



CALLS FROM CONSTITUENTS CAN TURN THIS AROUND TELL SENATOR SCHUMER TO "CHUCK THE DEAL"

I'm sure you don't need to hear from me how perilous this [Iran Deal](#) is — for those of us living in Israel, most vulnerably, but equally for [Americans](#) and the Western world.

Should Congress reject the deal come September, President Obama will execute his promised veto. Senator Chuck Schumer is the one U.S. lawmaker who may be able to orchestrate the veto override needed to defeat the deal after that.

Schumer, presumed next Senate Democratic Minority Leader after Harry Reid resigns, has the best chance of influencing thirteen fence-sitting colleagues (page 4). They're waiting to see where Schumer will place his chips.

This key Democrat must be persuaded to resist White House [pressures](#) and act forcefully — *right now*, when he can get sufficient others to join him; *not conditioned on an "all clear,"* from Obama senior advisor Valerie Jarrett, who will let him know when/if it is politically safe for him to vote against.

It appears that Schumer — self-described 'guardian of Israel' — may need reminding he has a substantial constituency that will support him if he expends every effort to kill this objectively bad deal, or reject him in the next election if he does not.

So call the Senator, as a New York constituent, and ask him to decide appropriately and lead the way. If you're an Israeli now but your last U.S. residence was in New York State, you still are considered a New York constituent. Schumer's staffers will keep a running record of the calls and report the results to him.

Voters making their [voices heard](#), especially in great numbers, can make the unexpected happen, even when a change in course seems impossible. The Iran deal is not a done deal — yet. Let's light up those phones before it turns into one.

This July 27 message from ZOA ISRAEL Director Jeff Daube, as part of the Americans Vote Israel *Chuck the Deal* campaign, was disseminated before Schumer's announcement. Adapt your follow-up phone calls to reflect more recent news and analysis (starting on page 7).

ACTION PLAN —

Call Senator Schumer ([202-224-6542](tel:202-224-6542)), after 4pm Israel time if you are in Israel. Calling from the U.S., you can use the easy call-in feature provided by [Citizens for a Nuclear Free Iran](#) as well. The staffer will ask you for your NY zip code, which is your last voting address.

Above all, be respectful and antagonize no one. Do not speak ill of the President of the United States or of Senator Schumer.

1. Sample text follows but your own words would be better. If you are calling past 7/27, check for news updates (page 7). Should Schumer later declare he will vote *no* on Iran deal, he still should be encouraged to work on his undecided colleagues.

"I am a constituent of Senator Schumer [living in Israel]. I am calling to urge the Senator to lead his colleagues in opposing the JCPOA appeasement deal with terror-state Iran. This agreement effectively backs Tehran's open goal to annihilate Israel, and threatens U.S. national security, by making it easier for it to acquire nuclear weapons. This agreement also awards Iran with a cash bonanza, which it will use to step up its current aggression against Israel and other U.S. interests in the region. I appeal to the Senator not to permit Iran, and the international forces helping Iran, to succeed by means of the U.S. giveaways in this very bad deal."

2. You might add a talking point or two. For example...

- a. Refer to the giveaways more specifically, such as those listed in the *Washington Times* [op-ed](#) ('The Iranian nuclear deal is surrender') by ZOA National President Mort Klein and ZOA Center for Middle East Policy Director Daniel Mandel.

- b. Express your disapproval at the Administration's having violated democratic principles, and your citizen rights, with its end run around Congress — starting with its rush to present the Iran deal to the UN Security Council for unanimous endorsement before our elected representatives had made use of their allotted sixty days. Further new revelations suggest the Administration may, in addition, be conducting [secret side arrangements](#) with Iran, and a disinformation campaign meant to deceive the American people about Israeli popular opinion and deal alternatives.

3. Ask a question, such as the one that follows, or selecting from *Times of Israel* editor David Horovitz's list of [sixteen](#). Request that a staffer get back to you by phone or email with the Senator's answer. If you get no response after a week, call back again and politely remind them.

"I would like to know how Senator Schumer views the verification aspects of this deal as realistic given the inevitable, artful cheating by Iran. According to U.S. polls, most Americans do not believe the deal is enforceable. Senator Schumer himself has recently been [quoted](#) saying, "I don't trust these Iranians."

4. Conclude by thanking the staffer. State that you are looking forward to Senator Schumer's *no* vote on JCPOA, and to his answering your question.

