

Geneva interim agreement on Iranian nuclear program / United States should not have signed agreement

< Geneva interim agreement on Iranian nuclear program

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

Position: United States should not have signed agreement

This position addresses the topic Geneva interim agreement on Iranian nuclear program.

For this position

“ The stepping-stone approach to dealing with Iran’s nuclear threat may work, and it may be the only option short of a military strike. But by not requiring a dismantling of its enrichment infrastructure, this first pact allows the Iranians to walk right up to the point of creating a nuclear weapon. Once there, it will be much more challenging to dissuade them from taking the final step. ”

From Iran deal relies too much on trust, by The Detroit News editorial board (*The Detroit News*, November 27, 2013) (view)

“ The deal confirms what Israeli leaders and much of the Israeli public have come to believe about Barack Obama: that he never intended to use military force against Iran, even as a last resort, and that this president will ensure that, sooner or later, Iran becomes the next North Korea. ”

From Israel's Freakout, Explained, by Yossi Klein Halevi (*The New Republic*, November 26, 2013) (view)

“ But for Tehran everything’s coming up roses. As our diplomats claim that the “infrastructure” of sanctions remains intact for at least six months, Asian and European firms are already cutting deals with Iranian counterparts as if the sanctions are gone. Some, in fact, really are. Like the lifted-in-Geneva ban on insuring Iranian ships — a major reason that Iran’s oil exports had screeched to a near halt. Plus, as Tehran’s diplomats contend (and ours deny), the deal “kosherizes” Iran’s uranium enrichment by promising to ultimately let it run “a mutually-defined enrichment program.” ”

From Why the Iran deal infuriates America’s allies, by Benny Avni (*New York Post*, November 26, 2013) (view)

“ After Geneva there will come a new, chaotic Mideast reality in which the United States will lose leverage over enemies and friends alike. What will that look like? Iran will gradually shake free of sanctions and glide into a zone of nuclear ambiguity that will keep its adversaries guessing until it opts to make its capabilities known. Saudi Arabia will move swiftly to acquire a nuclear deterrent from its clients in Islamabad; Saudi billionaire Prince Alwaleed bin Talal made that clear to the Journal last week when he indiscreetly discussed "the arrangement with Pakistan." ”

From *Worse Than Munich*, by Bret Stephens (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 26, 2013) (view)

“ The dreadful fact of life is that any deal that is causing jubilation in the streets of Tehran, but trepidation in the streets of Jerusalem and Riyadh cannot be a good thing. The Saudis have been remarkably quiet thus far, but they know well that allowing Iran to continue any uranium enrichment — and this agreement does that — undercuts previous United Nations efforts to halt enrichment entirely. ”

From *A deal to regret*, by Boston Herald editorial board (*Boston Herald*, November 26, 2013) (view)

“ Don't worry, we are assured. The sanctions relief is reversible. Nonsense. It was extraordinarily difficult to cobble together the current sanctions. It took endless years of overcoming Russian, Chinese and Indian recalcitrance, together with foot-dragging from Europeans making a pretty penny from Iran. Once the relaxation begins, how do you reverse it? ”

From *'Sucker's deal'*, by Charles Krauthammer (*The Washington Post*, November 21, 2013) (view)

“ Perhaps a nuclear armed Iran can be deterred from war, as the Soviet Union was. But for the leaders of the Soviet Union — who as good Communists were atheists — this world is all there is. Iran is run by religious fanatics who think a world war would speed up the return of the Mahdi. Those who love life are deterred more easily than those who love death. But even with the Soviets, at least three times we came perilously close to nuclear war. ”

From *Obama administration oblivious to Iran danger*, by Jack Kelly (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, December 6, 2013) (view)

Against this position

“ A lasting solution is, of course, ultimately the goal, but limited and temporary relief from sanctions may make it easier for the new government of President Hassan Rouhani to persuade Iran's hard-liners and religious leaders to support negotiations toward a permanent deal. ”

From *Iran deal deserves a chance*, by Los Angeles Times editorial board (*Los Angeles Times*, November 26, 2013) (view)

“ Perhaps most importantly, such an agreement, which was achieved under the leadership of the European Union’s minister of foreign affairs between Iran and the P-5-plus-one, has the potential, if implemented and expanded into a permanent accord after six months, to bring Iran back into the family of civilized nations. ”

From *Progress in Iran: Americans should appreciate the initial accord*, by Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial board (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, November 26, 2013) (view)

“ In May of next year, Iran will be further away from being able to build a bomb than it is today. And this achievement is being attacked with the word “appeasement” and references to Munich? Give me a break. In return, the United States and other leading nations have agreed to suspend some minor sanctions that mean a paltry \$7 billion to the Iranian economy. Even if negotiations for a permanent agreement ultimately fail, this is a bargain price for six months of peace — six months, mind you, during which the Iranian nuclear program goes backward, not forward. ”

From *Iran deal is a diplomatic success story*, by Eugene Robinson (*The Washington Post*, November 25, 2013) (view)

“ The definition of a good agreement is one that each side can sell to its public, and that’s the case here. The agreement seems broadly positive for the United States and Israel, at the outer edge of what was possible in terms of freezing the Iranian nuclear program and providing daily inspections to check against any trickery. The world is safer from the Iranian nuclear threat today than it was a week ago. ”

From *To reach Iran deal, secret diplomacy that worked*, by David Ignatius (*The Washington Post*, November 25, 2013) (view)

“ Netanyahu’s worry has been that a partial accord would allow the Iranians to advance their nuclear program while stringing us along in interminable follow-on negotiations. It should be clear that the terms of this agreement prevent them from playing games. President Obama also said, in a televised address Saturday night, that if the Iranians don’t abide by their commitments in the next six months, he will again freeze their overseas funds and impose stiffer sanctions. ”

From *We Have a Deal With Iran. A Good One.*, by Fred Kaplan (*Slate*, November 24, 2013) (view)

“ For Mr. Netanyahu, and for some Israelis, the only correct American relationship with Iran would be war, not talks. War would serve the dual purpose for Israel of having America devote its attention to fighting one of Israel’s proclaimed enemies while not having the time or energy to bother Israel about working out a long-term agreement to share Palestine with the Palestinians. ”

From *Talk beats war: Give the Iranian deal a chance*, by Dan Simpson (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, December 2, 2013) (view)

Mixed on this position

No results

Retrieved from

"https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Geneva_interim_agreement_on_Iranian_nuclear_program/_United_States_should_not_have_signed_agreement&oldid=17069"

This page was last edited on November 26, 2013, at 14:48.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.