

Samantha V: [00:03](#) [inaudible]. Um, Sam's gonna be, see if he can over there. [inaudible] hello. Can I trouble you for some too? Thank you. Wait [inaudible] I miss treasury been dying. Tim and I said every day. It's such a great agency. I started in oh seven in Iraq. [inaudible] hello again. [inaudible]

Samantha V: [01:30](#) you are stuck with me for another panel this time. We're here to dive into Iran and I feel very lucky because right now we basically have a mini situation room sitting up on the stage. This is bringing back a lot of memories of that dark, windowless room where we spent far too much time and where the under secretary is currently spending a lot of time. I imagine we have representatives from three or four agencies in fact, uh, that are deeply involved in rom policy, treasury, state, CIA and the Pentagon. What I'd like to do today is obviously talk about some of the tactical developments that we're seeing and then take a step back and look at the macro picture of where are we going, not only how we got here, but what are we actually going to do about it. Let me briefly introduce our panelists and then we'll dive in to my right is under secretary of the Treasury for terrorism and Financial Intelligence Under Secretary Mandel.

Samantha V: [02:23](#) Carr has also served in senior law enforcement and national security positions at the US Department of debt of justice and DHS. She previously served as a clerk to the honorable Clarence Thomas and um, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania law school and holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Michigan. Uh, Ambassador Sherman. It's great to see you in Basadur. Sherman is currently senior counselor at the Albright stonebridge group. I was lucky enough to learn from ambassador Sherman when she was the under secretary of state for political affairs at the u s department of State. She previously served as counselor for the state from 1997 to 2001 and as assistant secretary for Legislative Affairs Under Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, my colleague Jeremy Bash is here as well. He was the chief of staff of the CIA and the Pentagon among many other roles in government and is currently a managing director and founder of beacon global strategies.

Samantha V: [03:22](#) Thank you so much for being here with us and just as I did with Senator Murphy, I actually want to start with the intelligence this time around as well because it's so intrinsic to the development of policy and policy adjustments Under Secretary Mandel Kerr, you work a lot with intelligence. There's an intelligence bureau within the Treasury Department and right now there's a lot of questions about claims that are being made about intelligence. President Trump said several months ago that Iran, uh, had violated the JC POA. I know yesterday we

implemented sanctions related to Iran, illicit activities related to WMD. Were there activities that Iran engaged in while the nuclear deal was still in place that were added cause for concern and that precipitated led to accelerated the president's decision to withdraw from the Iran nuclear deal?

Sigal Mandelker: [04:10](#)

I can just for a moment, I want to just to take us a step a step back because I think, you know, president Trump of course campaigned on what he called the failed a Iran deal. And I think that there were a lot of expectations that when he would come into office, he would have abandoned the deal right, right away. Um, and, and, and he didn't do that actually. He took an 18 month period, uh, to, to study the situation. Uh, there was a lot of effort to work with our [inaudible] partners, for example, to come in a agreement on what we thought a better deal would look like. Um, and in that, in that intervening time, you saw a great deal of continued highly provocative activity that the Iranians continued to engage in, whether it's their, uh, support for terrorism. Of course, historically Iran has, has, has provided, uh, Hizbullah hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars a year for their terrorist activity.

Sigal Mandelker: [05:07](#)

And we can't forget that yesterday was the anniversary, the 25 year anniversary of the bombing of the Jewish community center in Argentina, uh, which, which resulted in 85 deaths and 300, uh, wounded. And of course, Iran continues to support his Bella in many different ways and certainly did during that, um, intervening time period, there are continued support for the horrific activity that's happening, uh, in, in, in Syria where not only was Iran providing, uh, funding and, and, and militia to support the Assad regime, they were also sending child soldiers to Syria where they would go and they would fight and they would die. And of course, Iran's ballistic missile program continued on, uh, unabated. So in that time period, we saw just continued aggressive behavior that was troubling. It should be extraordinarily troubling, I think for everyone in the room. And I'm sure everyone, everyone on on this panel in the meantime, they were able to benefit from a deal that allowed them to, to profit off of investment, um, from, from a number of different companies all over the world. And of course, you cannot ignore the fact that that kind of revenue is going to go to support, um, neurons, highly destabilizing activity. And that was a big concern for us, for the president. Um, ultimately the biggest concern is that they continued on their way, their path, their pathway, uh, to a nuclear program. Uh, which again is just what we consider to be a fundamental flaw of the deal.

