control of Camp Liberty.

We also know that there have been 50 people who were killed. Does it make any sense in the world, if your family member, if your daughter, if your wife, if your son were being shot at by somebody with a rifle and you had a hidden pistol somewhere or even a knife, do you not think that you would pull it out and defend them, defend your family members? Makes absolutely no sense? So we are talking about those conditions in Camp Liberty and what it means.



## **Senate Briefing**

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

Now, I believe in the freedom of movement of people. I believe that people particularly, particularly those that are under threat of repression by their governments should have the right to be able to leave. And I think it is absolutely clear that those who are in Camp Liberty are prisoners. They have no freedom of movement. They can't go outside Camp Liberty. Not even to get adequate medical care when they need it. They don't allow people in to be able to interview them to find out what the conditions are. It is a concentration camp. That's what it is.

And yet many of those who claim that, women, they have the freedom, they can apply -- they've been taken off the terrorist list by the European Union, you know, the United States is one of the only countries, with Iran, that is listing the MeK and MeK members as terrorists. But the fact is no one, no country will take someone who is officially listed by the United States of America as a terrorist. And everyone who is associated with the MeK, and that means all of those still in Camp Ashraf and all of those in Camp Liberty, are under suspicion of being terrorists and threats to the United States of America. Nobody is going to take those. And least of all, is the United States going to take those?

So I think it is absolutely one aspect that human rights are being violated by the fact that these people are not being treated as refugees. They are not even being accorded when they would be accorded if they were officially prisoners of war, which would be protection by the Geneva Convention. I will say to General Phillips that one of the things that happened when people turned over their weapons, when they gave up their personal weapons, when the camp gave up its military weapons, one of the things the United States did was to sign a pledge with each of those individuals guaranteeing their security. Those pledges bear the stamp of the United States Government and yet we are not protecting those people. And the only way to protect those people is to de-list the MeK so that these people have the freedom to go and to live where they choose.

Thank you very much.

**Lt. Gen. David Deptula (ret.),** *former Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance*

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It really is an honor, a privilege and pleasure to be here today and join with the members of this very distinguished panel to advocate for the free Iranian community. Patrick, let me add my thanks, too, for your passion and eloquence in articulating and summarizing what we all are here to attempt to accomplish. Now, there's a bestselling book out there about leadership and inspiring people to take action, the name of that book is "Start With Why."

So let me start today by following that advice. Why support the free Iranian cause? Well, it really boils down to two principal reasons: The first as you heard so eloquently from Secretary Chavez, it's the right thing to do from a human rights perspective. The second is that it's the right thing to do from a U.S. National Security perspective. So what I'd like to do, couple of short remarks this afternoon, is explore the rationale behind these viewpoints in a bit more detail and why it's so important to support this cause and what's the most effective action that can be taken to do that.

Now, in 1998 and 1999 I had the distinct privilege of being the commander of the combined task force operation in Northern Watch. Some of you might not know, but Northern Watch was the follow-on to Operation Provide Comfort. It was established in 1991 deter Saddam Hussein's aggression against his own people, the people he relentlessly subjugated. I won't go into the details of security council resolution of 688 that established the reason Provide Comfort was initiated, except to relay the impetus and focus of that effort as well as Operations of Northern and Southern Watch was on humanitarian relief in protecting human rights. We spent 12 years successfully executing those operations.

My point here sharing this with you briefly is that the United States will go to great lengths and expend significant effort to support humanitarian rights. There are many, many other examples out there. The United States has a long record of protecting those who are suppressed in being persecuted. Now you all are very familiar with the situation surrounding the fate of the unarmed members of exiled Iranians, your brothers and sisters and family members who are living in Camp Ashraf and now Camp Liberty.

Following the liberation of Iraq, several U.S. Government agencies conducted a thorough investigation of residents of Ashraf and then recognized them as protected persons under the 4<sup>th</sup> Geneva Convention. We heard that firsthand this morning from General Phillips. There is no better testimony or source of the facts. From 2003 to early 2009 U.S. forces protected Camp Ashraf from attacks from the Iranian regime. After that, however, Iraqi forces launched attacks several times on the camp's defensive residents killing nearly 50 and injuring over 800. What's Tehran's reaction to these attacks been?

Well, it's to praise the Iraqi Army for those attacks and they've asked Baghdad to continue attacking the MeK until their destruction. Since these attacks, the situation has become more complicated. You know about last December's U.N. Memorandum of Understanding, drafting the relocation of residents of Ashraf to Camp Liberty. Since that time, nearly 2,000 residents of Ashraf have moved to Liberty. The Memorandum of Understanding and signed by the U.N. and the government of Iraq explicitly says Iraq will ensure, quote, transit locations meet humanitarian and human rights standards. Let's do a brief review of how supportive these standards in regard to Camp Liberty are not being followed. The fifth movement of residents from Ashraf to Liberty occurred earlier this month.