5. [Share](#) this action plan with New Yorkers — family, friends and associates — who you know are inclined to speak against the Iran agreement.

Whatever your U.S. state affiliation, let me know how you feel and I will help you communicate those feelings where it counts.

I plan on relating to my numerous contacts on Capitol Hill representing several key states what I've personally heard from American voters, across the political spectrum, living in Israel:

They are extremely disturbed by this fatally flawed, "there's no other [alternative](#)" process unfolding — a farcical pathway sure to intensify Middle East chaos, and bring Israelis *and Americans* closer to the war the Iran deal purportedly was designed to avoid.

Silence is not an option! Thanking you in advance for your commitment and participation.

Jeff Daube
Israel Director
Zionist Organization of America
Email: americansvoteisrael@gmail.com

THE UNDECIDED SENATORS: 13 DEMOCRATS, 1 REPUBLICAN

A call to the U.S. Capitol Switchboard at (202) 224-312, or to the numbers provided here, will connect you either to the Washington or local offices of:

Kirsten Gillibrand
780 Third Avenue
Suite 2601
New York, New York 10017
Phone:(212) 688-6262
Fax: (866) 824-6340

No longer undecided. Will vote YES on Iran deal.

Claire McCaskill
5850 Delmar Blvd., Ste. A
St. Louis, Missouri 63112
Phone: (314) 367-1364
Fax: (314) 361-8649

Jeff Flake (Republican)
2200 East Camelback Road
Suite 120
Phoenix, AZ 85016
Phone: 602-840-1891
Fax: 602-840-4092

Chuck Schumer
780 Third Avenue, Suite 2301
New York, NY 10017
Phone: (212) 486-4430
Fax: (202) 228-2838

No longer undecided. Will vote NO on Iran deal,
but will he lead others? (see page 7...)

Cory Booker
One Gateway Center, 23rd Fl.
Newark, NJ 07102
Phone: (973) 639-8700
Fax: (973) 639-8723

Richard Blumenthal
90 State House Square
10th Floor
Hartford, Conn. 06103
Phone: (860)258-6940

Bob Casey
2000 Market Street, Suite 610
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 405-9660
Fax: (215) 405-9669

Ben Cardin
100 South Charles Street
Tower 1, Suite 1710
Baltimore, MD, 21201
Phone: (410) 962-4436

Nelson Florida
3416 South University Drive
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33328
Phone: 954-693-4851
Fax: 954-693-4862

Stabenow, Michigan
Flint/Saginaw Bay Office
432 N. Saginaw St, Suite 301
Flint, MI 48502
Phone: (810) 720-417

Jon Tester
Judge Jameson Federal Building
2900 4th Ave N, Suite 201
Billings, MT 59101
Phone: (406) 252-0550
Fax: (406) 252-7768

Ron Wyden
911 NE 11th Ave., Suite 630
Portland, OR, 97232
Phone: (503) 326-7525

Heidi Heitkamp
306 Federal Building
657 Second Avenue North
Fargo, ND 58102
Phone: (701) 232-8030
Fax: (701) 232-6449

Gary Peters
Patrick V. McNamara Federal Building
477 Michigan Avenue
Suite 1860
Detroit, MI 48226
Phone: (313) 226-6020

Barb Milkulski
901 S. Bond Street, Ste. 310
Baltimore, MD 21231
Phone: (410) 962-4510
Fax: (410) 962-4760

Full *Medium* article is [here](#).

My Position on the Iran Deal*

Chuck Schumer August 6, 2015

If one feels that Iranian leaders will not moderate and their unstated but very real goal is to get relief from the onerous sanctions, while still retaining their nuclear ambitions and their ability to increase belligerent activities in the Middle East and elsewhere, then one should conclude that it would be better not to approve this agreement.

...To me, the very real risk that Iran will not moderate and will, instead, use the agreement to pursue its nefarious goals is too great.

...Therefore, I will vote to disapprove the agreement, not because I believe war is a viable or desirable option, nor to challenge the path of diplomacy. It is because I believe Iran will not change, and under this agreement it will be able to achieve its dual goals of eliminating sanctions while ultimately retaining its nuclear and non-nuclear power. Better to keep U.S. sanctions in place, strengthen them, enforce secondary sanctions on other nations, and pursue the hard-trodden path of diplomacy once more, difficult as it may be.

