

# Continuing Threats From Terrorist Activities

An address given to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council  
on March 27, 2008 by

The Honorable Brad Sherman  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade,  
Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives

The focus of my remarks today will be on foreign policy. I believe our foreign policy is adrift and has been since the end of the Cold War because we have been unable and unwilling to prioritize. We have a national ADD where we focus on whatever international objective flits across our consciousness. We have an enormous national ego where we refuse to believe that we cannot simultaneously and successfully pursue all our objectives, and that we cannot defeat evil everywhere that we choose to notice it. We punish politicians and pundits who dare to deflate this enormous national ego, and our bureaucracy opposes prioritization because it would mean going to a particular bureau and telling them they're not going to get what they want. Imagine having to go to the Moldova desk in the State Department and say that Moldova's sovereignty over its Transdnistria region is just one of those issues America just can't prioritize in its foreign policy. As a nation we have sacrificed 4,000 of our finest and untold treasure in order to protect ourselves from weapons of mass destruction, which in this case did not exist. But just because we are able to sacrifice treasure and lives does not mean that we can sacrifice our ego and our bureaucratic imperatives to focus on the real threats that face us.

Now, we are afflicted with three clouds that prevent us from properly prioritizing. The first of these is our unhealthy fixation on Iraq, where we prioritize one threat to the exclusion of virtually everything else. This fixation began with Bush and it affects now the entire body politic. We're told that morally we must stay in Iraq because we "broke it." But we're told this by the same people who rightfully point out that whatever shape we leave Iraq in, whenever we leave, it will be better off than Saddam who, after all, killed over a million people through his policies. We are told that we must stay in Iraq because we risk a humanitarian problem if we leave while at the same time we ignore actual humanitarian holocaust going on now in places like Somalia, Chad and the Congo. Those humanitarian holocausts don't count because CNN isn't there, and CNN isn't there because our military isn't there, and so we have to stay in Iraq because CNN is there—because we are there—so we must stay there because we are there; an interesting way to prioritize our objectives. We are told most insidiously that if we leave Iraq terrorists could meet there and plot against us. Imagine how big a national ego we have to have to think we're going to deprive our enemies of a conference room. The fact is they can plot against us in Somalia, Yemen and countless other places which, of course, don't count because CNN isn't there. But remember 9/11 was plotted in an apartment building in Hamburg which makes you wonder why we're staying in Iraq to make sure the terrorists don't have a place where they can plot against us.

Our next unhealthy fixation is our reflexive, unthinking and implacable anti-Russian attitude. I don't mind being hostile to Russia; I do mind being implacable, unthinking and reflexively anti-

Russian. Now, part of this stems from our great national hubris; we don't like Putin and we don't think that we have to like anybody or be nice to anybody that we don't like. At the same time, our politicians tell us that we are in a state of war. Well, the last truly great wartime leader of the United States was Roosevelt and he did business with Putin's most venal predecessor.

Now, this reflexive anti-Russian attitude grew up in large part because who are our foreign policy decision makers? People who studied and planned and wrote thesis on how to surrender and disempower the Soviet Union. Old habits die hard. Putin has given us much to be angry about but let's take a look at whether that started with them or it started perhaps with us. One issue that you face throughout foreign policy is the ongoing battle between territorial integrity and self-determination, the right of a group to establish its own country or the right of countries to maintain their integrity and their territory. In fact, consider the two greatest wars in our history, one was a war for self-determination and the other was the war against Southern independence. Well, we face these same issues today—territorial integrity versus self-determination. Let's examine six places where we face that conflict. We are for self-determination of Kosovo just as we were for the self-determination of the Slovenes and the Croats with the split-up of Yugoslavia. We are against self-determination with regard to the Transnistria region of Moldova or even the northern part of Kosovo which would like to use Kosovo's concept of self-determination to self-determine itself out of Kosovo and back into Serbia.