This was the worst movement in terms of limitations imposed on them by the Iraqi government. Iraq imposed new restrictions preventing the residents to take properties that had already been agreed to. The inspection before they departed lasts more than a week while residents were constantly being harassed by the Iraqi forces. And as a convoy left Ashraf, after an hour, the Iraqis and yet another violation of their commitment stopped six utility vehicles and returned them back to Ashraf. Then the Iraqi did not allow the residents to transfer special trailers or cars for the disabled so those individuals were not able to go to Camp Liberty.







## **Senate Briefing**

### **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

As we have heard today, Iraqi police are stationed inside the camp equipped with 11 armored personnel carriers and dozens of armed police patrol Camp Liberty. And one of the Iraqis instrumental in previous attacks on Ashraf was appointed as the person in charge of Camp Liberty. The U.N. in repeated statements has emphasized the need for freedom and movement for the residence of Liberty, yet no freedom exists. The legal counsel for Liberty residents is barred from visiting. Water supply continues to be a major concern and there's a shortage in the camp.

Electricity is another significant problem. It's not connected to the national grid and the residents rely on small generators that are going to be insufficient for the upcoming hot weather. Camp Liberty is really, as you've heard people allude to and say, it's not an appropriate name for what's going on there. Camp suppression is more like it. Reaction from the United States and this entire chain of events was to condemn the attacks against Camp Liberty and support the U.N. in its effort to relocate the inhabitants to camp suppression. But more can and must be accomplished if the United States is to live up to our principle of vigorously supporting human rights.

Now, given that U.S. forces are no longer in Iraq, the most effective tool we have in protecting the people of Ashraf, protection that we assured those people in 2004 is to remove the MeK from the list of foreign terrorist organizations. You all know that the United Kingdom and the EU removed the MeK from their terrorist lists and we need to do the same. Meanwhile, the Iranian regime is continuing to create propaganda that attempts to demonize the MeK as we saw just a couple of months ago when an Iranian spokesman told NBC the Masada had been flying MeK members to Israel for training and sending them to Iran to carryout assassinations. This set of untruths was no accident.

Just as the support is growing to remove the MeK from a list of foreign terrorist organizations this fabrication is injected into the media in an attempt to prevent de-listing. The Iranian opposition has survived a level of repression that unparalleled. From a human rights perspective, it's long overdue to reverse that oppression. Furthermore, the removal from the MeK from the foreign terrorist organizations list would send a signal to the people of Iran that the United States is standing with them rather than with their oppressors. Okay. Let's take a look at this issue now from a U.S. National Security perspective.

The current Iranian regime is a brutal theocracy where the description of their government as a collection of zealants is not an exaggeration. It's a fact. Iran today is the center of international terrorism and much of it is aimed at the United States. The Iranian regime uses terror as a instrument of policy both internally and externally. This is why a Iranian nuclear weapons capability would pose a monumental security risk not only to the countries in Middle East and Europe but would threaten the stability and security of the entire world. Now, summarizing the analysis of impact of a nuclear armed Iran are six major concerns that the U.S. originally laid out by Ambassador Robert Joseph, the former Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

First, an Iran with nuclear weapons would em bold in the regime to carry out its aggressive ambitions in the Middle East and beyond. Second, a nuclear capability in Iran would pose a direct threat to U.S. forces, to European allies and possibly the Continental United States. And I would add that just recently the Iranian government current regime announced that it intended to launch a satellite into orbit as early as next week. And if you put one and two together, if you can launch a satellite into orbit, you can launch an intercontinental missile that may not threaten the continental United States but certainly will threaten the continental United Nations.

Third, proliferation of nuclear weapons would ensue by nations in the region that would feel compelled to attain their only nuclear capability to counter. Recently, the London Times reported that Saudi Arabia could acquire nuclear warheads within weeks of Iran developing atomic weapons as a threat from Tehran triggers and arms raised across the Middle East. Fourth, nuclear weapons would consolidate the Iranian Mullahs' power guarantee their survival thus severely degrading the prospect of democracy in Iran. Fifth, the bomb would become an existential threat to Israel given Iran's stated objective of wiping Israel off the map.