* Will Senator Schumer try to influence colleagues?

[Read more [here](#)] “Schumer said that while he is opposing the deal, which would curb Iran’s nuclear program in exchange for billions of dollars in sanctions relief, **he signaled that he wouldn’t lobby hard against the accord.**

“There are some who believe that I can force my colleagues to vote my way,’ he said. ‘While I will certainly share my view and try to persuade them that the vote to disapprove is the right one, in my experience with matters of conscience and great consequence like this, each member ultimately comes to their own conclusion.’”

[Read qualifying view [here](#)] “Schumer became an instant hero to those who disdain the Iran deal, and rightly so, but some people wanted more. Why did Chuck say that he was only acting on his own behalf? Why did he say that he would not, repeat not, rally his fellow Democrats to his side?

Well, what more can we possibly want? Schumer still has to live in the real world. He still has to caucus with members of his own Party. He still has to do lunch with the President – the leader of his Party, the leader of his country. Too much lobbying would be rubbing it in. Schumer has done plenty as it is. He should not be made to answer for what he is not doing.”

Excerpts from *Politico* indicating Schumer will not lobby colleagues. Full article is [here](#).

Chuck Schumer working the phones on Iran

[He calls colleagues to explain his decision and assure them he will not be whipping opposition.](#)

By JOHN BRESNAHAN 8/11/15

With liberal groups furious over his opposition to the Iran nuclear deal, Sen. Chuck Schumer has been quietly reaching out to dozens of his colleagues to explain his decision and assure them he would not be whipping opposition to the deal, according to Democratic senators and aides.

...In these conversations, Schumer has been walking through his position on the Iran agreement, the product of lengthy negotiations between the leading world powers and the Iranian government.

Schumer, though, is not lobbying his colleagues to vote against the agreement when the Senate takes up a “resolution of disapproval” next month, several undecided senators said during interviews. The disapproval resolution is expected to win the 60 votes needed to overcome any Democratic filibuster.

The real question, however, is whether President Barack Obama can rally the 34 senators he needs to uphold a veto of the resolution. Right now, the Senate vote is too close to call, although Obama’s support for a veto override appears more solid among House Democrats, with three more coming out on Tuesday in favor of the agreement.

...Schumer’s opposition to the Iran deal also does not seem to have had any impact on his standing as the presumptive Democratic leader-in-waiting. Support for Schumer inside the Democratic Caucus remains strong, despite longstanding complaints about him from the progressive wing of the party.

...“He understands that this a tough call,” [Sen. Claire] McCaskill said of Schumer. “He’s gonna respect everyone’s decision.”

...“Some say the only answer to this is war. I don’t believe so,” Schumer told reporters, reiterating some of the points he raised in a long statement released Thursday night. “I believe we should go back and try to get a better deal,” he added. “The nations of the world should join us in that.”

How Chuck Schumer could sink the Iran nuclear deal

Updated by Max Fisher on August 5, 2015



Chuck Schumer.

Chip Somodevilla/Getty Images

Officially, Barack Obama is still the president of the United States, but watching the politics around the Iran nuclear deal, you might get the impression that Sen. Chuck Schumer is leading the free world this week.

The reason is this: Schumer has become perhaps the most important person in deciding whether the Iran deal can get past Congress. If two-thirds or more of each house of Congress votes to oppose the Iran deal, that would kill it. If they don't, the deal will proceed.

That means the vote is effectively decided by a relatively small number of Democrats who could vote either way. Of those swing votes, Schumer is probably the most important and most influential. He is a pro-Israel Democrat from New York. He is also very important in both his party and in the Senate, where he will take over as Democratic leader after 2016.

So what Schumer does here matters a great deal. He insists he is still undecided, but there are plenty of tea leaves to read suggesting he has already made up his mind (the tea leaves, as they often do, offer contradictory guidance on which way he'll vote). Here's why Chuck Schumer is your de facto president on the Iran deal for the moment, what it means, and what we know about how he'll vote.

Why Chuck decides

Congress, my colleague Andrew Prokop has written, will probably not kill the Iran deal. It would require a lot of Democrats to vote against their president on his legacy foreign policy achievement, which is possible but seems unlikely.