Six conflicts – three times self-determination, three times territorial integrity. Are we inconsistent? No, we are not. We are consistently, unthinkingly, reflexively, anti-Russia. In all six of those conflicts Russia has a strong abiding interest. All six of those conflicts are somewhere between obscure and incredibly obscure from an American point of view, and yet every single time we take a very strong and determined position against the Russian position. As to our conflict with Russia over missile defense based in the Czech Republic and Poland, Russia believes that putting those missiles is to create anti-Russian facts on the ground in their own area of Eastern Europe. Our position is that those missile defenses will protect Europe from Iranian nuclear tipped missiles. Keep in mind nobody ever asserts that these missile defenses in the Czech Republic or Poland will do anything to defend the United States that's not their purpose and it could not have that effect. The Europeans don't particularly want those missiles there. We have to bribe the Czechs and the Poles to put them there, and the Germans and the French would just as soon that they not be there.

Well, why are we taking this aggressively anti-Russian position? One would say to protect Europe from the threat of Iranian nuclear weapons. But, wait a minute. We have not even thought of going to Russia and trying to get their help to prevent Iran from having the nuclear weapons to begin with. Perhaps in return for not building a missile defense system which the Russians think is not there for missile defense but is there to create anti-Russian facts on the ground. I can give you a host of examples in the recent commercial disputes between Ukraine and Russia we have announced that it is simply wrong to sell goods for their fair market value. We have told the former communists that capitalism is wrong. Why? Because capitalism will allow Russia to get more for its natural gas and being reflexive anti-Russian exceeds our interests in capitalism.

The third area where we are a bit fogged up is our disregard of world, and especially European, opinion. Think back to 9/11. We had the world's sympathy; they were ready to follow our leadership; people demonstrated for America in places where people have not demonstrated in favor of America before or since. And we took the world's sympathy and we ignored Kyoto; we invaded Iraq; we distained the International Court of Justice; we angered our friends and allies

with unilateral approaches on the wrong set of issues. Today who can say that the United States has the support or the sympathy of the world?

We do need to prioritize and the real threat is nuclear weapons in the wrong hands. Now, I want to distain the use of the term “weapons of mass destruction” because it puts nuclear weapons in the same category as chemical and biological weapons. Now chemical and biological weapons, chemical weapons could kill thousands, biological weapons could kill hundreds. That is devastating to individual American families but nuclear weapons never fail to kill hundreds of thousands when used against cities. Our ego is so big, and our stomach for reality is so small, that we put these in the same category because even the death of hundreds of Americans is “unthinkable” and therefore we can’t even think about the dangers that involve hundreds of thousands of Americans. I believe that the only thing that can prevent us from being a little better off, on balance, in 2050 than we are today is being hit by nuclear weapons. I know that this sounds like a big downer. Keep in mind that in the 1960s we faced a far greater threat. At that time we faced the risk of thousands of Soviet weapons, ten megatons and more. Now, we face weapons less than one five hundredth the size you’d expect the North Koreans and the Iranians to develop, and less than five hundredths of the number. So we are safer now than we were when we were ducking under the desks in our school rooms in order to protect ourselves in case of an air raid. Now, what would be our response to the nuclear threat? There are four possible responses – prevention, deterrence, interception and survival. I will deal briefly with the latter three and then focus mostly on prevention, and by that I mean prevent the wrong people from getting the most powerful weapons.

Now, deterrence and interception are, I think, false hopes because they miss the delivery system that is most likely to be used. For 20 or 30 years we’ve been talking about starwars, we’re going to hit a bullet with a bullet. Maybe it will someday work, I don’t think so, but maybe it will, but it’s irrelevant because if a nuclear weapon is coming into the United States it does not take a rocket scientist to bring it here. You could smuggle one in. Now, we’ve had a lot of talk about making our borders more secure. Our efforts to date have increased the cost of smuggling an illegal alien into the United States from \$1,000 to \$1,500. If we are able to raise that much higher we may, in fact, have a substantial impact on those people who aspire to wash our dishes for minimum wage, but whether the average cost of bringing in something the size of a person into the United States is \$1,000 or \$10,000 isn’t going to matter much to the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps. We are not going to have borders so secure that you can never bring anything across our borders. We have three million illegal border crossings every year; we have zero police of any kind guarding the border between Alaska and Canada whereas between Canada and the mainland of the United States we have one person every 30 to 40 miles. So, you can imagine that it’s a lot easier to smuggle a weapon. Also smuggling a weapon gives the perpetrator plausible deniability. You send in an ICMB up, we know where it came from. You smuggle a weapon in, you do what bin Laden did – you deny you’re responsible, you applaud the people who did it then a few years later maybe you take responsibility—deterrence is undermined and interception is made irrelevant by smuggling nuclear weapons. I know that the greatest dictators really want ICBMs; it is the Viagra of tyrants but, as a practical matter, they will determine that smuggling a weapon makes a lot more sense.

