

 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**
**IRAN AGREEMENT:
LIBERAL LETTER
WRITER IS CONFUSED!**



 By Stephen L. Bakke
March 26 and April 2, 2015

Here's what provoked me:

A letter of mine was printed and it immediately inspired a scolding by a liberal commentator in a response letter. But the writer missed my point and distorted what I was saying. Actually, I'd almost agree with the writer, except for a few facts which he over looked. But guess what! After I responded to that scolding, it was published, and another letter from the same writer quickly appeared. So, I tried one more time! Following are my two responses to the letter writer.

Here's my first response:

Obama's actions mean an Iran agreement IS NOT a treaty!

Ron Smiley scolded me for suggesting the letter to Iran from the 47 senators was "certainly not treason" (Following the Constitution, 3/26). Actually, I would agree with Smiley if the facts were just a little different.

Smiley is correct that the Senate has a role in establishing international treaties – that of "advice and consent" – with debate on the Senate floor. I agree that it's the President's exclusive role to negotiate treaties.

Smiley missed my point which was: Obama has clearly defined this agreement as something other than a treaty. He's accomplished this by implying he will go to the United Nations with his proposal, thereby not asking the Senate for approval. Therefore it's NOT a treaty. If Obama were going to bring it to the Senate, I would agree with Smiley's assessment.

His criticism of my letter further deteriorates by accusing me of justifying the Senate letter by reference to others who have "meddled" in the past. He again missed my point. I stated that while "meddling is nothing new for either party," ALL such events have been "foolish and unhelpful" – just not treasonous.

Smiley should read reasonable conservative commentary more closely. He may agree more than he'd like to admit!

Here's my response to the second letter from Mr. Smiley:

Iran Agreement: Liberal Letter Writer is Confused!

Two letters criticizing my letters, (Ron Smiley, March 26 and April 2, re: the Senate and the Iran negotiations), dealt with:

- 1) Smiley implies I dredge up the past to justify senators' meddling in the Iran negotiation.
- 2) He asks where in the Constitution does it authorize the Senate to advise a foreign country about anything?
- 3) He claims he was not referring to the negotiation in the context of it being a "treaty."
- 4) He asks what part of the Logan Act is acceptable to break.

Regarding 1 and 2, Mr. Smiley, you misread my words, which were:

"Meddling is nothing new for either party. The senate letter **AND** these events are *foolish and unhelpful*, but certainly not treasonous."

You see, I OPPOSED the Senate letter, AND those earlier examples. Shame on you for overlooking that in the first letter! Shame on the newspaper for editing the words out of my second letter!

Regarding item 3, it's disingenuous to suggest the accusations of treason (to which I was reacting) were in any context other than Constitutional responsibilities re: treaties.

Regarding item 4, your question doesn't apply because I am opposed to the senators' actions, as my words clearly state.