

AIPAC: Anti-Iranian Propaganda at Congress

By [David Swanson](#)

Global Research, July 16, 2015

[Let's Try Democracy](#)

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [Military Militarization](#)
and [WMD](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

Here's AIPAC's statement:

"AIPAC Statement on Proposed Iran Nuclear Agreement

"AIPAC has consistently supported diplomatic efforts to end Iran's nuclear weapons program,"

Except when lobbying for ever greater sanctions that would have blocked the negotiations, and even for a US commitment to jump into any Israeli-Iranian war. Here's a [brief history](#) in the form of activist opposition to AIPAC.

"and we appreciate the commitment and dedication of President Obama and his administration throughout these negotiations. Unfortunately, this proposed agreement fails to halt Iran's nuclear quest."

There is no evidence of Iran pursuing a nuclear weapon. Gareth Porter makes this clear in his [book](#) *Manufactured Crisis*.

"Instead, it would facilitate rather than prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and would further entrench and empower the leading state sponsor of terror."

There is no evidence re the leading state sponsor slur, but let's not get distracted by it. How do tougher inspections than ever faced by any country FACILITATE anything other than Iran's ability to refute slander and libel? The inspections worked in Iraq. Inspections work very well. The only reason anything is missing from these inspections is past US resistance to universal standards that would have required the US to face surprise inspections itself, and [U.S. abuse of inspections in Iraq](#) to spy on and seek to overthrow the Iraqi government.

"During these negotiations, we outlined criteria for a good deal that Congress itself had set in five critical areas: inspections, possible military dimensions, sanctions, duration, and dismantlement. In each of these areas, the proposed agreement has significant flaws:

"-The proposed deal does not ensure "anytime, anywhere" short-notice inspections;"

After you, sir. Let Israel and/or the United States submit. Make it standard. Make a public commitment not to overthrow the Iranian government. Again. Then tell Iran to submit to this.

“-The proposed deal does not clearly condition sanctions relief on full Iranian cooperation in satisfying International Atomic Energy Agency concerns over the possible military dimensions of Tehran’s program;

“-The proposed deal lifts sanctions as soon as the agreement commences, rather than gradually as Iran demonstrates sustained adherence to the agreement;

“-The proposed deal lifts key restrictions in as few as eight years;”

Some things take more time, but they all begin right away.

“-The proposed deal would disconnect and store centrifuges in an easily reversible manner, but it requires no dismantlement of centrifuges or any Iranian nuclear facility.”

This is a problem in every state with nuclear energy.

“In return for this flawed agreement, Iran will receive over \$100 billion in sanctions relief. Tehran will use these funds to fuel its hegemonic ambitions, support the killing of civilians in Syria, fund the terrorist organizations Hamas and Hezbollah, and spur deadly conflicts throughout the region.”

Prove it. Never mind that Israel is murdering people in Syria on a retail and wholesale basis, and the U.S. the same. These things are illegal. They haven’t proven a sufficient basis to stop selling weapons to Saudi Arabia or giving them to Israel. They need to be handled but shouldn’t be used to wreck this deal.

“This agreement not only fails to achieve its objectives in the nuclear arena, but it releases Tehran in a matter of years—regardless of Iranian behavior—from ballistic missile sanctions and an arms embargo imposed by the United Nations Security Council. This late, unexpected concession will provide additional arms for terrorism and proxy wars, while strengthening Iran’s capabilities against our regional allies.”

Iran

Has never had nuclear weapons

Is not violating the nonproliferation treaty

Spends \$24b total, \$303/capita on military

Has 0 foreign bases and has started 0 wars in centuries

Has never overthrown U.S. government

USA

Has 7,200 nukes

Violates the NPT by not disarming, by building more, and by sharing with other nations

Spends \$648b total, \$2,057/capita on military

Has >800 foreign bases in >70 countries and has invaded >70 countries in past 70 years

Overthrew Iranian democracy in 1953 to install dictator

If Israel and/or the United States were to propose a WMD-free Middle East and/or impose a region-wide arms embargo, I guarantee you Iran would go for it. In the meantime, the kettle may not listen to the pot.

"This accord threatens the future of the nuclear non-proliferation regime. By leaving Iran on the threshold of a nuclear weapon—despite its history of violating international obligations—other countries in the region will have a dangerous incentive to initiate their own nuclear programs. The resulting nuclear arms race would severely destabilize the region."

For godsake, Israel is in blatant violation of the NPT except that it's never even joined it. The US joined it and blatantly violates it. Iran is in compliance, and the inspections regime was intended to accomplish just what this deal accomplishes. Resulting nuclear arms race?! That's the work of the U.S. and Israel and of all the Gulf dictatorships now building nuclear energy.

"Proponents of the proposed agreement will argue that the only alternative to this agreement is military conflict. In fact, the reverse is true. A bad agreement such as this will invite instability and nuclear proliferation. It will embolden Iran and may encourage regional conflict.

"We strongly believe that the alternative to this bad deal is a better deal. Congress should reject this agreement, and urge the administration to work with our allies to maintain economic pressure on Iran while offering to negotiate a better deal that will truly close off all Iranian paths to a nuclear weapon.

"Congress should insist on a better deal."

Demanding a deal you'll never get is how wars have been started through history, including in Yugoslavia in the 1990s, not to mention the demand that Iraq hand over the WMD it

didn't have. We're not falling for it again, guys.

The original source of this article is [Let's Try Democracy](#)
Copyright © [David Swanson](#), [Let's Try Democracy](#), 2015

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [David Swanson](#)

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