So, I’ve dealt with deterrence and interception then there’s survival. This is something you’re not allowed to talk about. The First Amendment protects many things but not talking about this issue because you have to turn to Americans and say, “Your government may not be able to fully protect you.” We may be in a circumstance where we’re trying to reduce the casualties from 200,000 down to 100,000 and I’m talking to an electorate that finds the death of 100 Americans

unthinkable and the death of 1,000 a taboo that cannot even be discussed. The fact is that we could cut casualties in half or more if we prepared, but if a nuclear weapon went off in Downtown Los Angeles as I speak, no one in this room—not even me—knows whether the right response is to get into the basement of this building and the parking structure or to hightail it up that Santa Monica trail to get as close to Point Mugu as we can. No one knows what to do; we haven't taken the American people into our confidence because we'd have to tell them that we actually face a threat. I know that survival is something we all tried to learn back in the '60s when we did have bomb drills. That might have been absurd; we could have been hit with 500 or 1,000 ten-megaton weapons. There would have been no medical care brought in from other cities; the living would envy the dead. In contrast, we're talking about being hit by a 15-kiloton weapon, one or two percent the size, and it would hit one or two cities, and we should be able to bring in medical care. We should talk about it, but as I pointed out it's illegal for any politician or pundit to talk about it so I won't.

Now, what should be our action towards trying to protect those people from getting nuclear weapons? We need the maximum carrot, maximum sticks. Maximum focus. We need to maximize our options and we need maximum linkage where we connect our objectives to other things that other people care about.

Let me deal quickly with North Korea because I really want to focus on Iran. Why do I think North Korea is less important? Because it's not ambitious. It wishes only to survive and oppress its people in its own territory. Now what we need to deal with the North Korean nuclear threat are not only the carrots of trade that have been discussed but one thing that our State Department refuses to discuss which is a nonaggression pact. That's what the North Koreans have asked for. If we get rid of our nuclear weapons, will we sign a piece of paper promising we're never going to invade? Believe it or not, the American answer is no. Why? Because the neocons never want to give up the dream of invading North Korea, which makes it a little difficult for the North Koreans to give up their nuclear weapons.

We also need sticks. Not only the sticks we have but the sticks that China has—that's where linkage comes in. Our discussions with China on its currency manipulation have got to include discussions of their actions toward nonproliferation and to fail to do so is to fail to make use of the techniques that are available to protect us. A government that has cost us 4,000 lives to protect us from Saddam's nuclear program should be willing to link currency values, and a bunch of other things, to real efforts to protect us from real weapons of mass destruction, there being only one real weapon of mass destruction and that's nuclear weapons.

Now, let's talk about Iran. If Iran develops nuclear weapons you can say goodbye to the world's nonproliferation regime. The Gulf Cooperation Council or Saudi Arabia individually will get them, Egypt will get them, Jordan will get them and who knows. Once it become popular for medium-size countries to get them how do you say no to Nigeria or Brazil? Second, imagine terrorism with impunity. Iran is already rated the number one state-sponsor of terrorism, imagine what happens to their egos if they have nuclear weapons. That puts us in a position where for the first time in a couple of decades we have a nuclear power that's officially hostile to the United States. Now, we lived through the Cuban missile crisis once. Iran's nuclear weapon is like a Cuban missile crisis every month whether it's IEDs smuggled into Iraq; whether it's blowing up things in Buenos Aires, Iran will provoke us. We go eyeball-to-eyeball and we go to eyeball-to-eyeball with someone considerably less sane than Khrushchev.