Samantha V: [06:41](#) So just to be clear though, did you see intelligence that Iran specifically violated the JCP POA?

Sigal Mandelker: [06:46](#) So I can't, of course talk about intelligence, uh, that I, that I, that I have seen, but others in the administration have spoken, uh, about, uh, what we have seen the Iranians do in connection with its WMD program. And as you mentioned just yesterday, we sanctioned an entire network, a firm of Chinese Belgium companies, uh, and Iranian individuals who were responsible for continuing to sell sensitive technology to support a Ron's, uh, centrifuge program. Uh, and of course, um, the, the, if any kind of material like that were to be sold, uh, to Iran, it would have to go through the UN Security Council process process. And the nuclear supply group. Uh, and, and that's not what I believe happened here.

Samantha V: [07:34](#) Certainly in the administration did say several months ago the DNI believe Republic Lee, that Iran had not violated the JCP away. To the best of my recollection, um, under secretary Sherman, it's a almost perfect that we're sitting here today. It's like foreign ministers reef timed his comments just for the Aspen security forum. He floated a deal earlier, enhance nuclear inspections in return for permanent sanctions relief. Now, I don't think he really believes anything is permanent based upon the fact that we levied sanctions and then reimpose them. But if you were currently out the State Department in the role that you played under the previous administration, would you take foreign ministers to reef up on this offer of conditions right on either side for negotiations right now? It's interesting. Um, one of the folks who cover this quite closely, Suzanne Maloney tweeted yesterday, uh, every one has, many people have said that Iran won't negotiate.

Wendy Sherman: [08:26](#) And here as ministers reef negotiating in the open, uh, I think that's what this was about yesterday. Uh, I think the foreign minister meeting with journalists meeting with think tankers basically proposed, uh, that if the United States would lift some of the sanctions that they would ratify the additional protocol now, which under the terms of the deal doesn't have to be ratified until 2023 when, uh, the deal has been implemented and executed over a number of years and, uh, Congress would terminate nuclear related sanctions. We've only lifted them. Mack now open reimposed, but the Obama administration had just lifted them, not terminated them when they were terminated, then the additional protocol would go in place. And the additional protocol, which Iran is voluntarily, uh, following at the moment, um, means that they can never obtain a nuclear weapon. Now that's not a fail safe. Uh, it is part of the nuclear

nonproliferation treaty and Iran could decide, even after making a deal, they're going to leave the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

Wendy Sherman: [09:27](#) So I don't see it as the be all and end all. And I certainly don't see it as the substantial deal that a foreign Mr Zarif laid out yesterday. But I do believe he was beginning to negotiate. And he is a, he knows the United States. He knows the United States media. He is a very clever negotiator. Um, I want to say a couple of broad things as well to what a cigar, uh, said. Um, the International Atomic Energy Agency has now, I think in 14 reports said that Iran has been in complete compliance. Uh, they have noted and have seen that indeed as the foreign ministry said itself, Aronne has now begun to, uh, enrich above 3.67%, and is allowing their stockpile to go above the 300 kilograms that are allowed. These are reversible steps. And in my view, these are wrong actions on behalf of Iran. They shouldn't do it.

Wendy Sherman: [10:23](#) Uh, they are doing it in their view, in response to provocations by the United States for reimposing all of the sanctions, uh, and for leaving the deal. I appreciate that the president took some time, uh, to consider the JCPO way when he came into office. Uh, but there was no doubt. I think in anyone's mind that as soon as people like Mattis, McMaster, even Tillerson left the administration that the guard rails were off and the president was going to withdraw from the deal. Certainly didn't come as a surprise to me because throughout the campaign he said he was going to withdrawal from the deal. I think the issue is not whether Iran does horrible things in the world or Ron does horrible things in the world. I have no trust in Iran. Iran has no trust in me or in the United States. The question is, do you want to make sure that Iran doesn't have a nuclear weapon so that it cannot project such power into the Middle East, that it would deter our and to our allies and partners?