So assume that the most likely, default scenario is that Congress makes a big deal out of passing a measure formally disapproving of the Iran deal. Obama will veto it, and then Congress will fail to secure the necessary two-thirds majority to override his veto.

This way, Congress doesn't have to own the nuclear deal ("we voted against it!"), thus allowing them to avoid any blame if the deal turns out to be a disaster. But they can also avoid killing the deal, which would require them to take the blame for any consequences that causes.

The whole thing is perfectly constructed to give Congress just enough of a role to avoid political blame without requiring substantive foreign policy contributions. However, there is one way in which those incentives might

get screwy: If it starts to look like Congress is going to get the two-thirds majority to kill the deal after all, and if it looks like killing the deal will become politically popular, then lawmakers will have an incentive to join the "winning side" and vote against the deal.

If it does happen, the road to such an outcome almost certainly runs through Chuck Schumer's office. Schumer turning against the Iran deal is probably the one thing that would be most likely to open a floodgate of Democratic opposition.

How Chuck could make or break the Iran deal

If Schumer votes to oppose the deal, that will send a signal to other Democrats that it's safe for them to oppose the deal as well. Somewhat freed from the bonds of party loyalty, many might do that, especially in the Senate; the deal is controversial, and no one wants to take the blame if it falls apart or becomes politically toxic.

A Schumer "no" vote would also make it harder for Democrats to take a stand in support of the deal. Schumer has strong "pro-Israel" credentials. If this prominent Democrat comes out and declares the deal bad for Israel, other Democrats are going to feel pressure not to contradict him.

A Schumer endorsement of the deal would have the opposite effect. Other Democratic senators are going to be less likely to defy both their president *and* their soon-to-be Senate leadership. Schumer's pro-Israel credentials make it easier for Dems to support the deal and position themselves as pro-Israel as well. And the fact that he has held out his decision for so long — thus positioning himself as the cautious skeptic — means that if he ultimately comes around, the political narrative will be "even well-known Iran deal skeptic Chuck Schumer is convinced." That will provide some real political momentum.

In either scenario, this really boils down to two issues: political taboos (you don't defy your president on a major issue ... unless everyone is doing it) and inevitability (people will want to avoid a politically painful vote against the crowd). Schumer, more than anyone, can set both of those.

'How Chuck Schumer Could Sink the Iran Nuclear Deal' on Vox website continues [here](#).

It's Not Just Iran's Hardliners Saying 'Death to America'

Obama said Iranian hardliners and Republicans have common cause opposing the deal. Take a look at what Iran's "moderates" are saying.

BY RYAN MAURO

Sun, August 9, 2015



U.S. President Barack Obama speaking on Iran (Screenshot from video)

President Obama [condescendingly blasted](#) opponents of the Iran deal as war-mongers who inflate threats and have "made common cause" with Iranians chanting "Death to America" who also oppose the deal. Well, guess what the Iranian leaders who *support the deal* are saying?

"Death to America."

Here's what President Obama said on August 5:

"In fact, it's those hardliners who are most comfortable with the status quo. It's those hardliners chanting 'Death to America' who have been most opposed to the deal. They're making common cause with the Republican Caucus."

These inflammatory lines are an insult that imply two dangerous falsehoods: One, that there are moderate Iranian regime leaders who don't chant "Death to America" and, two, that these moderates—like President Obama—are being challenged by political extremists.

If the deal's supporters are so concerned about the "Death to America" chants of the deal's Iranian opponents, let's take a look at what the deal's Iranian *supporters* say—those who, by President Obama's standard, have made common cause with his administration:

"Saying 'Death to America' is easy. We need to express 'Death to America' with action." – “Moderate” [Iranian President Hassan Rouhani](#), May 2013; deal supporter.

"Of course, yes, Death to America." -- Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei, [March 2015](#); deal supporter.

"Our policies toward the arrogant government of the United States will not be changed at all." –Iranian Supreme Leader Khamenei, [July 2015](#), (statement made after the deal was announced).

"If a day comes when the world of Islam is duly equipped with the arms Israel has in possession, the strategy of colonialism would face a stalemate because application of an atomic bomb would not leave anything in Israel but the same thing would just produce damages in the Muslim world." --"Moderate" former Iranian President Rafsanjani, [December 2001](#); deal supporter.

Democracies require voters and their leaders to have honest— even if heated — dialogue about the issues. The dialogue must include facts and logic from different points-of-view. The entire country suffers when policy is influenced by consciously-crafted falsehoods like the one above and undue accusations of malice and idiocy.