Now, even if we roll the dice crisis after crisis and win every time and there comes a day when the Iranian government, and I pray for this, is about to be overthrown, do you think that they're going to imitate the Soviet communists? Shrug their shoulders and walk off the world stage. Among their other options are to use nuclear weapons against Israel, in an effort to regain popularity on the Tehran street, or use nuclear weapons against the United States, figuring if they're going to go out they might as well go out with a bang. Now, I know that there was a national intelligence report that was deliberately designed to be misread and was successful, because it was misread. The two-page nonclassified summary says don't worry about the Iran nuclear program. This is silly, read the report carefully it says, in effect, that Iran is on target, they will have a nuclear weapon by the middle of the next decade. The key difficulty in getting nuclear weapons is to get the fissile material; they won't have it until the middle of the next decade. Nobody ever thinks they will have it until the middle of decade. Of course, you read the footnote that says if they make real good progress they could get it by 2009.

They have for a few years put away their weaponization program but the weaponization program only takes one or two years to complete. There's no reason for them to build the cart if they haven't bred the horse yet. All they have to do is continue to develop the fissile material. Now, why do I know they're developing the fissile material? Because the whole world knows. They have the centrifuges turning and they say it's all about generating electricity. This is a country that flairs its natural gas, has no way to export it. If you have free natural gas, isn't that the cheaper way to generate electricity? It is absolutely absurd to think that Iran is doing this to develop electricity. But even if they for some reason had a demented view that natural gas can't be used to generate electricity they could at any time get a lot of heat off themselves just by agreeing not to control the flow of fuel cycle and use imported nuclear fuel under strict regulations. Of course, they have not been willing to do so. Iran is developing the fissile material.

Now, there are those who will talk that a military strike is the way to solve these problems. Hussein's nuclear program was destroyed by Israel in 1981. Saddam put it all in one place, above ground. The Iranians aren't nearly so stupid. They have it dispersed, they have it deep underground, and they have it hidden from our intelligence. Even if you believe a military strike is a good idea, we ought to exhaust our non-lethal alternatives first if we have a decent respect for the opinion of the world, and I will talk about those non-lethal options in just a second.

There are those who say, "Well shouldn't we just have a law in Congress to prohibit any military action against Iran?" That's what I call Ambien for Ahmandinejad. It helps him sleep better. What we want is the Iranian elites, who are thinking over whether to press the world and continue to develop nuclear weapons, to be able to say, "One of the reasons we ought to give up this program is because in the end it's all going to be destroyed by an American bombing raid before it bears fruit." So you strengthen the hand of the realists in Tehran if you leave all options on the table. But the best option is to be able to convince the Iranian elites and the Iranian people that they face economic and diplomatic isolation if they don't give up their nuclear program. Now, we've got the broadcast resources—radio is broadcasting into Iran right now so we have to get that message through. The program with getting through the message that they face economic and diplomatic isolation is that I can't lie that well in Farsi. They do not face economic and diplomatic isolation because we haven't been willing to really do much. We yell so loud you think we're doing something. We invaded Iraq so your think we're really assertive people. No, we're not doing anything. I'll show you in just a second. We have a lot of tools in our tool box, that's the good news. The bad news is that the tools are still sitting in the tool box.

Recently we made a big announcement—we're going to prohibit four major Iranian banks from doing dollar denomination transactions with the U.S. Federal Reserve Board branch in New York, but we allow other banks to do the transactions including other Iranian banks. The slightest bit of financial inconvenience we have forced Ahmadinejad's to change from Wells Fargo to BofA. We announced that the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps was going to be listed as a terrorist organization, and for a few hours people wondered does that mean that if Mercedes sells trucks to the Revolutionary Guard Corps they can't sell cars in the United States? Three hours later the State Department answered and said, "No. We're not really serious about this." So, we're designated the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps that meant some of these folks are not allowed to visit Disneyland. That's not a sanction that's going to change behavior.