Wendy Sherman: [11:27](#) Actions and Jeremy will talk more about the security and the defense posture that we need to be in and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps who I call the hard hardliners in Iran. I don't think anyone in Iran is a moderate. People in the past have heard me say people like were honney and reef are hardliners. The IRG GC, the could sports are hard, hard liners and the hard hard liners never wanted the joint comprehensive plan of action, uh, because they owned the black market. That is, there is a substantial black market in Iran. Uh, they owned it. They controlled the economy. Rohani was trying to pull the economy away from the IRG c they've now re claimed a great deal of the economy. Uh, and we thought that if we could stop

Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, we could use all of our remaining sanctions, which remained in place on their terrorist activities, on their weapons, uh, and proliferation activities on their missiles, uh, on their human rights abuses, uh, trying to negotiate, getting, uh, the rest of the Americans and those missing in Iran back to the United States.

Wendy Sherman: [12:36](#)

We could work with our partners and allies wouldn't be deterred by Iran having a nuclear weapon and could work on these terrible nefarious actions that continued. It's a difference in strategy. And my fundamental question to the administration, then I'll stop, uh, is what is the strategy? Uh, I know that it is about maximum pressure, but to what end? Uh, and I think the Iranians are trying to calibrate whether president Trump will be reelected or not if they think he will be reelected or that there's a good chance that he will be. I think we will continue to see proposals from the Iranians. I think we will continue. I believe that Ron Paul probably met with foreign ministers a reef. I hope you did quite frankly. Uh, because there's a long history of senators, uh, beginning to try to open doors for diplomacy. And I think in this case, diplomacy is better than war. War by inadvertence, by miscalculation, by accident with this escalatory cycle would be catastrophic and devastating. In Jeremy, we've talked about the nuclear threat, which is further away than the threats that American citizens, American assets and allies are, are facing in the region right now. Uh, it feels like Iran is implementing their own maximum pressure campaign. If the nuclear program is their Trump card, this is their maximum pressure campaign. How is the Pentagon feeling? What, what is the appropriate military response? More assets, less or status quo?

Jeremy Bash: [14:06](#)

Well, Iran strategic doctrine for the past 30 years has been to meet pressure with pressure and in their view when they don't counteract the pressure, it invites more pressure. And so in that vein, I think you've seen from Iran over the last two months, a counteracting pressure campaign by them. We've seen a series of military actions. We've seen the mining of tankers, we've seen increased pace of missile and drone attacks into Saudi Arabia. We've seen the targeting of Mrid shipping infrastructure. We've seen the attempted armed boarding of a British vessel. Just yesterday, Iranian forces came upon the amphibious ready group at the United States had transiting the straits, a led by the u s boxer, not just with a drone, which we read about in the press, but also with a helicopter for fast boats, another Iranian flag vessel. And of course on June 20th the downing with a radar guided surface to air missile of an RQ for Global Hawk, the first downing of a u s flagged aircraft in

international airspace since the Korean War by an adversary nation.

Jeremy Bash: [15:14](#) Think about how eschalots story Iran has been just in the last six weeks. And what is Iran objective here? Number one I think is to test our red lines and the red lines of other countries. I think it's to disperse and raise the costs around the region. I think it's to intimidate allies. Maybe they're trying to raise oil prices and a and cause havoc and the global economy. But fundamentally it's what the supreme leader said in his May 29th remarks in which he said, we have been pressured. We have to build up, leverage something to trade away. If we have to end up in a discussion with the uh, with Washington and we have to trade something away, we need to have something to trade. So they are building up their leverage. A second point, which is that the manner in which I think we responded to the June 20th attack actually reduced our deterrence.

Jeremy Bash: [16:08](#) Uh, why do I say that? I think had we clearly said that this provocation will be met with a u s response at a time and place of our choosing that would have obfuscated our red line. And I think made less clear exactly how we would respond. Instead, what we said publicly was that dod did not tell us about civilian casualties until 10 minutes before the strike and which of course the Iranians assumed to be false, just the cover story. And so they concluded and I think rightly so, that their actions did not cross a u s red line. And so they're going to continue to press and continue to push forward. A third point as we try to reassert deterrence as we try to prevent them from accelerating their activities, we could over-rotate and our exertion of force could be received by them as an escalatory step.