The debate about the Iran deal has intelligent, well-meaning advocates on both sides. It should be passed or rejected based on its true merits.

It's Not Just Iran's Hardliners Saying 'Death to America' on *Clarion* website [here](#).

Excerpts from *Jerusalem Post* article about Iran threat to U.S. Read full article [here](#).

Obama's enemies list

By CAROLINE B. GLICK August 6, 2015

Today Iran is harming America directly in multiple ways.



Photo by: OFFICIAL WHITE HOUSE/PETE SOUZA

...So the real question lawmakers need to ask is whether the deal is good for America. Is Obama right or wrong that only partisan zealots and disloyal Zionists could oppose his great diplomatic achievement? To determine the answer to that question, you need to ask another one. Does his deal make America safer or less safe? The best way to answer that question is to consider all the ways Iran threatens America today, and ask whether the agreement has no impact on those threats, or whether it mitigates or aggravates them.

...The most graphic way Iran is harming America today is by holding four Americans hostage. Iran's decision not to release them over the course of negotiations indicates that at a minimum, the deal hasn't helped them.

It doesn't take much consideration to recognize that the hostages in Iran are much worse off today than they were before Obama concluded the deal on July 14.

The US had much more leverage to force the Iranians to release the hostages before it signed the deal than it does now. Now, not only do the Iranians have no reason to release the hostages, they have every reason to take more hostages.

Then there is Iranian-sponsored terrorism against the US.

In 2011, the FBI foiled an Iranian plot to murder the Saudi ambassador in Washington and bomb the Saudi and Israeli embassies in the US capital.

One of the terrorists set to participate in the attack allegedly penetrated US territory through the Mexican border.

The terrorist threat to the US emanating from Iran's terrorist infrastructure in Latin America will rise steeply as a consequence of the nuclear deal.

As The Wall Street Journal's Mary Anastasia O'Grady wrote last month, the sanctions relief the deal provides to Iran will enable it to massively expand its already formidable operations in the US's backyard. Over the past two decades, Iran and Hezbollah have built up major presences in Cuba, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Ecuador and Bolivia.

Iran's presence in Latin America also constitutes a strategic threat to US national security. Today Iran can use its bases of operations in Latin

America to launch an electromagnetic pulse attack on the US from a ballistic missile, a satellite or even a merchant ship.

The US military is taking active steps to survive such an attack, which would destroy the US's power grid. Among other things, it is returning the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) to its former home in Cheyenne Mountain outside Colorado Springs.

But Obama has ignored the findings of the congressional EMP Commission and has failed to harden the US electronic grid to protect it from such attacks.

The economic and human devastation that would be caused by the destruction of the US electric grid is almost inconceivable. And now with the cash infusion that will come Iran's way from Obama's nuclear deal, it will be free to expand on its EMP capabilities in profound ways.

Through its naval aggression in the Strait of Hormuz Iran threatens the global economy. While the US was negotiating the nuclear deal with Iran, the Revolutionary Guards unlawfully interdicted – that is hijacked – the Marshall Islands-flagged Maersk Tigris and held its crew hostage for weeks.

Iran's assault on the Tigris came just days after the US-flagged Maersk Kensington was surrounded and followed by Revolutionary Guards ships until it fled the strait.

A rational take-home message the Iranians can draw from the nuclear deal is that piracy pays.

Their naval aggression in the Strait of Hormuz was not met by American military force, but by American strategic collapse at Vienna.

This is doubly true when America's listless response to Iran's plan to use its Houthi proxy's takeover of Yemen to control the Bab el-Mandab strait is taken into consideration. With the Bab el-Mandab, Iran will control all

maritime traffic from the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. Rather than confront this clear and present danger to the global economy, America abandoned all its redlines in the nuclear talks.

Then there is Iran's partnership 20-year partnership with al-Qaida.

The 9/11 Commission found in its report that four of the 9/11 terrorists transited Iran before traveling to the US. As former Defense Intelligence Agency director Lt.-Gen. (ret.) Mike Flynn told Fox News in the spring, Iranian cooperation with al-Qaida remains deep and strategic.

When the US Navy SEALs killed Osama bin Laden in 2011, they seized hard drives containing more than a million documents related to al-Qaida operations. All but a few dozen remain classified.

According to Flynn and other US intelligence officials who spoke to The Weekly Standard, the documents expose Iran's vast collaboration with al-Qaida.

The agreement Obama concluded with the mullahs gives a tailwind to Iran. Iran's empowerment will undoubtedly be used to expand its use of al-Qaida terrorists as proxies in their joint war against the US.

Then there is Iran's ballistic missile program.

The UN Security Council resolution passed two weeks ago cancels the UN-imposed embargoes on conventional arms and ballistic missile acquisitions by Iran. Since the nuclear deal facilitates Iranian development of advanced nuclear technologies that will enable the mullahs to build nuclear weapons freely when the deal expires, the Security Council resolution means that by the time the deal expires, Iran will have the nuclear warheads and the intercontinental ballistic missiles required to carry out a nuclear attack on the US.

Obama said Wednesday that if Congress votes down his nuclear deal, “we will lose... America’s credibility as a leader of diplomacy. America’s credibility,” he explained, “is the anchor of the international system.”

Unfortunately, Obama got it backwards. **It is the deal that destroys America’s credibility and so upends the international system which has rested on that credibility for the past 70 years.**

The White House’s dangerous suppression of seized al-Qaida-Iran documents, like its listless response to Iran’s maritime aggression, its indifference to Iran’s massive presence in Latin America, its lackluster response to Iran’s terrorist activities in Latin America, and its belittlement of the importance of the regime’s stated goal to destroy America – not to mention its complete collapse on all its previous redlines over the course of the negotiations – are all signs of the disastrous toll the nuclear deal has already taken on America’s credibility, and indeed on US national security.

To defend a policy that empowers Iran, the administration has no choice but to serve as Iran’s agent. The deal destroys America’s credibility in fighting terrorism. By legitimizing and enriching the most prolific state sponsor of terrorism, the US has made a mockery of its claimed commitment to the fight.

The deal destroys the US’s credibility as an ally.

By serving as apologists for its worst enemy, the US has shown its allies that they cannot trust American security guarantees. How can Israel or Saudi Arabia trust America to defend them when it is endangering itself? The deal destroys 70 years of US nonproliferation efforts. By enabling Iran to become a nuclear power, the US has made a mockery of the very notion of nonproliferation and caused a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

The damage caused by the deal is already being felt. For instance, Europe, Russia and China are already beating a path to the ayatollahs' doorstep to sign commercial and military deals with the regime.

But if Congress defeats the deal, it can mitigate the damage. By killing the deal, Congress will demonstrate that the American people are not ready to go down in defeat. They can show that the US remains committed to its own defense and the rebuilding of its strategic credibility worldwide.

Obama wishes to convince the public that the deal's opponents are either partisan extremists or traitors who care about Israel more than they care about America. But neither claim is true. The main reason Americans should oppose the deal is that it endangers America. And as a consequence, Americans who oppose the deal are neither partisans nor turncoats.

They are patriots.

Read more on ZOA's website [here](#).

ZOA: Pres. Obama Falsely Claims Deal "Permanently" Stops Iranian Nukes, Only Iranian "Hardliners Chanting 'Death to America,' Only Israel Objects To Agreement

Obama Doesn't Mention Americans Oppose Deal By 2 To 1

NEW YORK, August 10, 2015 — The Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) has noted that, in his speech this week at the American University in defense of his nuclear deal with Iran, President Barack Obama falsely claimed that Iran was under a "permanent" prohibition on nuclear weapons. This contradicts what he himself has admitted as possible, namely that, in 13-15 years, "the breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero." President Obama also falsely claimed that that Iranian extremists who chanted 'Death to America' at Iranian rallies were those opposed to deal, not those who negotiated it -- surely a surprise to President Hasan Rouhani, who both negotiated the deal and led chants of 'Death to America' at recent rallies after signing the agreement. He also falsely claimed that only the Israeli government is opposed to this nuclear deal, when in fact many Middle Eastern governments have expressed alarm. Additionally, President Obama smeared his Congressional opponents of this deal as being in league with elements in the Iranian

hierarchy who were critical of the deal, insultingly suggesting that these Iranians should "caucus with the Republicans."