What sanctions are we not using? Well, we don't enforce the Iran Sanctions Act. That means the Clinton Administration and now the Bush Administration's official policy is to violate American law in order to protect Tehran's business partners—oil companies, chiefly based in Europe and Japan. But they go further. We have a loophole that allows American oil companies to do business with Iran through their foreign subsidiaries. We got a bill through the House, opposed by the administration, to close that loophole. The United States has acquiesced in the World Bank loans to Iran. Now why are those so important? Because I know what it takes for a politician to stay in power. You have to bring home the bacon. I know it's not kosher but it is good politics. And what could be better for Iranian politicians than to be standing there in front of a major water plant, cut the ribbon, say, "Not only have I brought this to you but it's from the World Bank. We're not isolated; they are sending money to us, on concessionary terms. What better example that the United States has done virtually nothing to bring economic isolation.

Now, I passed a bill through the House and I think I'm going to pass it through the Senate next month on OPEC—America's most unfortunately named agency. OPIC is the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, not to be confused with OPIC, and it's one of the many agencies in the federal government that helps exports. We have in there a provision that says if you want that help you, and all of your subsidiary and affiliated corporations, have to sign that you're not investing in the Iran oil sector, lending money to the Iranian, government or selling munitions to Iran. This has to be a model that has to apply to every one selling major goods to the federal government. We have to do it at the state level, we have to do it with every corporation or affiliated group of corporations getting any federal benefits at all. We have to urge people to divest from companies, particularly those in Europe and Asia who are investing in the Iran oil sector or loaning money to the Iranian government. We have a bill that passed through the House of Representatives, opposed by the administration, to say that trusts and pensions and cities, can if they want to with their own money, divest from these corporations without facing frivolous lawsuits. You know who's on the side of the frivolous lawsuits? The administration. It is the only kind of frivolous lawsuit they've ever endorsed. And why? Because the idea of shareholders pushing corporate management strikes them as outrageous. We should be pushing corporate managements around the world. They're investing our money and they shouldn't be undermining our nonproliferation policy. I will also be introducing a bill to the House in April to say that we should give tax-free treatment when you divest from a company that's doing business in Sudan or in Iran, and reinvest those proceeds in companies that are not doing so. We shouldn't tax those who divest from terrorism.

Now, that's just our economic tool box. Our diplomatic tool box comes down to one thing that would be most powerful. But the most powerful thing would be serious UN sanctions. We have silly UN sanctions right now. How do we get serious UN sanctions? You get Russia and China on your side. How do you get Russia and China on your side? Linkage. We have never even

whispered to China that how we feel about any issue that affects them will be effected. As a matter of fact, we've told them they won't be affected by what they do on the Iran issue or the North Korea issue. We have made it painfully clear to Russia that we will oppose them on virtually everything we can think of regardless of what position they take with Iran. If we were able to get China and Russia on our side, not because we convince them that we are the force of truth and light, but just because they realize they need to do business with us on a host of other issues, we would be able to get significant sanctions. And the most significant sanctions would be a prohibition against the importation by Iran or the export to Iran of refined energy products. They import roughly half of their refined gasoline because they don't have the refinery capacity notwithstanding the fact that they're exploiting the crude.

So, we have a lot to do. It starts by recognizing a certain degree of humility. We are not so powerful, that we are invulnerable. Our vulnerabilities have to be taken seriously and have to be prioritized. We cannot achieve all of our goals simultaneously and we have to seek the help of the world to reduce the vulnerabilities of the United States. If we do that then we can get through the next 50 years in the safety that we thought we'd enjoy when we saw the Berlin Wall come crashing down; otherwise, we'll not only have to worry about the kinds of things we've already been hit with, but the kind of things we don't like to talk about.

Thank you.

[www.lawac.org](http://www.lawac.org)

Speeches are edited for readability and grammar, not content. The views expressed herein are not endorsed by the Council. The Los Angeles World Affairs Council is a non-profit, non-partisan organization that pays neither honoraria nor expenses to its speakers.