Jeremy Bash: [17:05](#) And we could be up the Escalade Tory ladder very quickly. And then a fourth and final point is that although I think the United States, I know the United States would eventually win and prevail in a conventional military conflict against Iran because we have such strategic overmatch, it would be terribly costly. We would struggle to generate the forces into the region necessary to prevail. And I think it would dramatically setback our ability to engage in diplomacy and prevent Iran from gaining a nuclear capability. So Jeremy, would you keep our military assets in the region where they are right now? Do you think we need more or less? Well, I think the first objective has to be to understand whether or not there's going to be a diplomatic path [inaudible] and I think we need to have a strong force posture in the region. And I think we have to reassert deterrence that as I said, we have to be very delicate and careful how we do it so that we don't over-rotate. So that's the

military instrument. Let's turn to the financial instrument. Uh, president Trump has implemented a historic sanctions campaign against the Iranians going above and beyond what President Obama did. From your perspective at the Treasury Department, our sanctions working

Sigal Mandelker: [18:16](#)

without a doubt, sanctions are working. Let, let me just talk about what I see as the two primary objectives of sanctions. One is to disrupt the ability of the Iranian regime and all bad actors around the world that we target to have access to the revenue that they need ultimately to engage in destabilizing and malign behavior. What you're seeing today is historic lows in the amount of, of oil that the Iranians are able to produce some estimated at under 300,000 barrels per day. The Minister of energy, in fact of Iran recently said that he's never seen anything like that. What does that mean? At bottom? It means at bottom that Iran isn't going to have the same kind of revenue that they have had historically to build out their nuclear program, to engage, to develop their ballistic missile development program, to, to support Syria, uh, to support his ball out, to support the, the hoodies.

Sigal Mandelker: [19:17](#)

And we're seeing clear evidence of that. Uh, his Nasrallah, that leader of his Bala recently besieged to the outside world for donations. Why would he have to, to ask, uh, for, for donations? Because he's not getting the kind of support that he's historically been able to receive from Iran. And by the way, this is the first time we've ever seen the head, the leader of his Bala, um, beg for that kind of funding in Syria. Similarly, you're seeing Iran back, Syria militia, uh, men receiving huge pay cuts. Um, Ron's not able to fund the reconstruction projects that they had promised, uh, to the, to the, to the brutal Asad regime. We're seeing time and again, not just in our broad authorities, but we've been able to disrupt the ability of Iran to continue to gain access to the revenue that they need by going after mass, uh, networks of iron, GC, IGC, um, puts force entities that have historically been able to try to manipulate the international financial system to gain access to the revenue, uh, that, that they need.

Sigal Mandelker: [20:24](#)

So I think that the, the, and of course, um, we were also seeing Iran's military budget decrease substantially. So I think that part of the pressure campaign is enormously important. Ultimately, we don't want Iran to ever get to a point where we're threatened, uh, by an ICBM, by a nuclear program. And the fundamental way to that is to keep them from having access to the revenue from the parts that they need to build out that pro program. And of course that's what we saw as one of the

fundamental flaws of the deal. The other piece of it is to change behavior. President Trump and secretary palm peo repeatedly have said that they are open to negotiations. They want to get to a far better, better deal, that they're willing to sit down at any time. And of course we're starting to see the Iranians is Wendy point out a make signals that they're, that they're willing to come to the negotiating table. Whether those are the right signals. Isn't it is an open question, but, but I think there's no question, there's no question that we're seeing this, this campaign, this campaign work

Samantha V:

[21:33](#)

and uh, ambassadors German. There are some clear winners in the scenario right now and it's not us who benefits from this state of play. And should president Trump be phoning a friend in any of these capitals and trying to get them to exert leverage over Iran to come back to the negotiating table. So I want to, I'll answer your question in a minute. Listening to Seagal and I have tremendous respect for the work that you do, uh, and for that job that you have, which is a really tough one. I know it was tough in our administration. Uh, you know, it's not the easiest thing to do to use all these financial tools to make these things happen. You really have to run around the world and enforce them. It's not enough just to do the sanction. You have to have a team go out and, and get people to do them.