The ZOA has provided the following critique of President Barack Obama's speech in defense of the Iranian nuclear deal his Administration negotiated. President Obama's most important mis-statements follow below, with the ZOA's critique following:

The nuclear deal "permanently prohibits Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon"

ZOA: Untrue. By his own admission in an interview in April, President Obama [admitted](#) as a "relevant fear" that, as a consequence of the Lausanne framework deal prefiguring the actually deal signed in Vienna that we now have, "In year 13, 14, 15 [from this year], they have advanced centrifuges that enrich uranium fairly rapidly, and at that point the breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero." Such a scenario obviously doesn't preclude Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon; at best it delays it, assuming Iran complies with the agreement.

"It cuts off all of Iran's pathways to a bomb. It contains the most comprehensive inspection and verification regime ever negotiated to monitor a nuclear program":

ZOA: Untrue. Inspections are limited to certain declared sites, military sites are off-limits, unknown sites are of course subject to no inspection at all. Inspection of violations at these limited number of sites can occur only after 24 days, perhaps more, permitting Iran to scrub evidence of violations, which are not merely a matter of nuclear material that President Obama has said cannot be concealed, but machinery, technology, etc. related to nuclear weapons. In any case, inspections regimes, even when far more comprehensive than this,

often fail. If, during 1990-2003, the UN Security Council couldn't enforce a genuinely intrusive regime of unfettered inspections, anywhere, anytime, without prior notice, backed by a Security Council-sanctioned threatened and sometimes actual use of force in the case of Saddam's Iraq, what confidence can we have that it will be able to do so with Iran, which is not subject to any such apparatus of inspections and force?

For the Congress to reject this deal would mean to block it "over the objection of the vast majority of the world"; "every nation in the world that has commented publicly, with the exception of the Israeli government, has expressed support":

ZOA: The weasel words here are "commented publicly". Many Sunni Arab states have been **privately** critical of Obama's policy towards Iran for years. As cables exposed by Wikileaks have demonstrated, [many Sunni Arab leaders have been privately expressing alarm](#) for years that the U.S. has not acted to stop Iran's nuclear program. Last week, following the conclusion of the Iran deal in Vienna, former Saudi intelligence chief and former ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar, reportedly [suggested](#) that "President Obama is knowingly making a bad deal, while President Bill Clinton had made a deal with North Korea with the best intentions and the best information he had. The new deal will 'wreak havoc' in the Middle East, which is already destabilized due to Iranian actions ... [had President Clinton known otherwise] I am absolutely confident he would not have made that decision ... [In the case of Iran] the strategic foreign policy analysis, the national intelligence information, and America's allies in the region's intelligence all predict not only the same outcome of the North Korean nuclear deal but worse -- with the billions of dollars that Iran will have access to." [President Obama has prevailed on the Gulf Arab states now to publicly cease their objections](#) so he could plausibly claim in his speech this week that

only Israel objects to the deal, but no-one believes that the long-standing opposition and apprehension over President Obama's policy towards Iran expressed by Saudi, Egyptian, Bahraini, United Arab Emirates and Qatari leaders has actually changed. Moreover, this agreement is opposed by the American public -- [by a rate of 2 to 1, according to a recent Quinnipiac poll](#); it also likely lacks a majority in the U.S. Congress. President Obama's dishonest attempt to isolate Israel as a sole, spoiling objector maligns Israel, the prime target of an Iranian nuclear weapon, as a warmonger, given his effort to cast opponents as favoring war -- something that is now more likely as a result of this disastrous agreement.

Even before taking office, I made clear that Iran would not be allowed to acquire a nuclear weapon on my watch, and it's been my policy throughout my presidency to keep all options, including possible military options, on the table to achieve that objective":

ZOA: The weasel words here are "on my watch," since Iran will not be a nuclear power by the time President Obama leaves office. However, President Obama continually committed himself to doing "everything, everything" to ensure Iran not obtain a nuclear weapon. Yet this deal permits Iran to maintain intact all the essential elements of its nuclear weapons program -- centrifuges, enriched uranium, underground nuclear sites, nuclear research and development, Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) research and development -- while discarding his own previously stated requirements for full, unfettered inspections of all suspected nuclear sites, Iranian accounting of past clandestine nuclear weapons activities, and maintaining all non-nuclear sanctions. Contrary, to his words in this speech, he has also discarded the military option which he claims is still there, saying in an interview that "the best way to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon is a verifiable, tough agreement. A military solution will not fix it, even if the United States

participates. It would temporarily slow down an Iranian nuclear program, but it will not eliminate it." Of course, this agreement also does no more than merely delay Iran getting a bomb -- assuming it actually complies.