Six, Iran's role at the nexus of weapons of mass destruction of terrorism would make it likely that the regime would sell nuclear weapons to other countries for terrorist groups. It's also important to recognize that the most secretive information about the current Iranian regime's connection in international terrorism about its nuclear weapons program and about its menacing intentions for Iraq has to a large extent come from the Iranian opposition movement. The Iranian's access to Intel about all aspects of Iranian society as well as clandestine aspects of the regime are very important to countering the malicious aspirations of the current regime in Iran.

In large measure, this is why Iran is doing everybody it can to eliminate the MeK. For decades the regime has made punishment of the Iranian opposition its prime negotiating point, compelling western nations to restrict the organization's activities while trying to eliminate. In that Wall Street Journal report today you may have noticed a quotation by some nameless diplomats that are concerned that the action to de-list may upset the current Iranian regime as all the more reason to de-list now. Unfortunately their tactics have been too successful. The most significant result being the '97 designation of the MeK, by the U.S. State Department as a foreign terrorist organization.

However in reality the Iranian regime survival depends how much it can suppress an increasingly uneasy and critical internal population. The resistance inside a Iran is committed to undermining these repressive policies but a nuclear arsenal would create a more powerful and resilient and repressive regime and eliminate hope for democratic change. This is why the Iranian people, even more than the rest of the world, cannot afford a nuclear armed Iran. Iran has never been more vulnerable than it is today. Their leader's fear that the organized opposition will continue to gain more visibility and international support.

Keeping the MeK on the list of foreign terrorist organizations is limiting U.S. National Security options unnecessarily while the ayatollahs are threatening us and the rest of the world with their nuclear bombing. Removal of the MeK from the list is in the United States' best interest from a National Security perspective. Removal would also send a strong message to the Iranians that their efforts to unseat the radical fundamentalist leaders would no longer be viewed by the United States as terrorism but rather as an exercise of their legitimate right to change the future.

So President Obama, Secretary Clinton, it's time to make this important contribution to the security of the United States and to the world as well as reiterating your commitment to defend human rights. Remove the MeK from the list of foreign terrorist organizations and as has been said before, not in 60 days after the last people move from Ashraf to camp suppression, but now.

Thank you very much.



## Senate Briefing

### Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options

**Hon. John Sano**, former National Clandestine Service's Deputy President and member of directorate of U.S. Central Intelligence Agency

I want to start off by not necessarily repeating anything that -- I can't call them colleagues because I'm in all of their presence -- but a lot of what they said echoes true in my statements. But, in essence, it's become very obvious now that Tehran is increasingly concerned of the developments. The Mullahs are now afraid more so now than they have been over the past several years. It's not because they're afraid of maintaining or protecting their nuclear programs. There's going to be negotiations next week with the U.S. security council plus Germany to talk about this. They're confident. What they're really afraid of is the threat to the continued existence of their regime, of their rule. Who poses that biggest threat? It's the MeK.

MR. SANO: And it's two-fold. Because they know as well as we all do what the MeK stands for. It is not a political party looking to take over the country. It is an organization that stands up for human rights, for a denuclearized Iran, for women's rights and for protection for all, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom from prosecution. That scares the regime more so than military force of any opposing nation. It's the internal dissent.

They know that if the United States de-lists the MeK that that sends a message not just to the world that this has been a farce in terms of designating them as terrorist organization, but it sends an equally strong, if not stronger message to the people of Iran, that democracy stands for something and human rights stands for something and the future of the country is moving in a positive fashion. It may not happen as quickly as we would all like. But that's the message de-listing the MeK will send to the Mullahs. That's what they're afraid of.

Now, we have talked a lot on the panel here about, you know, information that is being put out there that's completely false that at one point several moments ago or almost a year ago there were statements coming out of the regime that said that the Camp Ashraf harbored female suicide bombers and that there were plots being developed within the camp to bring down U.S. airlines. It's very hard to prove a negative. But we should expect no less from a regime that treats their own people in such a poor fashion. From leaders of the country that even deny the Holocaust had ever occurred. So we can expect no less from these type of individuals. But again they remain very scared.

Now, you've also probably seen comments from both Iraqi and Iranian news reports that said that they've already discovered some weapons at Camp Ashraf. I won't go into the details in terms of, you know, the inspections that were done. General Phillips did an excellent job in terms of providing details on the depth to which the U.S. military took to ensure that the camp had been disarmed. But what I did find interesting was a Statement that was made by then fourth infantry division commander General Odierao, who is now the U.S. Army chief of staff.

He said in the statement released on June 18, 2003, quote, we have taken all small arms and all heavy equipment. They had about 000 small arms. They had about 2,200 pieces of equipment, to include 300 tanks, 250 armored personnel carriers and about 250 artillery pieces. We disarmed all of that equipment. Now, again, as other members of the panel have stated, you are being attacked and you have these secret caches of weapons stored somewhere, you're going to use them to protect yourself. And yes, they have a couple of knives and the Iraqi government has even commented that, yes, our soldiers why were attacked with knives. I'm sure we all feel very bad for them.