Wendy Sherman:

[22:16](#)

So I have great respect for the work you do. But we know a few things about sanctions. Sanctions rarely if ever stopped bad behavior when the Europeans began negotiating with Iran in the early two thousands, Iran had 164 centrifuges. Spinning centrifuges are the mechanism that can, uh, turn a enriched uranium into highly enriched uranium, which is the material that you need. And one of the ways for material inside of a nuclear weapon, by the time that we got to very serious negotiations in 2013 with unbelievable both unilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran where we had had a fundamental reduction in their financial assets. Um, they had 19,000 centrifuges. So sanctions did compel around to the negotiating table and they may compel around to the negotiating table in this instance, but they did not fundamentally stopped bad behavior. And one of the tricky parts here is to make sure that as you are putting the pressure on them to try to take away the financial assets to get them back to the negotiating table, that you are not shifting the balance to trying to stop other Ba bad behavior, legitimately malign and bad behavior at cost of them obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Wendy Sherman: [23:48](#) Because all of that bad behavior does not begin to match the deterrent power of Iran having a nuclear weapon. So that's the balance here that I think is very tricky. And not clear to me that the administration understands that leverage balance and the need to ensure that Iran does not get a nuclear weapon. Now back to your question, who are the winners or the losers? Who we with say, I would say Russia and China are currently winners, uh, because the Europeans have basically been destroyed by the United States, uh, in this deal, uh, tried to stay in the deal, uh, tried to keep it going, creating a special purpose vehicle, uh, for barter rearrangements that particularly around humanitarian goods. Uh, and I am, it does break my heart that there haven't been any waivers from treasury on the humanitarian side because I think, uh, Iranian citizens are hurting badly.

Wendy Sherman: [24:50](#) Um, but I think that as a result, uh, Russia is playing the role it played in Syria, which is I can solve this problem, I can take charge. And the Europeans who feel like they can't rely on us are turning more and more, uh, towards China. So I think Russia and China are winners in this operation. Uh, I think that, um, uh, the other winner in this operation, uh, quite frankly is the IRG GC and the quits force, the hard hard liners are in ascendancy in the politics of Iran. I think the chances of Rohani who is a hard line or as opposed to a hard hardliner being reelected in 2021 is pretty dismal. Uh, and I think that the oppression which is always present and quite rigorous in a neuron will be worse in the years ahead.

Jeremy Bash: [25:38](#) Sam, but just gonna jump in here. I mean, um, just a little bit to play devil's advocate, I think Seagal and her team have been so effective at trying to ring out any ability of Iran to gain revenues from their energy exports. It seems like what the strategy is, and I don't want to put warden words in anybody's mouth is, is that your, we are also trying to build up leverage so that if the Europeans do come to the negotiating table, we have something to trade away. It's kind of basic and I would think that that's exactly what we would want. Now the question is in ending the waivers, did we push it too hard trigger an Escalade story cycle that could lead inadvertently to a military conflict. That I think is kind of the nub of the issue. And you know, I think that's sort of what's important to discuss

Samantha V: [26:27](#) and we'll come back to that. We'll come back instead. Can I ask Seagal a moment too to that? And now she wants to talk about the humanitarian waivers. Um, but coming up by August 1st you can make some news here. Uh, you have to make a decision about the nuclear waivers and the nuclear waivers waivers that

allowed Iran to import some things to make some of the changes that came out of the joint comprehensive plan of action. You have to make a decision. The administration's make a decision about whether they continue or not. If they don't continue, I think we will see this Escalade Tori ladder escalate significantly.

Sigal Mandelker: [27:00](#)

So I'm not going to make any news. Uh, I tried to for all the reporters out here, but I am going to say, look, I think the IRF GC or the big losers here, I think the IGC could sports are the big losers here. I started out by saying that our massive pressure campaign has resulted in less revenue going to Iran's military. That is a significant achievement because all, ultimately it's the IGC, it's the kids force, it's the month, the awful. All of those entities that are posing an incredibly destabilizing presence in the region. They're threatening our out, our great ally, Israel and and look after the JCP away. What did the, the Obama administration do to curb that kind of behavior? Nothing. It's really the best, huge.

Samantha V: [27:47](#)

I don't think that's quite accurate, so let's, let's let, we'll let others respond to that. Let me, let me, let me just it

Sigal Mandelker: [27:55](#)

great again, bad actors need money to do bad things. That is why we have this massive sanctions regime because we know Iran is threatening our great partner Israel because we know that they're, they're supporting a regime in Syria that is using chemical weapons against its own people. Because of its crisis that we see, uh, in, in Yemen, all of that material, because they're supporting his Bala, the great terrorist organization has bottled that's responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans and many more. Because throughout this deal we [inaudible] the time period of this steel. We continued to see the Iranians in engaged in thankfully mostly forwarded terrorist plots all over Europe. And every time we apply that pressure, that crunch on them, we deny them the ability to get access to Tibet kind of revenue. We make the world a safer place. That's number one. Number two, I think we just have a fundamental disagreement about what Iran would have done when the sunset, a clause is expired, right? They would've had, they would've been during this long time period where they would had acts, a great amount of access, uh, to revenue that would have been able them to support and build out their WMD program. That's not happening now. And I think any deal the United States negotiates in the future needs to prevent that piece from happening. I can address the humanitarian piece. So

- Samantha V: [29:35](#) I just had one more question. Just in the interest of time and may give you, if you could address both them, we'll go down the line one more time. There's been a lot of focus on Instax on the settlement mechanism and the Europeans pushing for us to allow them to use this measure. What concerns does treasury have about this particular mechanism? Because from the outside, from the outside it looks like, why wouldn't you let them proceed with this? So I've spoken about this publicly in red, not bad about it. I sent a letter to the head events sticks about this. I want to say first and foremost, all of ours,
- Sigal Mandelker: [30:06](#) general licenses that permit humanitarian aid to go to the Iranians continue to exist. And we've been very clear that we want humanitarian aid to go, uh, to go to Iran. The biggest barrier to that, to humanitarian aid getting to the Iranian people is the Iranian regime. If they would stop spending all this money on their WMD program, if they would stop spending all this money on his Bala and instead focus, uh, on their economy, the Iranian people would be much, much better off that, that, that's number one. That's just a fundamental please. The keys to helping the Iranian people rest in the hands of the Iranian regime. There's no, there's no question about that when it comes to insects. So insects is a special purpose vehicle, uh, arrangement that the [inaudible] agreed to, uh, with, with, with the Iranians. And when they made the announcement to agree to this, um, insects, the eat three announced that it was going to operate under the highest anti money laundering countered terrorist financing, uh, standards.
- Sigal Mandelker: [31:08](#) The fundamental problem for the e three is that there are no anti money laundering standards and run. They don't exist. So three years ago at the t at the time of the, at the time of the JC POA, Iran agreed to implement an action plan under the Financial Action Task Force, uh, whereby that they would agree to take 10 very significant steps to have an anti money laundering counter terrorist financing regime in Iran. And they just utterly failed on that. Why have they failed at that? Will you only need to listen to members of the regime to understand why? It's because they feel that if they have an AML system in place, it's going to be what they call the Sopo so-called sanction on themselves. Right? You can't tell the largest state sponsor of terror, uh, to, to stop, uh, funding terrorism if that's just their fundamental, they're fundamental.
- Samantha V: [32:00](#) So your concern with insects was related to the AML and CFT concerns.

Sigal Mandelker: [32:04](#) There's that piece of it. And then the other piece of it, which is also really important that the Iran that the Europeans have to understand is that on the other side of the insects, on the Iranian side of the insects and negotiations as a central bank of Iran, the Central Bank of Iran systematically has engaged in funneling money to his Bala, to Hamas, to, to, uh, to the [inaudible] force and to other terrorist organizations. And we've exposed that, um, many times over the last year. In fact, not too long ago, we sanctioned the then governor of the Central Bank of Iran for being involved in a huge scheme to send, to send money out to the kids force as Bella. And I'm awesome. We've done it a number of other, a number of other times. So it's just a problem for the Europeans. Right. How do you, how do you negotiate, how do you, how do you com develop a, a trade vehicle when the people that you're dealing with on the other side of the vehicle don't understand what it means to have any money laundering

Wendy Sherman: [33:02](#) controls? Ambassador Sherman, would you like to respond? And then Jeremy, uh, last question for you, uh, on whether it's possible to build military coalitions in the street right now? I think the only response I would give to what a psychologist went through is part of my concern very broadly is how we treat and how we work with our allies and partners. And Europe has always been the most reliable, the most important partner to the United States. We are stronger economically, we are stronger in terms of security. Uh, we are stronger in terms of our own prosperity and our values when we work with Europe. And so when our European partners want to try to find a way forward, uh, to preserve the Deo, to continue to talk about the issues of concern about maligned behavior, uh, when we want Israel, uh, to, uh, security to be protected.

