

Congressional / Israeli Determination to Block Iran Nuclear Deal

By <u>Stephen Lendman</u> Global Research, April 08, 2015 Region: <u>Middle East & North Africa</u> In-depth Report: <u>Nuclear War</u>

Bipartisan congressional hardliners, Israel and its Lobby intend going all-out to undermine a final deal on Iran's known peaceful nuclear program.

On April 6, AIPAC manufactured what it called "significant concerns" about framework terms agreed on.

It claimed "(t)he emerging deal could leave Iran as a nuclear threshold state and encourage a Mideast nuclear arms race."

It calls the best deal none at all – or one depriving Iran of its legitimate right to develop and use nuclear power the same as dozens of other nations not criticized.

AIPAC claims "profound national security implications" are at stake. "Congress must have a role."

"Iran's leaders cannot be trusted. Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terror, which it continues to promote on a global basis."

"It has lied and cheated under its Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) obligations for three decades..."

It's "buil(t) a whole nuclear infrstructure clandestinely. (It's) actively cheating."

It "refuse(s) to answer the IAEA's questions about its efforts to weaponize ... "

It "refuse(s) access to IAEA inspectors...(It) continues its illicit activity of importing sensitive nuclear technology...Until Iran comes clean, (it) can't be trusted.

Fact: AIPAC's rant makes bad fiction look good.

Fact: It repeatedly and systematically lies about Iran's legitimate nuclear program.

Fact: It's totally silent about Israel's illicit one - a nuclear outlaw state maintaining a formidable thermonuclear arsenal.

Fact: Iran's legal nuclear program threatens no one.

Fact: Congress has no right to serve imperial Israeli interests at the expense of legitimate Iranian ones – or those of any other nation.

Fact: Nothing whatever suggests Iran can't be trusted.

Fact: Claims about Iranian sponsored terror are Big Lies.

Fact: So are bogus accusations of violating NPT provisions.

Fact: No Iranian clandestine nuclear infrastructure exists.

Fact: Its facilities are the world's most intensively monitored.

Fact: It fully cooperates with IAEA inspectors.

Fact: Israel refuses to come clean on its program. Inspections are strictly prohibited.

Fact: Iran absolutely can and should be trusted – not Israel or America, known nuclear outlaws threatening world peace.

Media reports indicate Israeli officials and many congressional members intend going all-out to undermine a final Iranian nuclear deal by June 30.

So-called concerns about Tehran's pathway to a bomb hold no water whatever. Malicious propaganda manufactures Big Lies.

Netanyahu absurdly claims Lausanne terms "threaten the survival of Israel" – increasing the risk of a "horrific war."

Only if Israel or America launches it. On Monday, Israeli strategic affairs minister Yuval Steinitz said the "military option" against Iran still exists.

"It was on the table. It's still on the table. It's going to remain on the stable," he stressed.

Despite no Iranian threat whatever (now, earlier or ahead), Steinitz blustered:

"Israel should be able to defend itself, by itself, against any threat. And it's our right and duty to decide how to defend ourselves, especially if our national security and even very existence is under threat."

Any deal with Iran "has to be made on the assumption that (it) may violate it."

Steinitz listed demands he and likeminded Israeli hardliners insist on, including:

- ending Iran's (nonexistent) nuclear weapons R&D activities;
- greatly reducing numbers of centrifuges more than P5+1 countries and Iran agreed on;
- closing Fordow located underground within a mountain for protection against possible US or Israel attacks;
- complete disclosure of Iran's past nuclear work;
- removing Iran's entire enriched uranium stockpile from the country; and
- letting IAEA inspectors monitor any Iranian nuclear or other facilities any time at

their discretion.

Obliging Israel would require entirely reworking terms agreed on – something P5+1 countries and Iran reject.

Steinitz claims Israeli military and intelligence officials identified what he called 10 "unanswered questions."

They include doubts about Iran observing what it agreed to, how quickly sanctions could be reinstated if backtracking occurs, and eventual more advanced centrifuges reducing breakout time to a bomb to three or four months.

"All of our experts are united in their opposition to this bad deal," Steinitz blustered.

Former IAEA deputy director-general/Zionist hardliner Olli Heinonen lied claiming Lausanne terms let Iran remain "a threshold breakout nuclear state for the next 10 years."

After that, things get worse, he added. The deal will encourage other regional countries to strengthen their own nuclear programs, he claimed.

Heinonen and likeminded Zionist zealots want Iran isolated, weakened and eliminated as an Israeli regional political rival.

They want its government toppled. They want Big Oil able to exploit Iranian resources freely.

Obama said military action remains an option he'll consider if Iran backtracks on nuclear deal terms reached.

Deputy National Security Advisor Ben Rhodes indicated the same thing, saying:

"Certainly, if Iran violates the agreement, all options are on the table related to Iran, including military options."

On Monday, senior Democrat Senator Chuck Schumer said he'll back legislation giving Congress vetting power over any final nuclear deal reached – what Obama strongly opposes.

His support appears to give the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act (NWFI) a veto-proof Senate margin. House members overwhelmingly support it.

Enactment could be a deal-breaker. Congress won't support what Israel and its Lobby reject.

Whether a Security Council resolution supported by P5+1 countries can overcome their damage remains to be seen.

Resolving things responsibly with Iran (short-term at least) hangs in the balance.

Longer-term is an entirely different story given deep-rooted US anti-Iranian sentiment and America's notorious history of breaching virtually all treaties, conventions, deals and core international laws.

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net.

His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III." <u>http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html</u> Visit his blog site at <u>sjlendman.blogspot.com</u>. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © <u>Stephen Lendman</u>, Global Research, 2015

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: <u>Stephen</u> <u>Lendman</u>	About the author:
	Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III." http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting- edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca