

WaPo Editorial Explains why Bibi Should Speak on March 3rd to Congress and the American People



US Secretary of State Kerry and Iranian Foreign Minister
Zarof, Geneva 1-14-15

Source: Terraizini/AP

Late last night, Cliff May, President of Washington, DC- based Foundation for Defense of America sent out this important editorial, "[The emerging Iran nuclear deal raises major concerns](#)". May headlined this making points you've been hearing from FDD for a long time, and demonstrating that even pro-negotiations centrists have now come to believe that President Obama is about to make a mistake of historic proportions. I headlined an email sent out to my private lists, "The Emerging Iran nuclear deal raises major concerns. It should explain why Bibi should speak on March 3rd to both Congress and the American people." Yisrael Medad of [My Right Word](#) blog in Israel also sent out the WaPo editorial with this line, " ...by the time Bibi gets to Washington, there'll be standing room only". Imre Herzog in Geneva wrote to his international Zionist list, saying, "Excellent editorial and I really hope the Democrats will wake up". [Dr. Rich Swier](#) of the eponymous eMagazine here in Florida wrote back saying 'this is very very bad'.

Doubtless here will be more news later this month about what's inside the negotiating package. Indications are that the intense weekly sessions between Secretary of State Kerry and

Iran's Foreign Minister Zarif reflect bilateral discussions that the rest of the P5+1 will be confronted with to accept as final agreement terms just before the March 24th date. In the meantime, the American Jewish community is divided on the issue of Bibi's speech to a joint session of Congress on March 3rd. Last weekend several Democratic Congressional Representatives pounding on Israeli Ambassador to Washington, Ron Dermer, a Miami native, former Republican strategist and Netanyahu insider in a Philadelphia meeting about the lack of wisdom of Netanyahu's acceptance of House Speaker Boehner's invitation to speak to a Joint Session of Congress. Some Democratic Senators and these and other House Minority members have indicated that they either will be elsewhere engaged, as Vice President Biden intimated. However, in view of today's *Washington Post* editorial , perhaps these Democratic Senators and Congressional representatives had best heed the warnings . The dilemma that American Jews face is allegiance to a President who clearly doesn't have "Israel's back" against the existential threat from Iran's nukes and soon, ICBMs with North Korea's help. These warnings have given heft to the rumblings about the emerging terms of a 'bad deal" waiting to be confirmed in the final terms of the March 24th agreement between the P5+1 and the Islamic Republic. All with the backing of the Obama Administration seeking to provide this as legacy to America, Israel and the World caught up confronting the Islamic State threat roiling the Middle East and the West. The WaPo editorial analysis of the bad deal being fashioned in those weekly talks between Kerry and Zarif may not bode well for Democratic prospects in 2016.

Here is the Washington Post View, "[The emerging Iran nuclear deal raises major concerns](#):"

By Editorial Board February 5

AS THE Obama administration pushes to complete a nuclear

accord with Iran, numerous members of Congress, former secretaries of state and officials of allied governments are expressing concern about the contours of the emerging deal. Though we have long supported negotiations with Iran as well as the [outlined by Mr. Kissinger offered assurances](#) to Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei that the two countries have shared interests in the region, and the White House has avoided actions Iran might perceive as hostile – such as supporting military action against the Syrian regime of Bashar al-Assad.

For their part, the Iranians, as Mr. Kaine put it, “are currently involved in activities to destabilize the governments of [U.S.-allied] nations as near as Bahrain and as far away as Morocco.” A Tehran-sponsored militia recently [suggested in Senate testimony](#) that the administration intends to postpone any congressional vote on a deal indefinitely, while meeting its commitments to Iran by using provisions allowing it to suspend legislatively enacted sanctions. Mr. Blinken conceded that the Iranian parliament would likely vote on any accord but said that Congress should act only “once Iran has demonstrated that it’s making good on its commitments.”

Such a unilateral course by Mr. Obama would alienate even his strongest congressional supporters. It would mean that a deal with Iran could be reversed within months of its completion by the next president. It’s hard to escape the conclusion that Mr. Obama wishes to avoid congressional review because he suspects a bipartisan majority would oppose the deal he is prepared to make. If so, the right response to the questions now being raised is to seek better terms from Iran – or convince the doubters that a deal that blesses and preserves Iran’s nuclear potential is better than the alternatives.