The individual organization that is presenting these myths and fallacies and, in fact, is the core to this sort of terrorist run regime is an organization that I have some experience in dealing with, it's the Iranian Ministry of Intelligence and Security, that's their CIA. I spent almost 30 years as a spy, most of that time overseas. It's a little unusual to be in front of cameras now. But the MOIS, as the panel has pointed out, and as Professor Der-showitz has mentioned, they're not only shrewd and clever, they are evil. I've dealt with them face-to-face, particularly in the Middle East. And they are a ruthless bunch. The only thing that they understand is if you are as ruthless or perceived to be more ruthless than they are. They understand force.

They will mistake at every instance kindness and concern on our part as weakness, as vulnerability and they will attempt to exploit that. It is no different now than it was back in '97 when we started to talk to them about their nuclear program. And they said we have got concerns about the MeK. And U.S. Government, trying to appease them to see if there was an opening, certainly understandable to a degree and within limits, listed the MeK. Again, the panel has pointed out, for purely political reasons. That was 1997. Here we are 2012 and it's Deja Vu all over again. It's happening just as it happened back then. They rattle their sabers, they threaten nuclear proliferation and they say, well, you can keep the MeK. And as was pointed out in the Wall Street Journal article, some diplomats are concerned if we de-list the MeK, that that might anger the Mullahs in Tehran. I say it's time to make them angry.







## Senate Briefing

# **Iran's Nuclear Threat: Impact of Sanctions & Policy Options**

Tuesday, May 15, 2012

11am - 1:00 pm

106 Dirksen Senate Office Building

The Mullahs need to understand and the message needs to go not just to them, but to the MOIS because they're orchestrating this. All these false allegations that are being put out there are basically what we call, in the intelligence field, disinformation. It is very easy to do. I practiced it for decades when I was overseas. It is very easy to plant stories. The cost is minimal. The impact is incredibly large. All you need is one or two what they call journalistic extremists to pick up the story, like the story about finding weapons buried at the camp.

I will guarantee you there will be more stories about weapons found in the camp over the next few weeks and I think as General Phillips and I were talking earlier, all you need to do is bring in a backhoe, dig a ditch and drop a container in there filled with weapons, cover it up and invite in your camera crews and say, look at what we found. How do you disprove that?

Now, they are clever, they are evil. They have good training, they have good experience. But, again, the MOIS plays to the needs and the desires of the Mullahs. The Mullahs are not intelligence professionals. They're barely politicians. So what they're going to do is simply put out the word through the MOIS this is our desire, this is what we want. What is their primary desire? It is to maintain their rule, their autocratic rule.

Now, most intelligence organizations in the world separate their authorities from intelligence gathering and law enforcement. The United States CIA does intelligence gathering, the FBI is in charge of law enforcement. But there's a definition in the separation between law enforcement and intelligence collection. Those are merged in the MOISs. And not only do they collect intelligence and put out disinformation, they also kidnap, assassinate and torture their own people. So what does that tell you about the character and the make-up of the country that will allow that to continue? It's not just the abuses of human rights inside Iran which is significant and Secretary Chavez pointed out, horrific in their treatment of their own people. It is also the way they treat dissidents abroad and not just Iranian dissident.

Anyone who opposes the regime. So it's important to understand that while the negotiations are very important to the Iranians, to the Mullahs, they care less about their nuclear program because they know they'll be able to continue it in some shape or form over the years. I agree the sanctions are working to a degree. But what they're deeply concerned about is maintaining their control. Nuclear weapon is a source of national cry for most countries whether they deploy them or not. To simply say we're part of the nuclear club. But to the Mullahs who don't understand the technical expertise required for these systems, their biggest concern, as with any dictatorial regime, is to maintain power. And by using the MeK as a bargaining chip in these negotiations, we are, again, going back to what we did in 1997. We are appeasing a dictatorship. Appeasement does not work with dictators. It never has and it never will.

It is time for the United States to finally and resolutely do the right thing. Do not continue to play in the hands of Mullahs. Do not continue to sacrifice the health and lives of the innocent and law-abiding residents of camps Ashraf and Liberty. Do not allow this travesty of justice to continue. Stand up against the Tehran regime. Stand up for the residents of Camp Ashraf and Liberty and stand up for the MeK.

Thank you.



From left to right: Hon. Patrick Kennedy, Hon. Linda Chavez, Prof. Alan Dershowitz, Gen. David Deptula, Senator Roy Blunt, Hon. Michael Mukasey, Gen. David Phillips, Hon. John Sano, Hon. Bill Richardson



REUTERS

## Senator Roy Blunt Opens Panel Where Senior Former Military, State Department, and Judiciary Officials Slam Claim Iranian Dissident Camp Could Hold Weapons, Call for Delisting the Group

Thu May 17, 2012

WASHINGTON, May 17, 2012 /PRNewswire-USNewswire/ -- The following is being released by the Iranian-American Cultural Association of Missouri:

In a Senate briefing, former US Military officials and lawmakers sharply rejected an argument by Justice Department attorney in US federal court of appeals that the delay in making a decision on removing Iran's main opposition group, the Mujahedin-e Khalq (PMOI/MEK) from the U.S. terror list was because the State Department was unsure whether there were any weapons at the Camp Ashraf, Iraq, home to 3,400 members of the group and that the U.S. had not been permitted to search the Camp. They urged the Secretary of State to delist the MEK immediately.

In his opening remarks, Senator Roy Blunt (R-MO), who sits on the Select Committee on Intelligence, said, "We're talking about MEK and Camp Ashraf... we're talking about people in Iran who have a tremendous desire for freedom and democracy." In a letter to Secretary Clinton in March 2012, the Missouri Republican had formally requested "a detailed briefing regarding the State Department's review of the Mujahedin-e-Khalq" (MEK) designation under section 219." He had noted that "if no satisfactory public or classified information exists to sustain our designation of the MEK as a foreign terrorist organization, it is my belief that the time has come to remove it from the list."

Addressing the allegations of Government lawyer, retired Brigadier General David Phillips, former commander of all police operations in Iraq, who supervised Camp Ashraf, said, "I take great offense to those comments because of the dedication and hard work done over year-long period... where my forces conducted operations, inspections, raids to find any contraband, (look) for weapons, explosives (or) other armaments possibly hidden someplace on the facility and around the facility... We had open access everywhere at any time, any place. I personally went to every single facility on that 36-square kilometer facility. Never did we find a single weapon."

"Why in the world in the two times that Camp Ashraf was attacked, that everybody wouldn't go back and look for the guns if there were actually guns in Camp Ashraf," said former Rep. Patrick Kennedy. "All I know is, if someone were out there shooting at me and killing my fellows and family members, I wouldn't be keeping a stash of weapons hidden for very long."

Former Attorney General Michael Mukasey said that the Government's refusal to withdraw its assertions amounts to a breach of legal ethics. "There are things a lawyer is allowed to do to win a case, and there are things a lawyer is not allowed to do to win a case," Mukasey said. "Among the things a lawyer is not allowed to do to win a case is to misrepresent facts or law to the court. That's sin number one."

"The MEK is far from being a terrorist organization. They have given us valuable intelligence... the designation of the MEK has been used by the Maliki government in Iraq to attack MEK members in Camp Ashraf or impose inhumane restrictions on them," Governor Bill Richardson emphasized.

Prof. Alan Dershowitz of Harvard University expressed "shock" at the misrepresentations of the Government attorney: "They say they'll make a decision on [delisting] 60 days after everybody has left Camp Ashraf, after they had a chance to inspect, to see if there are weapons behind. The Iraqis could easily plant weapons when everybody is out of the camp. What they have to do is to inspect [Camp Ashraf] now."

"The people who are living in Camp Liberty do not even have an adequate water supply system... The women have to be confronted on a daily basis with the soldiers who are armed... It is absolutely clear that those who are in Camp Liberty are prisoners. They have no freedom of movement... Not even to get adequate medical care when they need it," Linda Chavez, former Assistant to the President for Public Liaison said.

John Sano, the former National Clandestine Service's Deputy Director and member of directorate of U.S. Central Intelligence Agency said, "What the mullahs are really afraid of is the threat to the existence of their regime. Who poses that biggest threat? It's the MEK [which] stands for human rights, for a denuclearized Iran, for women's rights and for protection for all, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom from prosecution. That scares the regime more so than military force of any opposing nation... They know that if the United States de-lists the MEK that sends a message not just to the world... but it sends an equally strong, if not stronger message to the people of Iran."

"Removal of the MEK from the list is in the United States' best interest from a national security perspective. It would also send a strong message to the Iranians that MEK's efforts to unseat the radical fundamentalist leaders would no longer be viewed by the United States as terrorism but rather as an exercise of their legitimate right to change the future," added LTG David Deptula, former Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance.

SOURCE Iranian-American Cultural Association of Missouri