"Just because Iranian hardliners chant 'Death to America' does not mean that that's what all Iranians believe. In fact, it's those hardliners who are most comfortable with the status quo. It's those hardliners chanting 'Death to America' who have been most opposed to the deal. They're making common cause with the Republican Caucus":

ZOA: This is completely untrue. The whole Iranian hierarchy, not just certain 'hardline' factions, including those who signed the deal, have called for 'Death to America.' President Rouhani himself [attended](#) the 'Death to America' rally that followed the signing of this nuclear deal. This should not be a surprise; as long ago as 1995, Rouhani, the phony 'moderate' [said](#) that "The beautiful cry of 'Death to America' unites our nation. In 2013, Rouhani, campaigning for the Iranian presidency, said. "Saying 'Death to America' is easy ... We need to express 'Death to America' with action. Saying it, is easy." It is with such phony moderates that President Obama has signed a deal giving Iran a pathway to nuclear weapons. While it is perfectly true that the Iranian public does not necessarily share its leaders' fanatical hatred of America, Iran is not a democracy and moderate Iranians have no means to sway the regime in the direction of peace and non-aggression.

Excerpts from *Bloomberg View* article follow. Full article is [here](#).



Top French Official Contradicts Kerry on Iran Deal

JUL 30, 2015

By [Josh Rogin](#)

Secretary of State John Kerry has been painting an [apocalyptic picture](#) of what would happen if Congress killed the Iran nuclear deal. Among other things, he has warned that “our friends in this effort will desert us.” But the top national security official from one of those nations involved in the negotiations, France, has a totally different view: He told two senior U.S. lawmakers that he thinks a Congressional no vote might actually be helpful.

His analysis is already having an effect on how members of Congress, especially House Democrats, are thinking about the deal.

... [He] also directly disputed Kerry's claim that a Congressional rejection of the Iran deal would result in the worst of all worlds, the collapse of sanctions and Iran racing to the bomb without restrictions.

"He basically said, if Congress votes this down, there will be some saber-rattling and some chaos for a year or two, but in the end nothing will change and Iran will come back to the table to negotiate again and that would be to our advantage," Sanchez told me in an interview. "He thought if the Congress voted it down, that we could get a better deal"...

...Audibert's comments as recounted by the lawmakers are a direct rebuttal to Kerry, who in remarks to the [Council on Foreign Relations](#) on July 24 said that if Congress voted down the deal, there would no chance to restart negotiations in search of a tougher pact. Kerry also said that Congressional rejection of the Iran deal would erode the U.S. credibility to strike any type of international agreement in the future. "Do you think the Ayatollah is going to come back to the table if Congress refuses this and negotiate again? Do you think that they're going to sit there and other people in the world are going to say, hey, let's go negotiate with the United States, they have 535 secretaries of State?" Kerry said. "I mean, please."

This argument is being echoed by a throng of U.S. [commentators](#) and former [Obama administration officials](#) who support the deal. They all say that if the Congress doesn't lift U.S. sanctions, the rest of the international regime will

collapse and allied countries will rush to do business in Iran. That would make the U.S. sanctions moot and put U.S. businesses at a disadvantage, the argument goes...

...Audibert disagrees with that analysis, too, according to the two lawmakers. He told them that if U.S. sanctions were kept in place, it would effectively prevent the West from doing extensive business in Iran. "I asked him specifically what the Europeans would do, and his comment was that the way the U.S. sanctions are set in, he didn't see an entity or a country going against them, that the risk was too high," Sanchez said.

Audibert also wasn't happy with some of the terms of the deal itself, according to Sanchez and Turner. He said he thought it should have been negotiated to last forever, not start to expire in as few as 10 years. He also said he didn't understand why Iran needed more than 5,000 centrifuges for a peaceful nuclear program. He also expressed concerns about the robustness of the inspections and verification regime under the deal, according to the lawmakers...

...While the chances of Congress voting down the deal and then overriding a presidential veto are slim, they are not negligible: Many Democrats, including Sanchez, remain on the fence. They are scrutinizing it and examining the administration's claims one by one. Now, one top French official has sent them a strong message that there could be better alternatives.