Wendy Sherman: [34:04](#) And we want everyone to be on that page with us, uh, to really say that what Europe is trying to do to create this special purpose vehicle with all of the concerns about the corruption in Iran, all of which is real. Uh, I just feel like we have turned our back on Europe at a time when we need your, we'd need NATO. We need the transatlantic alliance, uh, to not only counter what Iran is doing, uh, but what China's doing to have a bulwark against Russia, uh, to strengthen that alliance so that we have the economic security we need into the future. So there's a broader strategic concept here that I think gets, uh, very much, uh, far trees lost in the forest, uh, issue. If I can just address it for

Sigal Mandelker: [34:52](#) one second. So I know that there's a narrative that, that we're not working with our European colleagues, it's just wrong,

right? We see the threat in Iran very similarly to our European colleagues. And in fact, we have worked very closely with our European colleagues on countering that kind of malign that behavior. In fact, over the last year, uh, the three over the last year, year and a half, all of the three countries have agreed, for example, to deny, um, landing rights to Mohan air, which is, which is one of [inaudible] major international airlines that we view as also an an arm of the, of the kids force. That's just one example of the many ways that we have in fact worked with our European colleagues and we're gonna we're going to continue to, to do, to do so. Those are extraordinarily important partnerships with for us. Again, we see the JCP way differently, but there's a wide range of activity, um, countering Iran that we're able to work very productively, uh, with and, and, and that alliance is, is, continues to be a very strong and, and will continue to in the future.

Jeremy Bash:

[35:54](#)

As we'll hear later from ambassador Jeffrey, there are some 80 countries in the anti isis coalition and even if you, uh, except the fact that we're going to have a lot of the capability and that others are going to be there more a for symbolism and perhaps for some niche capabilities, uh, that is an impressive show of force and I do think that, well, we need to create in the Arabian Gulf is a, is a, a forced posture that at least includes as many countries as possible. Many, many countries beyond the Gulf Sunni Arab countries have a stake in the commerce that flows through the streets, have a stake in the energy, uh, flow and the flow of other goods and services in that area. And I think it's, it will be, we're down to our benefit if we can get a strong and as large of a coalition to constrain principally Iranians activities to stop the F, uh, just to stop that commerce and, uh, and to allow the free flow of commerce in that area.

Samantha V:

[36:50](#)

Thanks, Jeremy. Do we have time for questions? Let's do one question. So make it a good one. Yeah, no pressure. Ron offered to help us. Uron offered to help us with, um, in Afghanistan and the Bush administration refused the help. Was that an opening that, um, potentially might've helped us and, uh, what do you all think of that closing, closing that door

Samantha V:

[37:22](#)

Monday?

Wendy Sherman:

[37:22](#)

You know, I, I can't speak to the judgements that the Bush administration May, what I can say is there have been other times in Afghanistan in Iraq, uh, which Jeremy Probably knows quite well, uh, where there have been relationships and discussions to protect troops to make sure that militias did not, uh, attack our troops, uh, when our interests aligned. Um, so I,

you know, I think there are always security situations where even with adversaries you might find a sliver of a common cause. Uh, but I think regardless, we would all agree, all four of us on this stage that are Ron is a serious issue that are wrongs, malign, activity in the region needs to stop. We would all agree on this platform that Iran should not obtain a nuclear weapon. We would all agree on this platform that the Iranian people deserve their human rights and a better life and that the corruption of the Iranian system really takes away opportunities for them.

Wendy Sherman:

[38:34](#)

The debate we're having is how you get there, how you achieve those objectives. And of course the additional objective, making sure that Israel, the only democracy in the region is protected and their security ensured and that we build our alliance with our partners around the world to achieve these objectives. So what we have up here is a difference in strategy. And for me, the Trump administration is too much about tactics and not enough about strategy and not enough about seeing the entire landscape and the interaction of all these problems. Issues are Sui generis, but the same kinds of tactics and pressure. Even though there are many sanctions on North Korea, the expectations of North Korea are quite different and the approach is quite different. And so it does lead some of us to feel like if it was something done by the Obama administration, it's no good for the Trump administration. I know that's too reductionist and life is more complicated than that. But I think what's important for everybody here to understand is we all seek the same thing. We just believe there's a different way and a more permanent way and a better way to get there. Thank you all so much for joining me.

Speaker 5:

[39:56](#)

We haven't, we have another great panel coming on this stage. Now. We are just resetting the stage. Um, I did hear a couple of cell phones go off, so please check your pocket, check your purse, make sure you're.